### 1964

## January

# Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1964 Vol. X JANUARY No. 1

CONTENTS

PAGES AFGHANISTAN Indo-Afghan Trade Agreement Signed 1 CEYLON Trade Arrangement Reviewed 1 HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS President's Republic Day Message 2 INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ORIENTALISTS President's Inaugural Address 3 Speech by Prime Minister 6 PAKISTAN

AKISTAN
Dr. Radhakrishnan's Reply to President Ayub Khan's Letter..
9
Shri B. N, Chakravarty's Letter to Security Council on Kashmir
11
Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to Security Council on Cease-fire Violatio

n 13

REPUBLIC OF KOREA Trade Agreement Signed

14

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Agreement for Instruments Project Signed 15

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

#### AFGHANISTAN PAKISTAN KOREA INDIA

**Date** : Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### AFGHANISTAN

Indo-Afghan Trade Agreement Signed

The talks between a Trade Delegation led by H.E. Dr. Nour Ali, Deputy Minister, the Royal Afghan Government, and the Indian Delegation led by Shri D. S. Joshi, Secretary, Ministry of International Trade, for working out a new Arrangement for the year commencing 1st February 1964, ended in New Delhi on January 21, 1964. The Arrangement signed today by Shri D. S. Joshi on behalf of India and Dr. Nour Ali on behalf of Afghanistan, will initially be for a period of one year and will be renewable for a further period of 2 years.

This Arrangement provides for the exchange of specified goods like dry and fresh fruits, asafoetida, cumin seeds and medicinal herbs, from Afghanistan and traditional items like textiles, tea, spices, and other specified goods, such as certain engineering and electrical equipment and apparatus, hardware, etc. from India. Such exchanges will involve an annual volume of trade of about Rs. 10 to Rs. 11 crores. The two Delegations, recognizing the desire of their Governments to diversify trade, have, agreed that payment in respect of exports by Afghanistan of cotton and wool and by India of a specified list of non-traditional goods will be paid for in free foreign exchange.

The two Delegations also recognizing that more realistic rates for commodities to be purchased by India and a mutually agreed procedure for regulating trade would make for smooth flow of trade between the two countries, have drawn up a schedule of such rates and the procedure.

The talks were held in an atmosphere of utmost cordiality and goodwill.

#### AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA

**Date** : Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### CEYLON

Trade Arrangement Reviewed

Talks were held in New Delhi between a Ceylon Trade Delegation, led by Mr. G. V. P. Samarasinghe, Director of Commerce, and an Indian Delegation, led by Shri D. K. Srinivasachar. Joint Secretary, Ministry of International Trade, from the 7th of January to the 13th of January, 1964, for reviewing the progress of implementation of the Trade Arrangement between the two countries for the year 1963, and for working out an Arrangement for the year 1964, within the framework of the Indo-Ceylon trade Agreement of 1961.

The Arrangement for 1963 provided for the exchange of certain specific commodities like dried fish, cane jaggery and tamarind from India and those like rubber and copra from Ceylon.

Measures for a smoother and quicker flow of goods on either side were discussed, and details of the Arrangement for the year 1964, more or less on the lines, of those for 1963, were also worked out, subject to the ratification of the two Governments.

This Arrangement with reference to certain specified commodities incorporated in the Agreed Minutes signed on January 13, 1964 involves a volume of trade amounting to Rs. 7 crores out of an overall annual trade of about Rs. 22 crores both ways. The working of the Arrangement is to be reviewed once in three months.

The talks were held in an atmosphere of utmost cordiality and goodwill.

1

INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Republic Day Message

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan broadeast on January 25, 1964 the following message to the nation and to the Indian nationals abroad on the eve of the Republic Day (January 26)

Friends,

As another Republic Day approaches, it gives me great pleasure to speak to our people at home and abroad and send them my warmest greetings and good wishes.

The last few weeks have been for us a period of great concern. The Prime Minister has not

been keeping well though happily he is now making rapid Progress. I know i speak on behalf of all our countrymen and friends of peace in the world in wishing him the speediest recovery so that we may continue to have his inspiring leadership. This country has had the good fortune of having Jawaharlal Nehru's stewardship at one of the most critical periods in is history. The general development of the country in the years since freedom bears his impress . He has brought a modern, secular and scientific outlook to our difficult and diverse problems and has indeed reflected the national purpose over these years. More than any one else our Prime Minister has helped to put us on the right track in our quest for national integration and orderly growth.

That we have still not attained the ideal he has set for us is borne out by the distressing events in Calcutta and neighbouring areas these last few weeks. Admittedly the provocation from across the borders of our country was there but we are not being true to the moral and spiritual values transmitted to us from the pas if we allow passions to get the better of us.

The twin means we have chosen for giving our citizens a fuller life are individual liberty and economic planning. In our democracy men of all faiths have the right to live in honour and harmony under the rule of law; the life and liberty of every citizen irrespective of caste or creed ought to be sacred to every other. Any departure from this is not only morally indefensible but politically dangerous; it weakens our internal unity at a time when the danger to our Country from without is undiminished. Government can and will take every step necessary to put down anti-social behaviour but the co-operation of the people is no less important if peaceful conditions are to be preserved, for such peace is the basis on which we could build our future.

Democracy does not believe in the infallibility of any individual or group. It does not think that any particular party represents unblemished good nor does it assume that those who think they are right are really right. Democracy is as much a discipline as it is a privilege; disorder is its antithesis and it behoves us all who wish to see our democracy strengthened to ensure that the manner of its functioning does not become a travesty of what it ought to be. The recent unrest in some parts of the country is traceable to a feeling held that the functioning of our democratic and administrative processes is not as clean as it should be. Factionalism and groupism in politics and loyalty to caste, clan and community have sometimes led to improper decisions- being taken and discontent is the result. We have to guard against the mistakes of a few being visited on the many; if faith is to be preserved in the principles of democracy, corruption has to be eliminated in our public life. It would be well to recognise that the tolerance of our society for weak, inefficient and unclean administration is not unlimited. If social evils such as black-marketing. corruption and nepotism are not effectively dealt with, there is the danger that the idealistic patriotism of public-spirited youth might in frustration seek other outlets.

The strengthening of our democracy is equally bound up with an improvement of our economy and a more equitable distribution of incomes and opportunities. We are now nearing the end of the third year of our Third Plan. A recent appraisal of our economy has indicated that progress so far in the current plan is well below what was hoped for. It is only if the agricultural sector expands adequately that our economic growth would have sure foundations and be broad-based. This is so obvious but it bear, repetition in the light of the inadequacy of our performance.

Though our achievements with regard to industrial expansion have happily been attended with greater success than those related to agriculture and increasing output on the farms, we have barely made a beginning in our effort at transforming ourselves into a modern industrial society.

#### 2

Looking back over the period since we started our efforts at planned development, our achievement though not inconsiderable in itself, has, in relation to needs, been insufficient. We are yet to make a marked dent on the problem of mass poverty-a problem made all the more intractable by the rapid growth of population. Alongside the growth in incomes, we should see that its distribution does not widen the existing inequalities of wealth and opportunity. Concentration of economic power tends to perpetuate inequality; a socialist reconstruction is intended to end it. A natural corollary to our political democracy is therefore a broad-based welfare state with increasing attention to investment in our human resources.

A country like ours can ill afford to divert its resources into non-productive uses like expenditure on armaments and we had been, by and large, successfull in avoiding this; this is regrettably no longer so. The aggression on our northern borders has brought home to us the perils of inadequate attention to our defences. We are correcting this but cannot afford to slow down our efforts at economic growth for the danger to our freedom and our democracy is no less internal.

The only manner in which we can ensure that our resources are put to the constructive work of bettering conditions for our people. is if we have the assurance of living in a world free from the threat of war. Man has now reached a stage when his capacity for destroying himself has never been greater. The only sane and lasting way out of the present situation is by achieving general disarmament and setting up a world authority. It is a pity-and one of particular import to us in India-that China has not been participating in the attempts for disarmament.

In our relations with China and with our other neighbour Pakistan, it is our earnest endeavour to aim at a peaceful and honourable settlement. We have striven all these years to bring about peace not on] on our borders but throughout the world. Our policy of noninvolvement in military blocs was directed to this end. We remain as firmly committed as ever to the methods of peace and to the ideal of a larger world community.

The easing of the cold war in the last few months owes not a little to the efforts of both the Soviet Premier Mr. Khrushchev and of President Kennedy, who was so cruelly and senselessly cut off from our midst last November. President Kennedy was a symbol of youth, hope and courage to a new generation which yearned for peace. We in India, who counted him as a great friend of this country mourn his loss.

As we begin another year in the life of our Republic let us rededicate ourselves to the ideals that have sustained this country in the past and to the completion of the unfinished task of building a brighter future for our people. This can be achieved if all of us work together with determination, unity and character. I wish you all well.

INDIA USA CHINA PAKISTAN

**Date** : Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ORIENTALISTS

President's Inaugural Address

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan inaugurated the 26th International Congress of Orientalists at Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi, on January 4, 1964. This was the first time the triennial Congress was held in an Asian country.

Following is the text of his inaugural address

Delegates to the XXVI International Congress of Orientalists,

I hope you will forgive me for being unable to be present here to greet you in person and welcome you to this Congress.

I have great pleasure in inaugurating this XXVI International Congress of Orientalists. I welcome the delegates, especially those who have come from abroad to attend this Congress. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that for the first time this Congress is meeting in Asia and in our capital in New Delhi.

Delhi itself offers to the investigators glimpses into past civilization. We may say that even a

#### 3

thousand years before Christ we had here, in this locality Indraprastha on which today stands the Purana Qila (Old Fort). The city bears the impress of successive civilizations, especially those of the Yaudheyas, the Kushanas, the Moghuls and the British.

The Sections into which the Congress is divided, and the subjects to be discussed in those Sections, cover a vast field of civilization which have grown up in Egypt, Babylon, Syria, Iran, Israel, West Asia and South East Asia. These civilizations made contributions which are now the heritage of all mankind. Though each of them had literary, artistic, philosophic and religious expressions some of them became more prominent than others in the different cultures. Egypt developed geometry and established the calendar. Babylon laid the foundations of astronomy. India gave numerals and decimals to the world. Iran and Israel laid emphasis on the law of righteousness. The values for which the cultures of these great lands have stood have also affected all civilizations, Greek and Roman, modern European and American. Even in periods when means of transport and communication had not been developed, oriental civilization penetrated into the West. Iran and Greece were in contact with each other and many Indians found their way to Greece through this contact, Asoka's missions to the West and Alexander's influence on Egypt, Iran and North West India produced a cross-fertilization of cultures.

We have a story of the meeting of Socrates and an Indian visitor, reported by Aristoxenes and repeated by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastica. History. When the Indian visitor found than Secrates was interested in the development of human personality, he said that there could not be fulfilment of human personality without adequate attention to the spiritual dimension of man. Consequently, secular humanism required to be sustained by spiritual wisdom.

We have again the report of a conversation between Alexander and Dandamis reported by Palladius and translated into Latin by St. Ambrose in the fourth century A.D. I just read an English translation of it published a few weeks ago. Alexander was greatly struck by the austerity of life and the majesty of philosophical wisdom of the Indian thinker. The Indian told Alexander that natural desires are quenched easily : thirst by water, hunger by food; but the craving for possessions is an artificial one. It goes on unceasingly and never is fully satisfied : "But, thirst being a natural desire, if you drink the water you thirst for, your desire for it ceases. Similarly, if feeling nungry, you receive the food you seek, your hunger comes to an end. If then man's appetite for gold were on the same natural level, no douot his cupidity would cease as soon as he obtained what he wished for. But this is not the case. On the contrary, it always comes back, a passion never satiated, and so mail's craving goes on without end, because it does not proceed from an inclination implanted by nature".1 Manu refers to the substance of this:

na jatu kamah kamanam upabhogena samyati havisa krsnavartmeva bhuya evabhivardhate".

Desire is never satisfied by the enjoyment of the objects of desire; it grows more and more as does the fire to which fuel is added.

Alexander abandoned the view that the non-Greek world was barbarian and its people fit only to be slaves. All men possessing wisdom and virtue are of one family. Plutarch says that Alexander brought together into one body and men everywhere, uniting and mixing, in one great loving cup as it were, men's lives, their characters, their marriages, their very habits of life. He looked upon the whole inhabited world as his fatherland. All good men are of one family; the only foreigners are the wicked. Alexander felt that it was his sacred mission to reconcile mankind. In Egypt, in Iran, in North West India, he felt the impact of the great civilizations of the East and looked upon them as worthy partners of the Hellenic civilization. Shortly before his death Alexander held a banquet to celebrate the end of a great war and he invited to it 9,000 people-Hellenes and non-Hellenes. At the end of it he prayed for peace,

for the partnership of all peoples of the world to live in amity and concord. Homo-noia, of one mind; the world should be based on a communion of minds and hearts.

It is the same task which is set before us today : that the world should get together with a heightened sense of the dignity of man and the brotherhood of peoples. In recent times, the study of oriental civilizations has accelerated this process. sir William Jones, who was a Judge of the High Court in Calcutta in 1784, started a revolution in the study of oriental civilization. He was himself a student of Arabic. Persian and Sanskrit. He affirmed the affinity of many of the European languages with Sanskrit. The similarities of European languages and Sanskrit indicate the extent of the agreement reached by different peoples in the matter of economic organisation, religious thought and social structure.

#### 4

Professor Gordon Childe writes : 'It would be absurd to suggest that any two tribes living, say, in Greece and India and speaking quite unconnected dialects, on reaching the same level of development should have hit upon such similar words for "father", "fall", and "five" and inflected them in such similar ways as the Vedic Indians and the Homeric-Greeks did in fact do. The primitive culture must be the stage of development reached by several peoples while living sufficiently close together to communicate.

These similarities suggest that the two peoples, the ancient Greeks and the Vedic Indians, must have been in communication with each other though neither possessed any recollection of those times and they met as strangers when Loth areas became part of the Persian Empire.

Today, all the peoples of the world form a close neighbourhood, thanks to the invention, of science and the devices of technology. Transport and communication have resulted in the meeting of cultures, races and religions. The only attitude we can adopt in the present context is an attitude not of exclusiveness but of comprehension, not of intolerance but of understanding, not of hatred and fanaticism but of appreciation and assimilation of whatever is valuable.

Mankind has stemmed from one roof, though it is split up into different communities. It is now striving for the recovery of its basic unity and the reconciliation of different cultures. The history of the new world, of one world, promises to be rich in range and majestic in its scope; and we in this Congress can contribute effectively towards the achievement of this goal of humanity.

Many leading intellectuals of the world have been influenced by Indian thought, notably Schopenhauer. Paul Deussen and Keyserling in Germany, Professor Winternitz and Professor Lesny in Czechoslovakia, Emerson. Thoreau and Whittier in America, Sylvain Levi in France, Sherbatsky in the Soviet Union, Colebrooke, Cowell, Hodgson, MacDonell and Thomas in Britain and literary figures like Yeats and AE in Ireland. I am mentioning merely a few prominent names which occur to me now.

We are living in a period of disintegration of faith and growing disillusionment about the traditional values which have come down to us. All eras of transition are periods of disintegration and renewal. People nurtured in the spirit of science and ethical humanism are unwilling to accept anything on authority. So in many parts of the world people are giving up their traditional faith. In this situation, the values for which this country has stood may be of sonic relevance. The Indian tradition asks us to accept nothing on trust or authority but to test everything by experience. Religion is direct encounter with the Supreme reality and insight into the mystery of things, into the meaning of existence. It is anubhava or samsparsa of the Divine. This is the state of awakening according to the Buddhists, of meta-noia or change of consciousness according to the Christians. When once we possess this authentic spirit of religion, which we feel in the pulse of our being, we realize that those who have attained it form one spiritual kingdom. The experience is ineffable that the Supreme is incapable of being expressed in logical propositions or linguistic symbols. So its different stages are described as the Transcendent Reality, the Deepest Self or the Cosmic Lord-

#### brahmeti paramatmeti bhagavan ity sabdyate

The Transcendent is God above all Godsdevati deva. We will discover Him in the depths of our being. So He is paramatman. He is also worshipped as the Lord of the World. There is the confrontation of i and Thou, God and the World. These varying accounts do not constitute conflicting descriptions but express different orders of being of the Supreme. Men may come from east and west, from this religion or that, but they are of the one family of God; the pathways we tread, the names we give, fade away into insignificance when we stand face to face in the glowing light of the Divine. When we touch the flame of the Divine a generous hospitality to different creeds and forms arises. We always have reverence for the inaccessible core of another human being, the potential divinity that dwells wrapped up in another human soul. Naturally, such a religion requires us to recognize the potential spiritual possibilities of the human being and to discard the artificial distinctions which man-made institutions have inflicted on human beings and the shackles of serfdom and helotry. A truly religious man will spend his life in the service of the unfortunate, the unregenerate, the ignorant, the poor and the destitute. According to the Indian traditions-Hindu, Buddhist, Jain and Sikhhe who conquers himself is a greater conqueror than one who conquers in battle a thousand times a thousand men. The so-called stress on asceticism is not to be associated with a negative attitude. It is one of positive participation in the work of the world. If God is the Creator of the world, we participate to sonic extent in His nature. We are co-creators with the Divine. Our duty is not to escape from time but to

#### 5

establish our superiority to the tyranny of time. It is the concept of redeeming the world by men whose hearts are emancipated by love. World redemption sarva-mukti has been the consistent theme of Hindu and Buddhist religious classics. Both Hindu and Buddhist thought agree in asking us to overcome anger by love, evil by good, greed by liberty, falsehood by truth. A religion of this type is rational, ethical and spiritual and its essence is to be found in all human beings. Every human being has rational, ethical and spiritual sides. It is wrong to think that some people are rational and others spiritual.

Every religion has to live up to this high quality of spiritual adventure or it will fade away. It is this religion that we require in the contemporary situation.

Today the, world is eager for the development of a world community based on unity and harmony as distinct from unanimity and uniformity. We have to remember what the great teachers of the world have affirmed, that all men are brothers, and that their differences are not to be obliterated but are to be fostered and sustained by mutual understanding. We must learn from other peoples beliefs and experiences. We have come to realize that conflicts between countries can no more be settled by wars, which are devastating in their character. There are no losers or winners, nor victors or vanguished, in modern war. The differences require to be reconciled in a large understanding of human depth and its varied expression. Through sheer political folly and fanatical, zeal for our own view, we may bring about the end of the world. We must learn to be loyal to the whole human race. Exclusive loyalty to an individual nation or group or creed is not enough in the present world.

You, the explorers of the art, literature and thought of the world's varied cultures, you have a more decisive voice in shaping the minds and hearts of the people than even political leaders. Let us dedicate ourselves today, in the spirit of scholarship which knows no frontiers, which, it genuine, breeds humility and tolerance, to the task of building a new world, to ridding ourselves of every trace of hatred, intolerance, and fanaticism of every variety. Let us move for ward to a great meeting where we respect every man, every race, every culture every creed. The world craves for fellowship. The spirit of this land, from the time of the Rig Veda till today, asks us to move together to develop common ideals and purposes :

samgacchadhvam samvadadhvam sam vo monansi janatam

samano mantrah samitih samani samanam manah saha cittamesani

samano va akutih samana hrdayani vah samanamastu vo mano yatha vah sushasti1

Meet together, talk together : May your minds comprehend alike Common be your action and achievement Common be your thoughts and intentions Common be the wishes of your hearts So there may be thorough union among you.

## INDIA USA EGYPT IRAN SYRIA ISRAEL OMAN GREECE GERMANY NORWAY SLOVAKIA FRANCE IRELAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM CHAD BAHRAIN

**Date** : Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ORIENTALISTS

Speech by Prime Minister

The following is the full text of the speech delivered by the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, at the International Congress of Orientalists on January 4, 1964 :

Mr. President and distinguished delegates, I am somewhat embarrassed at this moment especially after hearing what Prof. Kabir, the President, has said about me. I must confess to you that I do not claim to be a scholar or historian. What I am, it is difficult to say for me--dabbler in many things, but I certainly feel a certain, shall I say, feeling of embarrassment standing before this distinguished audience of Orientalists, because apart from dabbling in many things, I have not studied carefully the work of the Orientalist scholars. I have thought it important and occasionally see what they have done, more to understand what the past has to show us and to relate it to the present and so far as that was possible. That does not entitle the to speak before this audience about subjects that interest you.

Why is a person an Orientalist? I suppose

the very idea involves people from outside this -the oriental sphere-as it may be calledlooking into the ancient lives and thoughts of those who are residents in this sphere. And I have been resident, born and-bred here and I can't very well look at it from outside.

Of course, even looking at it from inside, the mind may be adapted to other things-may look at it from the point of view of an Outsider also.

#### 6

I suppose that the original study by western scholars of Oriental lore was conditioned chiefly by curiosity chiefly by trying to know what it was all about. And I feel grateful to the many eminent scholars in Europe who have studied these subjects and shed a great deal of light on them, studied them from the point of view of modern scholarship and criticism and not merely as, perhaps, an Indian is likely to do in regard to India much overburdened by that very, shall I say, over-burdened by thoughts and feelings of Mr forebears which pursue us still. Now many of our people are. also adapting the modern scientific methods to study them. But what is the object of the study apart from curiosity. It is I suppose to learn how people thought and acted in the old world. It is extraordinary that in some countries, and one of them is India, how these old ideas and thoughts have clung to the people, and survived all kinds of ups and downs-and still affect them and their lives.

I would say that there is something important, something' lasting in those thoughts and things which lasted so long in spite of all manner of events that have happened not in India only-I am referring to other countries too. But at the same time, those thoughts have got tied up with many others that certainly are not of a lasting nature.

They are the various customs and other things which have grown with us and which we find a little difficult to discard although they have no particular virtue and yet, which may have many disadvantages attached to them. But it is for scholars to distinguish between the real thing and dross attached to it which grows with the ages. India is one of the few countries left which has a more or less continuous tradition over a long time past. That tradition is based on the thinking which was current in India a long time ago. It was also based on all manner of customs that have gradually grown and covered our lives, which we find it difficult to get rid of.

Among the other countries, most of them, the ancient countries, whose ancient history you study, there has been a definite break from that ancient period and the modern period. That break I think has not come to India. It has affected India and India is different from what it was, of course, but there has been no sudden break as there has been. there was long ago in Egypt or in many other countries and so India offers a peculiar ground or place for study.

How these old ideas and thoughts have continued and influenced our people and what in them may have some application today and what has no application at all because today all of us, wherever we live, and especially in the older civilizations, have to find some method of finding some synthesis between the old and the new.

We cannot discard the old and uproot ourselves from it. I do not think it will be desirable to do so, that is thinking of the old as something, not something which has some value, not the superficial customs, etc., which have come down to us.

Undoubtedly if we want to give it up or circumstances force us to give it up, we become rootless. We cannot live in the past. We have to live in the modem age and adapt it to our ways. How to bring about that synthesis between the old and the new is the problem before us.

Many of you, ladies and gentlemen, are interested in finding out the old and the very old from various points of view. To me, the chief thing that occurs to me, that fills my mind is how to find the synthesis between the old and the new because I do not find it good enough to discard the old and obviously I cannot discard the new. The two have to be brought together. May be that the new as we know it, important as it is, lacks somewhat of the depth of the old. I am not talking of India only, but of other countries too with ancient civilizations.

There was certain depth, certain something that even now has a meaning. With life today, with its rush and burry and technical developments which are very important in their own way, we are apt to lose something of the depth that the old civilisations gave us. And that is why I have tried to think of how the two can be joined together. In the modem world, with all its great virtues and advantages, one finds a certain superficiality, a certain lack of depth and certain something which takes the value out of life. Whether the old world had it or not, I do not know. Possibly when I talk of the old world I talk about some writers and thinkers only and not of the masses of the people in the old world.

Yet I suppose even the masses were to some extent governed by the thinking of the age and I do not know bow we can keep that depth of the old world and join it to the speed of the new.

I suppose we live now, as we always lived to some extent in the transitional age. Only today the transitions are much more rapid due to the enormous advance that science and technology has made and are making. And that makes it still mom difficult for us to adapt ourselves continuously to the view which is changing all the time. Perhaps, I am thinking of this living

#### 7

in this new world, a little of the old world which helps us to keep our balance and not become something without roots or balance rushing about from one place to another and gradually our standards and ideals also changing all the time.

Well, you ladies and gentlemen are interested in discovering the ancient past of various countries and finding out what they stood for. That is interesting, of course, and it is all a matter of history. It is interesting and that probably leads you to think of other things also. Why it is interesting? What is there in it? What was there in the thinking of the old which has still some meaning for us ? Whether it was Plato, let us say or somebody else, some of our ancient sages or old people of China, Confucius and others. What is there which they said is of value to us today? That I suppose is one of the chief values of these studies.

Sometimes, I find that the specialists in these studies either become rather expert in them, no doubt, but they look upon them as museum pieces, as you look at a museum unconnected with life's every day happenings or they lose themselves in them and they are unconnected with life today.

How can you bring about this connection between the two? It is a strange world we live in, ever changing especially now, opening out new avenues. But all the progress which we make is essentially a knowledge of the. external world and the forces that control it and in technology and science, not very much in it, I suppose, of the knowledge of yourself, of ourselves. We go back to our ancient saying whether it is ancient Greek saying or Indian or of any other country where people always laid stress on a person knowing himself, knowing thyself before one seeks to learn about the world. Well, that is before or after the ancient way of thinking really concentrated itself on knowing oneself and thereby forgot to learn about the external world in which they lived. Today we concentrate our minds on the external world, which is very necessary and very good, but we perhaps, ignore the individual, who he is and do not know enough about him.

These two approaches, the external approach and the internal approach, have to be, I suppose, combined in order to make us realise what we are, how we are to face our problems. This is which I am suggesting to you, I am not sure, is outside the scope of the Orientalists who are here, but I do suggest to you that it is desirable for us to learn something of ourselves, apart from learning something of the outside world about us. That, perhaps, in this era of tremendous change and of confusion if you like, it would be helpful if we thought quietly about ourselves and of the world at large and not merely in terms of the atom bomb and how to escape it. Of course, we all want to escape from the atom or hydrogen bomb. We all want to have peace without which there can be no progress. But in addition to that, it may be necessary to think a little more deeply-what we are, what the

world is and where it is leading to.

I am a politician tied up with day-to-day occurrences and having little time to think of the deeper things of life. Yet nevertheless, sometimes, I am forced to think of them and to wonder what all this is about we indulge in and whether it is worth-while our doing many things that we do. Yet I do believe that there is some force which fashions our destiny, which in spite of all these dangers leads us forward and perhaps, the human race is as a whole going forward, not in the merely material sense, which it is, but also in other ways too, and that out of this tremendous confusion of today something better will arise.

It is in the fashioning of that better world that, perhaps, the old thoughts which our forebears had in various countries could help us. And, therefore, a study of them in an understanding way ought to prove very useful to us.

In India there is a wealth of matter to be studied. I do not know how many books there are, but I was told there are still in Sanskrit alone about 50,000 or more books listed in catalogues-many of them not seen, not read or considered carefully yet, apart from the other visible evidence of the ancient thinking in our temples and structures. And I suppose the same is the case in other countries. And so a study of these must throw some light not only on the past thinking, apart from the past way of life, and help us in the present, because after all our history is a very short one, going back a few thousand years and in these few thousand years all these changes have taken place.

If we could discover the essence of things from a study of the past and the present we might be able to serve the cause of the future a little better and not leave it to take its own shape as it chooses.

You will realise, distinguished delegates, that I have nothing to say to you. Therefore, I am wandering on about various odd things that strike me. I am not touching the subjects you study in India or Egypt or China or Mesopotamia.

I think they are highly fascinating, those sub-

jects. There is still I believe the question of

8

the scripts of Mohenjodaro period which has not been solved yet and the solution of which we may have further light thrown on that period and subsequent periods which came after it. Those are interesting no doubt, but for me their interest lies chiefly in the fight they throw on the present in so far as that light is there. I think they do throw some light on the development of the human species, how they have developed, how they have developed internally as well as externally.

Apart from this, the work of Orientalists, which, perhaps, is considered not very useful from the point of view of the modern world, seems to me of extreme importance. because it throws that light on our past, on our past think ing and past action. So, I hope that your labours of this conference and otherwise will lead to light, more and more light on our past, which will help us to see the present in a proper perspective and not as something cut off from the past.

Therefore, I welcome this conference and you have already been received by my colleague. I also, on behalf of the Government of India, bid you a warm welcome to our city of Delhi and hope that your labours; will be rewarding and interesting and will lead to our understanding the world of today a little more. If we find out the roots, out of which it has grown, we are likely to understand the present day more.

Some people think that the present day is so cut off from the old, that it is not necessary to care about the old. I do not think that that is a very helpful way of thinking. We can only understand the present, if we know something of the past out of which we have grown and your labours no doubt throw light on this past and help us, therefore, to understand this present in a deeper sense than a superficial understanding.

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA EGYPT CHINA **Date :** Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

#### 1995

#### PAKISTAN

#### Dr. Radhakrishnan's Reply to President Ayub Khan's Letter

Following is the text of President Radhakrishnan's reply, dated January 16, 1964 to a letter from the President of Pakistan, dated January 13, 1964

I have received your message of the 13th January through our High Commissioner in Pakistan. Our Government deplores the disturbances that have taken place in West Bengal as well as those that took place earlier in Khulna. district and elsewhere in East Pakistan in which there was wide-spread lawlessness, causing arson, loot and much loss of life and property to the minority community. According to our information, nearly 200 lives were lost in the Khulna riots, and the disturbances are still continuing in many places in East Pakistan, the latest being those, at Naravangani and Dacca.

Our Government is fully conscious of its responsibility for maintaining law and order and for affording protection to all sections of its population on the basis of equality, and has taken the most energetic measures to bring the situation in West Bengal under control. The situation in Calcutta, certain parts of which were affected, and elsewhere, has now returned to normal as a result of firm measures taken which will not be relaxed till complete normalcy is restored.

The figures of casualties reported to you are obviously exaggerated; it is also not correct to say that military rule has been imposed in certain areas of Calcutta. The military were called in in substantial numbers as a precautionary measure in the first instance, and when the situation worsened in certain parts of Calcutta, they were given the responsibility of restoring order, without any diminution of civil authority. Our Home Minister, who has just returned from Calcutta, has made a statement which you may have seen and which I am asking our High Commissioner in Karachi to transmit to you. A hundred and fifty persons, including large numbers of non-Muslims, lost their lives, the latter mostly during police firing. The sternest measures have been taken. The police and troops are unhesitatingly using force against those trying to disrupt the peace. Several thousand arrests have been made by way of preventive action. At several places collective fines are being imposed as a punitive measure. The response to the appeal made by the Home Minister in Calcutta for cooperation by men of goodwill among all communities has been good and peace brigades are functioning. The Home Minister has reaffirmed the determination of the Government to take the strongest possible measures and to afford the fullest protection to all

#### 9

citizens. Many people who had left their homes are already returning and many leaders of the minority community met the Home Minister and conveyed to him their sense of reassurance.

I welcome your statement appealing to the people of Pakistan to maintain calm. I am glad to learn of the. East Pakistan Government's determination to maintain order. I also understand your concern caused by the influx of refuges from West Bengal, though here again the figures reported to you are. grossly exaggerated.

I must confess to you our disappointment lit your own statement on the unfortunate theft of the Holy Relic from the Hazratbal Mosque in Kashmir, which was a matter of sorrow for the entire people of India, and was severely condemned by our Prime Minister and myself. Your Foreign Minister's statement in this context was particularly unfortunate. Without a shred of evidence the theft of the relic was attributed to Hindus and a communal turn to the Hazratbal incident was thus given in Pakistan from the beginning. The Pakistani Press started the most virulent tirade against India and did everything to rouse, communal passions to an uncontrollable pitch. While the emotions of the people in Pakistan over the theft of the sacred relic were understandable, I am constrained to observe that irresponsible and unrestrained statements and accusations against India

and the false cry of Islam in danger had the inevitable effect of inciting the Muslim population of East Pakistan to take revenge on the Hindus still living in Pakistan. A mob of 20,000 which was allowed to form a procession and indulge, in violent demonstration, broke loose and started a reign of terror in Khulna and neighbouring areas lasting for several days in which the minority community in East Pakistan from all accounts suffered grievously. It is the serious incidents in Khulna which lei to the influx of refugees from East Pakistan and started the vicious circle and resulted in the disturbances in West Bengal.

Our Government rejects in emphatic terms the thesis advanced that the disturbances in West Bengal are a part of the plot to drive out Indian Muslims living in West Bengal into East Pakistan. India is a secular State and the home of over fifty million Muslims as well as of several million citizens professing other faiths. The policy of the Government of India has always been directed to the fullest realisation of the secular ideal and to the creation of a society in which all its citizens enjoy equal rights and equal protection of the law. Despite difficulties and those too not of our making, our Govern ment have relentlessly pursued this objective.

You have, in your message, mentioned specific figures of refugees who have allegedly gone from West Bengal into East Pakistan. These evidently must include in large part Pakistan nationals returning to Pakistan in recent months, who had illegally entered into areas of India bordering East Pakistan without visas or permits from the Indian Government who, under well esatablished international law and practice, had to return to Pakistan. The Pakistan Government in spite of repeated requests by the Government of India have done little to prevent the illegal entry of Pakistan nationals into India. The population of our border districts in Assam and Tripura and West Bengal has been abnormally inflated as a result of the influx of such persons. As you are aware, this matter is separately under discussion between our two Governments. On the other hand, the influx into West Bengal of members of the minority community from East Pakistan, which has continued unabated ever since the partition of India, is a matter of history. The number of such refugees, who have been obliged to flee their ancestral homes in distress be-cause of fear and lack of sense of security is well over four million.

Our Government has observed with deep regret and dismay the virulent campaign against India that has been carried on in the Pakistan Press and on the Pakistan Radio in recent weeks. Even yesterday's newspapers in West Pakistan had the most irresponsible and mischievous headlines disseminating entirely false accounts of the Calcutta disturbances. I hope that Your Excellency and your Government will do their utmost to end the tension and disturbances in East Pakistan and to instil into the minority community a sense of security and well-being. In particular, I hope that Pakistan leaders and the Pakistan Press would exercise restraint in their utterances and would do or say nothing to incite communal passions. This is of the utmost importance to both our peoples.

It is my sincere, belief that the time has come when our Governments should put their heads together and devise ways and means of bringing to an end the recurring cycle of such incidents and disturbances in both countries. These not only poison the relations between our countries, but affect the lives of millions of persons who seek nothing but to live as good citizens in their respective countries. I suggest to you. Mr. President, in all earnestness, that we direct ourselves immediately to this task. As a first step I propose that you and I join in an immediate appeal to the people of our two countries for communal peace and harmony. if you are agreeable, my High Commissioner will submit to you a draft of such a joint appeal for Your Excellency's consideration.

10

PAKISTAN USA INDIA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

#### PAKISTAN

#### Shri U. N. Chakravarty's Letter to Security Council on Kashmir

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed the following letter to the President of the Security Council on January 24, 1964, in reply to Pakistan Representative's allegations against India in regard to Kashmir :

I have been instructed by my Government to refer to the letter from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan addressed to you on the question of the alleged steps being taken by the Government of India to destroy the special status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir within the Indian Union around which Pakistan has sought to build up an atmosphere of crisis and to state that this allegation has been dealt with in the letters of the Permanent Representative of India addressed to the Security Council (S/3994, S/4228, S/5454). Nothing has happened since so far as the constitutional arrangements between the constituent State of Jammu and Kashmir and the Indian Union are concerned to even remotely support the Pakistan allegations about the existence of a tense situation and a crisis atmosphere. Legally and constitutionally, Jammu and Kashmir has been Indian Union territory and continues to be so. The inter-relationship between the Union Government and the Government of the State is an internal matter governed by the constitution of India and any change in the existing relationship, within the framework of the constitutional arrangements, would make no difference in the constitutional status of Jammu and Kashmir as a constituent State of the Union of India.

During the last few months, Pakistan has taken every opportunity of creating difficulties and an atmosphere of crisis in Kashmir. In the letter of the Pakistan Permanent Representative addressed to you (S/5450) Pakistan alleged military preparations by India on the cease-fire line with the object of annexing Chaknot, which is on the Indian side of the ceasefire line. This was investigated by the U.N. Chief Military Observer, who came to the conclusion that India had concentrated no troops in or in the vicinity of Chaknot, and that on the contrary Pakistan troops had reinforced the area contrary to the Karachi (Ceasefire) Agreement. Accordingly, he gave an award of no-violation against India and an award of violation against Pakistan (S/5503). Thus the complaint of the Pakistan Government was proved to be false and baseless.

Having failed in their attempt to create trouble over Chaknot, the Pakistan authorities stopped the supply of water in a channel, which takes off from the Betar Nullah on their side of the ceasefire line and which feeds, the hydel generator in Poonch. When an appeal by India to the Pakistan authorities failed to produce any effective result, the State Government had no alternative except to build another channel outside the 500 yards zone on the Indian side of the ceasefire line. While this generator was being built, the workmen engaged in its construction were fired upon from the Pakistan side of the ceasefire line and India had to lodge a complaint with the U.N. field observers. Subsequently, at a meeting of the Commanders arranged by the U.N. field observers, who were also present at the meeting, Pakistan refused to restore water in the original channel. The Pakistan Commander's allegation that the alternative channel had been built within 500 yards zone was denied by the U.N. field observers.

The letter of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan addressed to you is a propaganda move with a desire to exploit certain recent incidents and to divert attention from the serious and tragic disturbances of considerable magnitude in East Pakistan affecting the minority community there. The theft of the Holy Relic, namely, the Prophet's hair, from the Hazratbal shrine in Kashmir had naturally caused serious concern to all people in Kashmir as well as the rest of India. This concern and sorrow was equally shared by people of all religious faiths. It was severely condemned by the President and Prime Minister of India, who expressed their sorrow at the incident. Following the disappearance of the Relic, there were demonstrations in Kashmir, but these were not of a political or communal character. They were participated in by all sections of the people of Kashmir to whom the Sacred Relic was a precious possession. Not only were the demonstrations not aimed against India, but the demonstrators appealed to the Government of India to take charge of the investigations into the theft and to

help recover the Relic. The Government of India energetically responded to this appeal and, thanks to their efforts, the Relic was found and restored with due ceremony. The culprits who were responsible for the theft will soon be put on trial.

The demonstrations in Kashmir at the theft of the Holy Relic were peaceful and orderly manifestation of sorrow and concern at the theft of the Relic and had as their sole objective prompt action by Government of India to recover the holy Relic and bring the miscreants responsible for this sacrilege to book. The attempts of the Pakistan authorities to exploit this sad incident for anti-Indian propaganda and to incite communal tension and conflict failed completely despite the false, and mischievous allegations made by Pakistan that the theft of the Sacred Relic was an outrage against Muslims of Kashmir, perpetrated by India. The people of Kashmir displayed their

#### 11

complete devotion to their tradition of tolerance and goodwill between the various religious communities despite the incitement constantly put out in statements of Pakistan leaders and Pakistani Press and Radio.

The Pakistani leaders and the Pakistan Press, from the very moment that the news of the theft broke out, gave the incident and the peaceful demonstrations of sorrow that followed in Kashmir a mischievous communal turn. Without any evidence whatsoever, and without making any effort to ascertain the facts from the Government of India, Pakistan leaders at the highest level attributed the theft to non-Muslims with the inevitable effect which they could not have failed to foresee on the Muslims in Pakistan and the disastrous consequences this had in East Pakistan, which alone of the two wings of Pakistan has a substantial population of the minority Hindu community.

From January 3, 1964, there were violent disturbances and widespread lawlessness in the East Pakistan town of Khulna and its environs, resulting in large number of deaths and large-scale arson, plunder and destruction of property. Hindu refugees trecked from East Pakistan to West Bengal. As a result communal passions were roused on the Indian side of the border and mischief makers and anti-social elements took advantage of the situation. This led to disturbances in Calcutta and some of its neighbouring areas which were sternly suppressed. The Calcutta and West Bengal situation was quickly and completely brought under control. The Government of India is now engaged in rehabilitating and providing succour and relief to those who suffered in disturbances. The population of Calcutta, both Hindus and Muslims, and others, are fully cooperating with the Government and are actively engaged in the task of reconciliation and reconstruction.

In East Pakistan, however, the attacks on the Hindu minorities continue and in fact have been intensified. A serious situation has prevailed in large areas, including Dacca, Naravangani, Chittagong, etc., beginning from January 14, 1964. The Pakistan Government has placed an official ban on the publication of news relating to the disturbances in East Pakistan. But according to most reliable information, the religious and communal frenzy worked up in Pakistan has resulted in hundreds of people of the Hindu community being killed, and whole villages inhabited by the Hindus being burnt down. In Dacca alone, there are reported to be 50,000 homeless. The letter from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan deliberately suppresses and makes no mention of the extremely serious situation that prevails in East Pakistan, news of which has been withheld by his Government from the press and its own people.

In spite of the curtain of secrecy imposed by the Pakistan Government, it was inevitable that news of the tragic happenings in Dacca, Narayanganj and other places in East Pakistan should leak out to the outer world. A Reuters report, datelined Dacca January 22, has this to say :

At least 1,000 persons were killed in communal riots here last week, authoritative sources said.

An American peace corps nurse, breaking the official curtain of silence on the casualties in the last-week's communal violence, said yesterday that there were 600 dead at Dacca Medical College Hospital alone.

These facts emerged As the army brought Dacca and neighbouring Narayanganj fully under control. The peace corps nurse who reported the 600 fatalities was one of several, who, with missionaries, bore much of the chaotic strain on medical resources. Hospitals were choked with wounded arriving in truckloads during the mass killings and burning of homes, businesses and whole villages.

Commenting on the riot casualties, diplomatic sources said "The total death figure is probably double the 600 at the Medical College Hospital and is at least 1,000".

A Pakistan army officer on the scene reportedly put the deaths at 'the order of 1,000'. The majority of those killed were women and children, the authoritative sources said.

Diplomatic sources confirmed reports that even moving trains were attacked by 'hooligans'. A train at Tejgaon, repeat TEJ-GAON, near Dacca, was stopped and 400 persons were stabbed, sources said. An estimated 500 persons were killed in the Rayer Bazar repeat RAYER BAZAR area on January 15 and 250 houses were destroyed.

Another 150 houses were destroyed in another market area."

The immediate preoccupation of the Government of India-and we feel that should equally be the main preoccupation of the Government of Pakistan-is to control these communal disturbances and give full protection to the life and property of all its citizens despite the tragic happenings in East Pakistan. The Home Minister of India and the Chief Minister of West Bengal have more than once affirmed their determination to protect all the citizens of India, irrespective of religion and creed, from vandalism and organised disturbances. India is a secular State and the home

#### 12

of 50 million Muslims, as well as of several million citizens professing other faiths, the principal of winch are Islam, Christianity, Buddhism, Sikhism and Zoroastrianism, all of whom enjoy complete equality of rights under the Constitution of India. The Government of India. is determined that, irrespective of what happens in Pakistan, there, shah be no violation of the rights and of the security of person and property anywhere in India of any citizen to whatever religious or minority group he may belong, and has taken and. will continue to take, whenever necessary, the sternest measures required to enforce this policy and to prevent any further repercussions in India. The Government of India hopes that the Pakistan authorities will by their policies and actions in their territory assist in this effort.

Among the measures taken by the Governmerit of India have been their appeal to the Press and other mass media of information to exercise restraint in the reporting of news from East Pakistan. They are glad to inform the Security Council that the Indian Press has, with rare exceptions, responded in a most responsible manner to this appeal. While the Press in East Pakistan has of late shown moderation and restraint and has appealed for communal harmony, the Press in West Pakistan continues its hate-India campaign and has indulged in the most reckless and irresponsible headlines depicting completely false picture of the alleged disturbances in India. The Government of India deeply regret that the Government of Pakistan do not appear to have made any effort to restrain the West Pakistan Press.

In the recent exchange of correspondence between the Presidents of Pakistan and India, the President of India made an earnest appeal to the President. of Pakistan in the following terms

"It is my sincere belief that the time has come when our Governments should put their heads together and devise ways and means of bringing to an end the recurring cycle of such incidents and disturbances in both countries. These not only poison the relations between our countries, but affect the lives of millions of persons who seek nothing but to live as good citizens in their respective countries. I Suggest to you, Mr. President, in all earnestness, that we direct ourselves immediate, to this task. As a first step I propose that you and I join in an immediate appeal to the people of our two countries for communal peace and harmony. If you are agreeable, my High Commissioner will submit to you a draft of such a joint appeal for Your

#### Excellency's consideration."

Unfortunately, the response to the proposal made in the Indian President's message has been negative.

The Government of India also proposed along with the President's message that the Home Ministers of the two Governments, accompanied by the Chief Minister of West Bengal and the Governor of East Pakistan, should meet immediately with a view to devising ways and means of bringing to an end the recurring cycle of incidents and disturbances in both countries. This proposal of the Government of India, a most practical and constructive way of dealing with the present difficult situation, has also been ignored by the Pakistan Government.

Instead of responding positively to the constructive suggestions made by the Government of India, the Government of Pakistan have chosen to adopt an agitational approach. I am instructed by the Government of India to point out that the initiative of the Government of Pakistan to call for a meeting of the Security Council in the context of the current situation is purely propagandist and displays a callous disregard of the human suffering and misery caused by these propagandist and agitational moves. The discussions in the Council wherein the charges and counter-charges are likely to be exchanged could only lead to exacerbation of feelings and to a worsening of the communal situation.

The primary need of the hour is harmony and peace between the various communities in India and Pakistan. The differences between the two countries can only be settled in a climate of peace. India stands by its offer that the two Governments should put their heads together to devise ways and means to bring about an atmosphere of communal amity. Once a better atmosphere prevails, it may be possible to discuss the differences which have bedevilled relations between the two countries. India has no desire but to live at peace and in friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan and will, despite provocations, continue to work to this end.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA PERU **Date :** Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

#### 1995

#### PAKISTAN

#### Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to Security Council on Cease-fire Violation

Following is the text of Shri B. N. Chakravarty's letter, dated the 7th January, 1964 addressed to the President of the Security Council on cease-fire violation in regard to Chaknot : Excellency :

In continuation of my letter No. D. 15/PR, dated November 27, 1963 (S /5467), I am desired

#### 13

by my Government to enclose copy of a communication received from the UN Chief Military Observer, giving his awards on cease-fire violation complaints lodged by India and Pakistan in regard to Chaknot. It will be seen that this communication from the Chief Military Observer vindicates the position which my Government took in my letter of November 27, 1963.

It is requested that this communication be brought to the notice of the Members of the Security Council.

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

The following is the text of the Communication, Rawalpindi, dated 29th November, 1963, from Lt. Gen. R. H. Nimmo, Chief Military Observer, United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan, addressed to Lt. Gen. Moti Sagar, Chief of the General Staff, Army Headquarters, New Delhi :

The following ACFVs were received on 21st October 1963 and 19th October 1963 respectively 1. Tangdhar 97 "Pakistani troops in the area Southeast of KEL have been reinforced."

Investigation by UN observers disclosed that troops had in fact reinforced the area contrary to the Karachi Agreement, and I am, therefore, obliged to award a Violation by Pakistan.

I It would appear that the troops were moved on account of reports of Indian concentrations on the opposite side of the CFL, which were unfounded. The troops have since been returned to base.

2. Skardu 29

"Indian troops have concentrated near CFL in the CHAKNOT area at Danna and Tsuntwar."

UN observers were unable to find any trace of troop concentrations, and a decision of No Violation is given in this case.

PAKISTAN INDIA

**Date** : Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Trade Agreement Signed

Documents leading to a long-term trade Arrangement between the Republic of Korea and India were signed in New Delhi on January 22, 1964 at the conclusion of the three-day talks between the delegations of the two countries. Mr. Chul Seung Lee, Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry and Leader of the Korean Delegation, signed on behalf of his country, and Shri D. K. Srinivasachar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of International Trade, signed on behalf of the Government of India. This arrangement, which is the first to be entered into with the Republic of Korea and which contemplates expansion of trade, provides for exchange of commodities consisting mainly of non-ferrous metals like zinc and lead and tungsten ores and concentrates from the Republic of Korea and engineering goods and machinery, ferromanganese, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, etc. from India.

14

### KOREA INDIA USA

**Date** : Jan 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Agreement for Instruments Project Signed

A contract for the preparation of the Detailed Project Report and Working Drawings for the establishment of a Mechanical Instruments Plant in Palghat (Kerala) has been concluded between the Ministry of Industry, Government of India and V/O "Prommashexport", a Soviet supply organisation. The contract was signed in New Delhi on January 10, 1964 by Mr. S. Ranganathan, Secretary, Ministry of Industry, on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. N. M. Silouianov, Counsellor for Economic Affairs of the USSR Embassy, on behalf of V/O "Prommashexport".

The Detailed Project Report of the Plant will be prepared by, a Soviet designing institute on the basis of the Memorandum of Instructions recently approved by the Government of India, and will provide for the establishment of machine and assembly shops, auxiliary shops, designing department, special designing bureau and other services necessary for the running of the plant. This public sector project will have a total annual production capacity of 2871 tons of mechanical, hydraulic and pneumatic instruments, including pressure, vacuum, flow and level measuring and control instruments. automatic hydraulic regulating units, control desks for automatic controllers and also various pneumatic devices. Soviet technical assistance for the project will be financed out of the credit extended by the USSR to the Government. of India under the Indo-Soviet Agreement of November 9, 1957.

The Palghat Project is another instruments plant to be set up in the public sector in India with Soviet technical and economic co-operation, the first one being the Kotah Precision Instruments Plant to be established in Rajasthan. When these two plants achieve full production, the increasing needs of process control instruments for Indian industries can be largely met and a saving of foreign exchange of about Rs. 20 crores a year can be effected.

15

INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1964

### February

### Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affair Record Feb 01, 1964 Vol. X FEBRUARY No. 2 CONTENTS

PAGES **BULGARIA** Five-Year Trade Agreement Signed 17 HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS Vice-President's Address to Parliament 17 INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri M. C. Chagla's Statements in Security Council on Kashmir 21 Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Lok Sabha on Kashmir Debate in Security Council 49 Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Kashmir Debate in Security Council 52 INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Lok Sabha on Foreign Affairs 55 Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Foreign Affairs 60 PAKISTAN Home Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Communal Disturbances in East Pakistan 66 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Indo-U.S. Loan Agreement Signed 73 MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

BULGARIA INDIA PAKISTAN USA

**Date** : Feb 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

BULGARIA

### Five-Year Trade Agreement Signed

A new five-year trade and payments agreement between India and Bulgaria was signed in New Delhi on February 14, 1964. Mr. Ivan Colomeev, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade of Bulgaria, signed on behalf of his country, and Shri S. Vohra, Joint Secretary, Ministry of International Trade, signed for the Government of India.

The agreement, which is operative from January 1, 1964 envisages trade both ways of about Rs. 90 million in 1964 and Rs. 105 million in 1965. The total trade both ways in 1963 was worth Rs. 61.7 million,

The list of Indian exports will be enlarged and diversified as a result of the agreement. Bulgaria will buy from India engineering goods, including tropicalised motors, diesel engines, pumps and sewing machines, drugs and pharmaceuticals, chemical products, cotton textiles, leather sandals (chappals) rolled steel products, tyres and de-oiled cakes apart from traditional items like tea, coffee, jute manufactures and shellac.

India will continue to import from Bulgaria electric hoists, cranes, power cables, transformers, steel products, machine tools, ball bearings, mining locomotives, automatic looms, battery-operated trucks, pig iron, zinc, chemicals, capital goods, etc.

# BULGARIA INDIA TOTO RUSSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

#### HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Vice-President's Address to Parliament

Following is the text of the address to Parliament by Dr. Zakir Husain, Vice-president, discharging the functions of the President of India, on February 10, 1964

Members of Parliament,

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

In the year which has just ended, the Government and the people of India have had to face problems which were vast in magnitude and complex in character. In spite of difficulties and distractions, we have continued to move forward towards our objective of a democratic and socialist order at home and for peace and co-operation in international affairs.

The mid-term appraisal of our Third Five-Year Plan undertaken by the Planning Commission has revealed that the ground to be covered in the remaining two years is considerable and an all-out effort would be required to realise our expectations.

While attention in the re-appraisal has necessarily been focussed on the sectors where we seem to be lagging behind the targets which had been set, it is important not to overlook or minimise the progress that has been made and the achievements which are in sight. The upward trend in industrial production has been maintained. The general level of industrial output in 1963-64 is expected to be 7 to 8 per cent higher than in the previous year. Basic industries, like coal and steel, have made further progress and production in the steel plants is running at near capacity. While power shortages have been felt in certain parts of the country, the total availability of power has improved and the transport position is easier. There has been an improvement in export earnings and with continuing external assistance from friendly countries, our foreign exchange reserves and the country's balance of payments position have not been under the same kind of pressure as in the previous year.

Public sector undertakings have made significant progress. The first Indian-manufactured A.C. electric locomotive rolled out of the Chittaranjan locomotive Works on November 16,

#### 17

1963. The Heavy Electrical Plant at Bhopal has increased its output. The National Mineral Development Corporation has practically completed the development of Kiriburu iron ore mines. The Oil and Natural Gas Commission has established the existence of substantial reserves of oil and gas in Gujarat. The Atomic Energy Establishment at Trombay has begun exporting radio isotopes.

A number of new projects are in various stages of implementation and will add fresh strength to our economy in the years ahead. The expansion schemes of the three public sector steel plants are well under way. Work on the Alloy and Tool Steel Plant at Durgapur is in progress. Action has been initiated for the setting up of the steel plant at Bokaro. Agreements have been signed with the United States of America and with Canada for the setting up of atomic Dower stations at Tarapore and Rana Partap Sagar in Rajasthan respectively. With the other plants under construction for which the necessary external assistance has already been secured, we shall not be far short of our Third Plan target and advance action on additional power plants to take care of our needs in the early years of the Fourth Plan has been initiated.

Despite these satisfactory trends, the overall rate of economic growth has lagged behind the Plan target. This is mainly due to the shortage in agricultural production which in 1962-63 showed a fall of 3.3%. There have been successive bad agricultural seasons in the course of the Third Five-Year Plan. A steady increase in agricultural production is the most important task before us today.

There has been a steady expansion in the overall agricultural effort during the first two years of the Third Plan. About six million acres of additional area have been brought under irrigation. Efforts are being made to extend irrigation facilities to over 5.5 million acres during the current year. Additional allocations of Rs. 19.15 crores have been made to the States for stepping up minor irrigation, soil conservation and agricultural production. Shortfalls in the production of foodgrains have had a disturbing effect on price levels. Through larger releases of goodgrains from Government stocks, the setting up of additional fair-price shops wherever feasible and appropriate regulation of movements, and through credit policies, every effort has been made to prevent prices of foodgrains from shooting up. Control over the ex-factory price and distribution to sugar was reimposed in April, 1963.

In the long run, however, the stability of prices, whether of agricultural or industrial products, can only be achieved through higher production to match the rising level of consumption. I have referred to some of the measures which we have taken to strengthen the agricultural sector and increase agricultural production. These and other measures, together with the policy of price support for major aggricultural crops, should raise the levels of production and productivity in agriculture.

To accelerate the pace of development in industry, various administrative changes have been introduced, procedures are being simplified and certain controls have been relaxed. Finance, both for agriculture and industry. particularly the co-operative sector and small-scale industries, is being made available on an increasing scale.

To improve the tone of administration and to deal effectively and promptly with complaints of corruption or lack of integrity, it has been decided to set up a Central Vigilance Commission which will have a status in its own Sphere broadly corresponding to that of the Union Public Service Commission. Its annual reports will be placed before both Houses of Parliament.

Legislative Assemblies with Councils of Ministries were constituted in July, 1963, in the Union Territories of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura and Pondicherry and a similar set up was established in the territories of Goa, Daman and Diu in December last. The State of Nagaland was formed on December 1, 1963, and elections to the Legislative Assembly were held in January, 1964.

The Chinese threat has continued throughout

the year, though there has been no actual fighting along our borders. China still maintains its intransigent attitude on the Colombo proposals and Chinese military build-up along our borders has increased.

Dedicated as we are to peace and to the policy of peaceful settlement of all international disputes, we cannot afford to neglect our defences. During the course of the year, many steps were taken to improve and expand our Army and Air Force. The response to our demand for recruits to the Armed Forces has been satisfactory in all branches, but we are facing a dearth of qualified personnel for our Technical Services. The conditions of service of armed personnel have been improved in many ways. The more important measures include revision in the rates of pension of Commissioned Officers, liberalisation of pensionary benefits to widows and other dependents of deceased personnel below officer rank and ad hoc increases in small pensions.

In the matter of equipping our Forces, appreciable assistance has already been received

#### 18

from the Governments of the United States the United Kingdom and a number of Commonwealth countries and further assistance is on its way. The Government of the U.S.S.R. have supplied us with a number of transport aircraft and other equipment and are assisting us in establishing a supersonic aircraft factory in the country. We are grateful to all these countries for the help they have extended to us.

To keep our Defence Forces well-equipped, we are anxious to rely on domestic production to the maximum possible extent. We are trying to secure a strengthening of our production base for strategic industries by getting the necessary plant and machinery under the external assistance provided for our Defence. Production in the Ordnance Factories in 1963-64 is expected to exceed Rs. 100 crores, as compared with Rs. 63 crores in 1962-63 and Rs. 41.45 crores in 1961-62.

In accordance with our declared policy, we have continued to seek friendly and co-operative relations with all countries in the world and we have been adhering to the policy of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence, which is receiving growing support and appreciation at a number of international gatherings and from the countries of West Asia and North Africa.

Our President had the privilege and pleasure of visiting the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Nepal, Afghanistan and Iran, and of receiving the warm and generous welcome of their Governments and peoples. With a view to further promoting goodwill and friendship, I visited Ethiopia, Sudan and the United Arab Republic. In addition, a number of our Ministers and other high personalities visited various countries of the world with the same end in view.

Our Government had the privilege of welcoming in this country as our honoured guests during the year : His Majesty the King of Laos; Their Majesties the King and the Queen of Nepal; His Majesty the King of Jordan; the Vice-President of the Republic of Cyprus; the President of the Executive Council of the United Arab Republic; the Prime Minister of the Somali Republic; the Premier of the Northern Region of the Federal Republic of Nigeria; the Premier of New South Wales; the U.S. Secretary of State; Earl Mountbatten of Burma; H.R.H. Crown Princess Margrethe of Denmark; and the Soviet cosmonaut Valentina Tereshkova Nikilaeva and her two colleagues.

We were shocked and grieved to learn of the assassination of President Kennedy. In his death, India lost a genuine friend and, the world, a great champion of peace and amity. We welcome the declaration made by President Johnson that he would continue the policies of the late President Kennedy in the great and difficult task of reducing tensions and maintaining world peace, as well as contributing to the economic development of the less-developed countries of the world.

One of the most encouraging developments in international affairs has been the-acceptance by the United States and the Soviet Union of the principle, subsequently adopted by the United Nations, of banning nuclear weapons from outer space. This and the Test Ban Agreement are significant first steps on the road to disarmament and genuine peace, which can be achieved only in a climate of mutual confidence and cooperative coexistence. We broadly agree with the principle underlying the proposal for an international agreement renouncing the use of force in settling territorial or border disputes made by Chairman Khrushchev, and hope that the principal Powers concerned will be able, in a spirit of mutual confidence, to work out a satisfactory and acceptable agreement on this important suggestion.

Our relations with Nepal are most cordial and friendly and there is full understanding and sympathy in each country for the problems and aspirations of the other. We are continuing to extend assistance for Bhutan's economic and social development.

Members of Parliament are aware of the tragic loss that both India and Sikkim have sustained by the death of the late Maharaja of Sikkim. His son, His Highness Palden nondup, Namgyal, acceded to the "Gaddi" in December, 1963.

We are happy that Kuwait has now secured her rightful place in the United Nations. We rejoice in the independence of Kenya and Uganda and the early advent of freedom and independence to other territories in Africa. We look forward to developing closer relations with all these countries and to co-operating with them in tackling the many tasks of development which freedom brings in its wake.

We extend our full sympathy and support to the African people who art still under Portuguese colonial rule in their struggle for freedom and independence and in the efforts being made by all people of Africa and other countries of the world to put an end to the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination practised by the Government of South Africa.

As regards our realtions with Pakistan, I regret to say that there has been no desire on the part of Pakistan to reach any settlement. The Minister-level discussions on "Kashmir and other related matters" that began in December,

# 19

1961, broke up after five rounds of talks on

May 16, 1963, on an acrimonious note. Hopes for the success of these talks were, in-fact, shattered by Pakistan concluding a border agreement with China ceding to China, a large area of Kashmir which was under Pakistan's military occupation. In spite of this and other acts of collusion with China against India, our Government patiently pursued the negotiations, but the five rounds of talks clearly showed that Pakistan has no intention to reach a settlement on a rational and realistic basis and that its sole object in entering into these bilateral discussions was to gain propaganda advantage against India.

Despite these unfortunate developments, India continued to seek avenues for peaceful solution of Indo-Pakistan problems and to ignore, as far as was possible, the "Hate India" campaign that had been mounted in Pakistan. A renewed call was made by our Prime Minister for a "No War Declaration" between India and Pakistan, and for simultaneous efforts to solve Indo-Pakistan differences through peaceful methods. The Prime Minister's appeal was disregarded and the year ended with Indo-Pakistan relations in a far worse condition than during 1962.

The heinous sacrilege committed by some anti-social elements in Kashmir who stole the holy relic from the Hazratbal Shrine in the last week of December, 1963, caused serious concern to all people in Kashmir as well as the rest of India. The prompt action taken by our Government in assisting the local authorities in Kashmir in the investigations resulted in the recovery of the holy relic which was a matter of great joy and satisfaction to people all over India. The Pakistan authorities, however, exploited this incident to fan anti-Indian and communal feelings in Pakistan which led to serious disturbances and complete breakdown oil law and order in various areas of East Pakistan including Dacca itself, resulting in the loss of several hundreds of lives of the minority community in East Pakistan and considerable loss of property belonging to the minority community. These incidents had repercussions in Calcutta and certain areas of West Bengal and Government took prompt and firm action against the miscreants and gave full protection to the life and property of all citizens of India, irrespective of their caste or creed. Our President

also made a proposal for a joint-appeal by the Presidents of India and Pakistan to restore peace and harmony amongst the various communities living in the two countries and suggested certain practical steps to follow up this appeal. Pakistani response to these proposals has so far been negative. The disturbances in East Pakistan have taken a heavy toll of the lives and properties of the members of the minority community in various areas of East Pakistan. As a result, we are faced with a large influx of the members of the minority community from East Pakistan into India.

Members of Parliament, I have placed before you an account of our main achievements and problems of the past year. I have also given you a brief picture of the tasks and burdens that faze us. They need your dedicated attention, understanding and co-operation in increasing measure. It will continue to be the endeavour of our Government, in all possible ways, to uphold the dignity and independence of our land and people, to promote our unity and well-being and to build a democratic and socialistic society in which progress is sought and attained by peaceful means and by consent.

58 Bills were passed by Parliament during 1963. 19 Bills are pending before you. Among the Bills that will be placed before you for your consideration will be :-

- (1) The Companies (Amendment) Bill.
- (2) The Indian Crop Insurance Bill.
- (3) The Standards of Weights & Measures (Amendment) Bill.

(4) The Indian Railways (Second Amendament) Bill.

(5) Bill to repeal the Bombay Co-operative Societies Act, 1925, as applicable to the Union Territory of Delhi and to extend the Punjab Co-operative Societies Act, 1961, with certain modifications to Delhi.
(6) The Foreign Exchange Regulation (Amendment) Bill.
(7) The Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Bill.
(8) The Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill.
(9) The Aligarh Muslim University (Amendment) Bill.

A statement of Estimated Receipts and Expenditure of the Government of India for the financial year 1964-65 will be laid before you.

Members of Parliament, I wish you success in your labours. I earnestly trust that wisdom and tolerance and a spirit of co-operative effort will guide you. May your endeavours bring increasing prosperity and contentment to our people, stability and security to our Motherland and assist in promoting peace and co-operation in the world.

### 20

USA INDIA RUSSIA CANADA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA CHINA SRI LANKA AFGHANISTAN IRAN NEPAL ETHIOPIA SUDAN LAOS JORDAN CYPRUS MALI NIGER NIGERIA BURMA DENMARK PERU BHUTAN KUWAIT KENYA UGANDA SOUTH AFRICA PAKISTAN

**Date** : Feb 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

# INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statements in Security Council on Kashmir

Shri M. C. Chagla, Union Minister of Education and Leader of the Indian Delegation, made two statements in the Security Council on Kashmir on February 5 and 10, 1964.

Following is the text of his statement dated February 5, 1964 :

The Security Council is perhaps the most important organ of the United Nations. Every Member State has a right to approach it. But they must approach it with a due sense of responsibility. It is not intended as a platform for propaganda against any Member State. Nor is it obviously meant for creating tensions in a world where there are already more than enough difficulties and problems. I propose to satisfy you that there was no justification whatsoever for Pakistan to have taken up the time of this Council. Pakistan's application constitutes the culmination of the campaign of hatred that it has ceaselessly carried on against India. The basic principle of its international policy is opposition to India on every front and, as the London Times recently observed, "The load-stone of every aspect of Pakistan's foreign policy is bad relations with India." Its approach to the Council is purely an agitational approach. Its desire is to use the forum of the Security Council to carry on its agitation against my Government and my country.

We sat at this Council table listening patiently to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to find some reason for the convening of this meeting and into what its deliberations are likely to lead. I confess that after having heard the statement of the representative of Pakistan, my delegation and my Government continue to hold the view that there was no reason for convening the Security Council because no new situation has arisen to aggravate the existing conditions in Jammu and Kashmir.

Pakistan's application reads like a horror story. We are told that the Muslim majority in Kashmir is in great peril by India's attempt at so-called integration or annexation of Kashmir; that large Muslim crowds have been demonstrating against India and in favour of a plebiscite; that Kashmir is in "open rebellion"; that the Kashmir is are being crushed under the heel of India and that terrible things will happen there unless something is done immediately. I shall satisfy you that all this is a figment of a vivid imagination.

Pakistan has pretended to show a great solicitude for the Muslims living in India and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has stated that hundreds of thousands of Indian Muslims have been pushed out into East Pakistan. When Pakistan talks of the Muslim minority, it gives one the impression that we are dealing with a few thousands or a few hundred of thousands of people in a large country tucked away in some far corner and surrounded by a large mass of Hindu population. Now let me inform the Council that Muslims are not a minority in the ordinary sense of the term. They constitute 50 million of the population of India. India is the third largest Muslim State in the world-the first being Indonesia and the second Pakistan. They are sons of the soil, they are Indian by race and they enjoy all the rights of citizenship. Every office is open to them, and in fact many of them hold the highest offices in the land. Our civilization is a synthesis of many diverse cultures and the Muslim contribution is one of the most significant. Ours is a secular State and an egalitarian society where everyone enjoys equal rights and equal opportunities and equal protection of the law. We have no official religion. Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Buddhists, Sikhs, Parsis and others have full freedom of worship, and fundamental rights under the Constitution are guaranteed to every citizen. We have no first-class and second-class citizenship. Before the law everyone is equal.

Much of our differences with Pakistan are due to the fact that there is this basic difference between our policy and that of Pakistan. While we have based our State on secularism, which means that there is no established church and everyone is entitled to profess and practise his religion without let or hindrance from the State, Pakistan is a theocratic State. When the leaders of the Muslim League demanded a partition of the country, the demand was based on the twonation theory. Their contention was that Hindus and Muslims were separate nations and were entitled to have a homeland of their own. We recognize India and Pakistan as two nations, but we have repudiated the two-nation theory based on religion and it is abhorrent to us. If Hindus and Muslims constitute two nations, then the

#### 21

inevitable results must follow that the 50 million Muslims in India are aliens in their own homes. We refuse to subscribe to the theory that religion can be the sole basis of nationality. We believe in a multi-racial, multi-communal and multi-linguistic society, and, according to us. peace and goodwill in this world depend upon the success of such a society. I am sure that this sentiment will strike a sympathetic chord in the hearts of many African countries which have recently achieved independence. Most of them have populations which practise different religions. The same is the case with many Middle East countries, and in the United States itself a brave attempt is being made to consolidate and integrate its different racial groups.

Is it not extraordinary that while Pakistan is shouting itself hoarse as a self-appointed guardian of Indian Muslims, Muslim opinion in India has always strongly endorsed the policy of my Government ?

May I, with the President's permission, read three quotations from three Muslim newspapers in India. They were written in Urdu, but I have the translations. The first is from the Siasat-e-Jadid, of Kanpur dated 16 January, which states :

"The Pakistani authorities and journalists make an exhibition of great sympathy for the Indian Muslim minority and bewail their plight through speeches and writings, without ever realizing that it is for their verbal and written intemperances and provocations that the Muslims have to suffer. Indian Muslims .... want to tell these foolish friends frankly that they should for God's sake leave them alone."

The Nai Dunia of 21 January states:

"Pakistani newspapers, leaders and radio played up the theft of the holy hair in a manner so as to excite the feelings of the majority. If the newspapers, the radio and the leaders of Pakistan had not behaved in this irresponsible manner, the mischief-mongers of Khulna and Jessore would never have dared to attack the life and property of Hindus."

These two places are in Eastern Pakistan. The third quotation is from the Musalman of Mad-ras, dated 18 January, which says that :

"The trouble which started in Kashmir following the theft of the sacred hair should have remained localized but it is to be regretted that Pakistani citizens thoughtlessly created disturbances over it and subjected the innocent non-Muslim minority there to tyranny. This led to Hindu-Muslim riots in Calcutta and the innocent Muslim minority of Calcutta had to suffer."

One might ask oneself what does Pakistan seek to achieve by its anti-Indian crusade, its

campaign of scurrilous abuse and hatred of India? Is it helping the Muslims of India, in exciting communal passions, fanning the flames of fanaticism and intolerance and in preaching Jehad-holy war-helping the cause of Muslims in India? May I observe in passing that no war is holy and that every war is cruel, bloodthirsty and the cause of terrible suffering and distress. No, I do not think Pakistan is so unsophisticated as all that. It wants to see discord and turmoil in India-it wants India to be politically and economically weakened so that it can get an opportunity to continue further its present illegal occupation of a part of territory which by international law is as much a part of Indian territory as Bombay or Delhi is. It is already thereby playing the Chinese game of weakening India internally and undermining its defence against China. I wish to make it clear on behalf of my Government that nothing, and, I repeat, nothing will induce any Government in India, whatever be its party affiliations. to sign the death warrant of the unity, integrity and solidarity of the country.

I said earlier that nothing has hapepned recently to justify Pakistan's approach to the Security Council. We are told in the letter addressed to the President of the Security Council dated 16 January 1964, that a grave situation had arisen in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and this was the direct consequence of the unlawful steps that the Government of India was continuing to take in order to destroy the special status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, that this was a part of India's design to annex Jammu and Kashmir to India and that the Government of India was deliberately set on defying the Security Council and on integrating Jammu and Kashmir with the Indian Union. This is not a new complaint. A similar complaint was made by Pakistan in June 1949 following a decision of the Constituent Assembly of India to reserve four seats for the representatives of Jammu and Kashmir in the Indian Parliament. The United Nations Commission had then refused to take any action in the matter on the ground that it was difficult to oppose the measure of the Government of India on purely legal grounds. Similar complaints had been made by Pakistan every time some chances were made. In regard to the present complaint, it is relevant to point out that this had already

been conveyed to the Security Council by the permanent representative of Pakistan in a letter dated 9 October 1963 (S/5437). India replied to this letter on 13 November 1963 (S/5454). The permanent representative of Pakistan addressed another letter on 5 January 1964 raising

### 22

the same complaints (S/5504). Nothing new has happened since then to justify the demand contained in the letter of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan dated 16 January 1964 (S/5517) for an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider the grave situation that has arisen in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

Let me deal, at some length, with this charge of Pakistan that we are trying to "annex" or "integrate" Kashmir into the Indian Union. It, is beyond doubt that legally and constitutionally when the ruler of Kashmir executed the Instrument of Accession to India and Lord Mountbatten, the then Governor-General of India, accepted the Instrument, the whole of Kashmir became an integral part of the Union of India. it is necessary to look at the political and constitutional position prevailing in the sub-continent of India on the eve of independence. There was British India over which the United Kingdom exercised complete sovereignty. There were also more than 560 princely States which were semi-independent and which were protected by the United Kingdom, by a doctrine known as paramountcy. The meaning of this doctrine was that the King of England and Emperor of India was the paramount lord as far as these princes were concerned and, in return for the fealty pledged by them, the King Emperor gave them protection. When the Indian Independence Act was passed by the British Parliament, British power was transferred to the people of India as far as British India was concerned and Britain also put an end to paramountcy, leaving it to the princes to arrive at such arrangements as they thought proper with the Governments of India and Pakistan. At the same- time, India was partitioned, a part of the country seceding to constitute itself into Pakistan. But the present Government of India was the successor Government to the Government of the United Kingdom. Pakistan was a new State which came into existence. It was also provided that it was open to every princely State to accede either to India

or to Pakistan. The law did not provide that the Instrument of Accession could be conditional. Once the accession was accepted either by the Governor-General of India or of Pakistan, the particular princely State became an integral part of one or the other of the two Dominions. It is significant to note that there was no provision for consulting the people of the princely State concerned. Nor was there any provision that the accession had to be ratified by ascertaining the wishes of the people of the acceding State. Leaving aside for a moment the question of Jammu and Kashmir, several princely States under this law acceded to India or Pakistan. It has never been suggested-either by India or Pakistan that these accessions are, in any Way, incomplete or require some action to be taken before they become conclusive. It is only in the case of Jammu and Kashmir that Pakistan has shown such laudable zeal in the sacred cause of democracy and self-determination.

It has also to be remembered that the partition of India was confined to British India and that in drawing the lines of the frontier, questions of Muslim majority provinces were taken into consideration only with regard to British India. There was no question whatsoever with regard to the religious complexion of the population of the princely States. The question whether one princely State should accede to India or Pakistan was left to the determination of the Ruler of the State. Pakistan has often put forward a proposition that the State of Jammu and Kashmir by reason of its large Muslim majority and of the fact that Pakistan came into existence as a Muslim State should naturally form part of Pakistan. This is a wholly erroneous view of the legal and constitutional position.

The British Government had made it quite clear that the partition was only of British India and that this principle did not apply to those States such as Kashmir and several hundred others, which were ruled by Indian princes. I quote 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 above (about partition) relate only to British India and that their policy towards Indian States contained in the Cabinet Mission's Memorandum of 12 May 1946 remains unchanged."

The Cabinet Missions memorandum reads as follows :

"His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the power of paramountcy. This means that the rights of the States 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 State 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, entering 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

#### 23

instrument of accession executed by the Ruler thereof."

These were Acts of the British Parliament which created the Dominions of India and Pakistan. None of the provisions of these Acts can be questioned, at least by India, Pakistan, or the United Kingdom which were parties to this agreement.

It was entirely for the Ruler of Jammu and Kashmir to decide taking all factors into consideration-the factor of contiguity, the factor of communications, the factor of economic ties and others-whether it would be beneficial for the State to be part of one Dominion or the other. The question of religion did not come into play at all. As a matter of historical fact, although the communal question assumed a large and unfortunate proportion in British India and was the platform on which the Muslim League based its policy, the people of the princely States, particularly Kashmir, although they suffered from many other disabilities and infirmities, did not suffer the disastrous consequences of religious hatred or intolerance.

Therefore, there is no substance in the suggestion that the accession of Jammu and Kashmir was not complete and absolute because the people of that State had not been consulted nor been given opportunity to express their choice. It is clear that international law does not require that a treaty concluded by the Ruler of a State, and with the mutual consent of the contracting parties, a treaty which is otherwise valid and binding, should be referred to the will of the people before it takes effect. There is no doubt, and I do not think that Pakistan can dispute it, that the Government of the Maharaja of Kashmir was recognized by Pakistan. It was with this Government that Pakistan concluded a standstill agreement by the exchange of telegrams on 12 and 16 August 1947. At that time the Government of Pakistan had not guestioned whether the Government of the Maharaja was capable of expressing the will of the people nor had it doubted the validity of the agreement. It is thus clear that international law does not require that the party to an agreement should look behind a recognized Government with whom it contracts to see that the agreement has been arrived at by prior consultation with the people. In fact, as I shall mention later, the accession was also supported by the largest political part in Kashmir.

I shall briefly deal with the subsequent event and developments in Jammu and Kashmir an see whether these have, in any way, affected the legal and constitutional position. I hope to satisfy the Council that they have not, in the slightes degree. Jammu and Kashmir became an integral part of India when the Instrument of Accession was signed and accepted, and from that day till today it continues to occupy the same position vis-a-vis the Indian Union and no question can possibly arise of annexing Kashmir or further integrating it into the Indian Union. You cannot make more complete what is already complete.

The distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan has said nothing new on the legal aspect of the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India. He has repeated the same mixture of misstatements, omissions of material facts and the refusal to face up to the clear provisions of the Indian Independence Act. I do not wish to enter into the details of our case, which is well known to the Security Council. It was last set out at length in 1962. I shall content myself with drawing attention to salient points.

Unlike most of the rulers who had acceded to India or Pakistan before 15 August 1947, the Ruler of Kashmir did not make up his mind. Pending a decision on accession, he asked for a standstill agreement both with India and with Pakistan in regard to communications, supplies and post and telegraph arrangements which had always been interlinked with British India. Pakistan concluded the standstill agreement, but before a standstill agreement with India could be concluded tribal raids started. Despite the standstill agreement, Pakistan cut off communications and stopped the supplies of essential commodities, thereby putting undue pressure on Kashmir. When this pressure failed, armed invasion by nationals of Pakistan and tribal raiders followed. The Ruler's appeals to Pakistan were of no avail. The raiders caused havoc in different parts of Kashmir. The Kashmir State troops were incapable of offering effective resistance to such a large body of raiders. Events moved with great rapidity and the threat to the Valley of Kashmir became grave. Unable to prevent the raiders from committing largescale killings, loot and arson, the ruler requested the Government of India that the State of Jammu and Kashmir should be allowed to accede to the Indian Union. An appeal for help was also simultaneously received by the Government of India from the National Conference, which was the largest popular organization in Kashmir and which had fought for the people's rights and agitated for freedom of Kashmir from the rule of the Maharaja. The Conference also supported the request for the State's accession to India. May I draw the attention of the Council to what was stated by Sheikh Abdullah, who was then the leader of the Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, and about whom we have heard

### 24

such laudatory remarks by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan? This is what, he said : "When the raiders were fast approaching Srinagar we could think of only one way to save the State from total annihilation, by asking for help from a friendly neighbour. The representatives of the National Conference, therefore, flew to Delhi to seek help from the Government of India but the absence of any constitutional ties between our State and India made it impossible for her to render any effective assistance in meeting the aggressor.... Since the people's representatives themselves sought an alliance, the Government of India showed readiness to accept it. Legally, the Instrument of Accession had to be signed by the Ruler of the State. This the Maharaja did."

A Sheikh Abdullah has come to judgment! And I hope Pakistan will accept that judgment, both as to the consultation with the people of Kashmir and also as to the fact that India did not put any pressure on Kashmir to accede to it.

As I have already stated, the Governor-General, Lord Mountbatten, accepted the Instrument of Accession. In answer to a letter of the Prime Minister of India, dated 22 December 1947, requesting Pakistan not to give aid or assistance to the raiders and not to prolong the struggle, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, on 30 December 1947, replied :

"As regards the charges of aid and assistance to the invaders by the Pakistan Government, we emphatically repudiate them. On the contrary, the Pakistan Government have continued to do all in their power to discourage the tribal movements by all means short of war."

On 1 January 1948, we approached the Security Council and, in our letter of that date, we stated:

"Such a situation now exists between India and Pakistan owing to the aid which invaders, consisting of nationals of Pakistan and tribesmen from the territory immediately adjoining Pakistan on the north-west, are drawing from Pakistan for operations against Jammu and Kashmir. The Government of India request the Security Council to call upon Pakistan to put an end immediately to the giving of such an assistance which is an act of aggression against India."

It is an extremely significant fact, which is often overlooked because so much time has passed since that event, that we were the complainants before the Security Council. and that we complained of aggression by Pakistan. On 15 January 1948, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan again emphatically denied that the Pakistan Government was giving aid and assistance to the invaders or had committed any act of aggression against India. On the contrary, the Foreign Minister stated, his Government had continued to do all in its power to discourage the tribal movement by all means short of war. He stated that the allegations made by the Indian Government that the Pakistan Government has affording aid and assistance to the tribal forces, or that these forces had bases in Pakistan territory or were being trained by the Pakistan Army, were utterly unconfirmed. Pakistan never contended that India had no right to be in Kashmir.

This categorical denial by Pakistan of being behind the tribal raid is the most important and significant aspect of the whole Kashmir issue. It is significant that, at that stage, Pakistan never tried to justify its presence in Kashmir or to claim any right to be there. Pakistan was obviously quite aware of the fact that its presence in Kashmir was contrary to international law and was fully conscious of the illegality of its action That is why Pakistan could not admit its presence in Kashmir and that is why there, was a total and straight denial of its presence. Incidentaly, the facts just stated by me clearly shown that the plea now put forward that Pakistan went to Kashmir in support of a liberation movement is clearly an afterthought designed to create a false moral justification for its invasion of Kashmir. Subsequent admissions by Pakistan, to which I shall presently refer, have made clear that this was not merely an equivocation but a deliberate falsehood.

In its reply to the Government of India's complaint dated 1 January 1948, Pakistan, on 15 January, cast doubts on the legality of the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India by suggesting that the accession had been obtained by fraud and violence. It is clear that in law, if fraud and violence was not established as vitiating it, the accession was perfectly legal and binding. On the question of fraud and violence, it may be stated that Lord Mountbatten had told the Maharaja of Kashmir, on behalf of the Government, that "you may accede to Pakistan if you wish and we will not take it as unfriendly act". It is also an admitted fact that not a single Indian soldier was sent to Kashmir to fight against the raiders before the accession. If any violence was used at all against the State of Jammu and Kashmir and Maharaja, it was by Pakistan. If the Ruler of Jammu and Kashmir was forced to accede to India, it was not because violence was used by India but because it was used by Pakistan and therefore, strangely enough the fraud and violence which Pakistan was complaining of was fraud and violence used not by India, but by itself, and it does not require

#### 25

a very deep knowledge of law to understand that a party cannot challenge or vitiate the legality of a contract by pleading its own unlawful acts.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has stated that India ootained the signature of the Ruler on the Instrument of Accession at a time when the people of Jammu and Kashmir had risen in rebellion against the Ruler and had ousted his authority from the State. This is a complete and utter distortion of facts. It was the tribal raiders and Pakistan nationals, aided and abetted by the Pakistan Government, who carried fire and sword into Kashmir, whose fate is now of such great concern to Pakistan, and compelled the Ruler to turn to India in the hour of extreme peril. Let us once again turn to Sheikh Abdullah, whose testimony is of great importance because it is the testimony of a witness who is speaking about contemporary events :

"When for the first time the people of Srinagar saw the incoming planes from India and the tanks of the Indian Army passing through the streets here, their disappointment and anguish was turned into joy and happiness. The people here, Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs, heaved a sigh of relief, knowing that their honour and dignity could now be safeguarded. We must not forget that time." The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has also

spoken of a despotic Maharaja having signed the Instrument of Accession. Are all the rulers of States who have acceded to Pakistan' paragons of democratic virtue?

When the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan visited Karachi in July 1948, Pakistan could no longer keep up the story that it had a blameless record as far as the invasion by the raiders was concerned, and Sir Mohammad Zafrullah Khan informed the Commission that three regular Pakistani Brigades had been fighting in Kashmir territory since May 1948.

It is in this context that the UNCIP resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949 which we accepted-and these are the only two resolutions, apart from the resolution of 17 January 1948, to which we have agreed-have to be understood and appreciated. The very foundation of these resolutions was that the presence of Pakistan in parts of Jammu and Kashmir was illegal, and that it must withdraw its troops and vacate the aggression against India. It is clear from the wording of paragraph 2A

(1) of the resolution of 13 August : "As the presence of troops of Pakistan in the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir constitutes a material change in the situation since it was reported by the Government of Pakistan before the Security Council, the Government of Pakistan agrees to withdraw its troops from that State."

It was only on Pakistan's complying with this essential condition that the possibility of holding a plebiscite in Kashmir could arise. It is clear that the Security Council could not possibly have suggested to India the holding of a plebiscite so long as a gross illegality perpetrated by Pakistan and a deliberate violation of international law remained unrectified. The Security Council could not possibly countenance a naked aggression by one country against another.

It is often forgotten that, when Pakistan approaches the Security Council, it does so as an aggressor which has not vacated its aggression. My submission to you is that Pakistan has been guilty of gross contempt of this august body, and it has no right to be heard till it comes with clean hands. It has not only not washed its hands, and not only tries to justify its aggression, but seeks to challenge the legal validity of an accession which has been accepted by the UNCIP and on the basis of which Pakistan's presence in Kashmir has been held to be illegal and contrary to international law.

Memories are so short that I am sometimes surprised that Pakistan should be permitted to reverse the roles of itself and India before the Security Council. It comes here in the innocent garb of an aggrieved party making charges against us as if we were the aggressors. Throughout this Kashmir controversy, which in all conscience has been sufficiently long and protracted, Pakistan has continued to be an aggressor. Even today it is guilty of continuing aggression and, in my submission, it has no locus standi whatsoever to make any complaint with regard to what India is doing in an integral part of its country.

It has been said that, notwithstanding the accession, assurances were given by several eminent Indian authorities that the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir would be consulted with regard to that State's forming part of India. Those assurances which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan catalogued in his speech were given always in the context of the vacation of Pakistani aggression and withdrawal of Pakistan from Kashmir as a condition precedent. The letter of Lord Mountbatten, the Governor-General of India, dated 27 October 1947-a separate communication to the Ruler not forming part of the instrument of accession-itself says :

". . it is my Government's wish that as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir and her soil cleared of the invader, the question of the State's accession should be settled by a reference to the people."

#### 26

I emphasize the words 'as soon as law order have been restored in Kashmir and her soil cleared of the invader".

Even today, sixteen years later, the soil of Kashmir is not purged of the invaders who continue unlawfully to hold two-fifths of the State. Every time the authorities in India, the Prime Minister or someone else, talked of ascertaining the wishes of the people, such remarks were always in the context of our demand for Pakistan's withdrawal from Kashmir.

A plebiscite is only a machinery for ascertaining the wishes of a people. There is nothing sacrosanct about it. There are other methods which are equally efficient. The British Government has, in the last twenty years, transferred power to a large number of its colonies, but it has never thought of ascertaining the wishes of these colonies by holding a plebiscite. In India itself no plebiscite was held to determine either whether the people of the sub-continent of India wanted freedom or whether the majority of Muslims living in the country wanted partition. The United Kingdom came to the conclusion that independence should be given and the country should be partitioned because it was satisfied that the Indian National Congress on the one hand and the Muslim League on the other represented the people on these two issues. In Jammu and Kashmir the National Conference as a party represented the overwhelming majority of the people of that State, and, as I have already pointed out, it fully supported the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India.

We accepted the two resolutions of the Security Council-namely, those of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949. Under these, a series of steps were contemplated to follow one after the other. The resolution concerning a plebiscite, namely, that of 5 January 1949, was subsidiary and supplementary to and an elaboration of part III of the resolution of 13 August 1948, if and when that part was reached. It was like an architects design and a blueprint and the 5 January 1949 resolution could spring to life only if the 13 August 1948 resolution was fully implemented.

The possibility of a plebiscite was envisaged because at that time no elections had been held in Kashmir. Subsequent to that Kashmir has had three general elections with universal adult franchise, and at all these three elections a party has been returned to power which firmly and emphatically supports Kashmir's integration with India. The last election, in 1962, was held under the Indian electoral law and supervised by the Indian Election Commission. We ourselves have held three general elections. Even our worst enemies have not suggested that these elections were rigged or that they were not secret and free. It was the ballot box that determined which member should be elected, and the elections were so free that in one general election, in one State, a party was returned to power which was opposed to the majority in India, the Indian National Congress. Therefore, if it was necessary to ascertain the wishes of the people of Kashmir, they have been ascertained not once, not twice, but on three occasions. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has made a great deal of capital from the quotations he has used from various papers about the nature of elections in Kashmir. May I quote from one of the papers he has chosen to quote. This is from the Manchester Guardian :

The Jammu elections are a great and quite a genuine victory for the National Conference.

Elections in Kashmir are over. In Jammu the National Conference was given a tough fight by the Hindu Praja Parishad, and all but five of the seats were contested. After strenuous canvassing and election fever, equalled only in India's most advanced parts, the National Conference won two-thirds of the seats....

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has referred to thirty-two candidates being returned unopposed in the 1962 elections, but he has chosen not to mention the thirty-nine other seats which were hotly contested.

Pakistan's perpetual harping on plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir is not due to its faith in democratic principles. I should have thought that democracy, like charity, begins at home, and before Pakistan preaches to us how we should ascertain the wishes of the people of a part of our country, it should first make at least a beginning in establishing democratic institutions at home. I need hardly say that since its existence it has never sufficiently trusted its own people to permit them to participate in a general and direct election for the creation of legislative and parliamentary bodies.

As the Foreign Minister knows, his own President has repeatedly stated that the people of Pakistan are not fit to exercise such democratic rights and, after seventeen years of independence, the people of Pakistan are still being educated in basic democracy, which, I need hardly say, is a very diluted form of democracy. The real reason for insisting on a plebiscite is to try and see whether it cannot inflame communal passions in Kashmir by making the inhabitants of that State believe that their religion is in danger, and bring about the recurrence of the terrible events of the partition of India in 1947 bloodshed, migrations, untold human misery. Therefore, if I may sum up, our position on Jammu and Kashmir is clear and unambiguous.

#### 27

The two resolutions of the Security Council dealing with, the plebiscite were conditional and contingent on Pakistan vacating its aggression and the condition has not been com with. It is really more than a condition. It was the very basis on which these two resolutions were founded, and the condition not having been complied with and the basis having disappeared, these resolutions are no longer binding on us. In any case, by the passage of time and various factors intervening-to which I shall draw attention a little later-they have become obsolete. We cannot possibly contemplate with equanimity the threat to the integration of our country and the danger to our cherished principle of secularism by the holding of a plebiscite in Kashmir. I wish to make it clear on behalf of my Government that under no circumstances can we agree to the holding of a plebiscite in Kashmir.

Let me deal with the allegation of Pakistan of the so-called attempt on the part of my country to further "integrate" Kashmir with India. In the first place, as Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India, what we have been doing is adjusting our relations with a constituent State of the Indian Union. It is on par with the Congress of the United States dealing with one of its fifty federated States. Therefore, the question raised by Pakistan is purely a domestic matter with which only India is concerned and in respect of which Pakistan has no right to intervene or interfere and which has been specifically excluded under the Charter from the jurisdiction of the United Nations.

But, even so, let us see what we have done which has roused the wrath of Pakistan and

which has brought it with such urgency to the Council. I may point out that Part XXI of our Constitution deals with provisions with respect to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. There are also other articles in that Part which deal with other States in the Indian Union such as Andhra Pradesh, Punjab and Maharashtra. These provisions in turn are intended to be only temporary and transitional. These will continue to apply so long as the necessity for their application continues. When the necessity disappears, these provisions will be deleted and the provisions of the Constitution which apply to all the States would also apply to the States with regard to which special arrangements have been made tinder this Part. It may be pointed out that the Centre's powers have constantly been modified or extended within the framework of the Constitution, so that the relationship between the Centre and the Constituent Units has been changing. These changes which occur at various intervals are part of the larger process of the organic growth of the Union of India. Now the changes, which are being contemplated and which formed the subject matter of Pakistan's letter of 16 January 1964 are changing the name of the Head of the State from "Sadar-i-Rivasat" to "Governor" and that of "Prime Minister" to the "Chief Minister". This is only a change in nomenclature.

The other proposal complained about is that the representatives of the State of Jammu and Kashmir in the Indian Parliament are hereafter to be elected directly by the people of Kashmir and not appointed on the recommendation of the Kashmir Legislature, as is being done so far. What is wrong in this ? One would have thought that Pakistan, with its professed solicitude for the right of self-determination of the Kashmiris, would prefer the direct election of their representatives to the Indian Parliament.

The next objection refers to certain amendments to introduce more progressive labour legislation. India is a member of the ILO and has adopted a number of ILO Conventions. The Indian Labour Legislation is in keeping with these conventions. The need for such labour legislation in Kashmir was not felt so long, since there was hardly any organized factory labour in Kashmir. Now that certain mineral resources have been discovered and mining industry has started, it has become essential to introduce modem labour legislation to prevent abuses. We are bound by the ILO conventions and we cannot ignore our obligations with regard to any part of our territory. Similarly, what can be the objection to the Government of India sharing with the State Government concurrently the power to make laws in respect of medical and other professions when the State Legislature agrees to this change and there is a formal request by the duly elected Government of Jammu and Kashmir. We feel that all India and other medical services lead to progress and

increased efficiency and the co-ordination of professional standards in different parts of India. So all these changes are for the benefit of the people of Kashmir. It is not a suppression of any human rights. If the Prime Minister of India used the expression the gradual erosion of article 370", it was a perfectly correct expression because by its very nature article 370 is temporary and must gradually fade away and disappear.

In his speech the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has also referred to further acts of integration by mentioning the taking over of responsibility for the administration of highways, telegraphs, telephone, income tax, broadcasting and customs; the subordination of the accounts and audit department of the State to the Auditor-General of India; the abolition of the custom barriers and the permit system for entry into and out of the

#### 28

State; the subjection of its economic plans to the Planning commission and the authority of the Supreme Court of India over Kashmir: and the arrogation by the President of India of powers to promulgate laws in Jammu and Kashmir by executive fiat--all these, among other things"-- and I am quoting the Foreign Minister of Pakistan--"are links in the chain with which Jammu and Kashmir has been shackled." If ever thee was a travesty of what we have done in Kashmir it is this.

Does Pakistan expect that while it continues its aggression, we should sit with folded hands and do nothing whatever in Kashmir to improve the lot of the people? Every action we have taken and to which the representative has referred has been in favour of amelioration of the conditions in Kashmir in favour of modernizing the state. Look at the language used by the representative of Pakistan: the subordination of the accounts and audit department of the State to the Auditor-General of India. Is it a bad thing to have a proper audit of the accounts of a State by an independent official like the Auditor-General of India, or does Pakistan want that those in charge of the revenues of Kashmir should play ducks and drakes with the peoples's money? Surely, the abolition of custom barriers and the permit system for entry into or out of Kashmir and other parts of India. In India we have a Planning Commission which plans for the economic development of the country. The plan is prepared after full discussion and debate at various levels.

We want Kashmir to participate in these economic processes which are the modern methods of ensuing orderly economic development which is beneficial to all the people of the country. It is indeed surprising that objection should be taken even to what is called the imposition of the authority of the Supreme Court of India over Kashmir. The Supreme Court is the highest court in our country, and under our Constitution it is constituted the custodian of the fundamental rights of the citizens. It is to safeguard these fundamental rights of the people of Kashmir that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court has been extended to Kashmir. The President of India does not promulgate laws unless the necessity for it arises and the conditions for the promulgation are duly satisfied. Our President is not a dictator. He is the constitutional Head of the State, and he can only act on the advice tendered to him by the Governnment of India, which is a Government responsible to Parliament. It is indeed a misuse of language--I would rather say a perversion of Language--to speak of these changes in Kashmir as links in the chain with which Jammu and Kashmir has been shackled." No amount of declamation from Pakistan will deer the Government of India from doing its duty by our people in kashmir.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, overwhelmed by the enthusiasm generated by his cause, agreed with the statement attributed to Sheikh Abdullah:

"Crores of rupees of the India Exchequer have

largely been utilized to corrupt the people of Kashmir and almost killed their soul." (1087th meeting, p 36)

Let us see how we have been corrupting the people of Kashmir and almost killing their soul. The revenue of the State of Jammu and Kashmir in 1947 was \$5.5 million. In 1959-60 it was \$23.5 million. The per capita income in 1950-51 was \$38 and in 1959-60 it was \$48. The food production prior to 1951 was 0.3 million tons and in 1961 it was 0.5 million tons. The electricity produced in pre-1951was 4,360 kilowatts and in 1961 it was 16,000 kilowatts. The number of factories in 1947-48 was 44 and in 1961 it was 138. The roads per hundred square miles prior to 1951 were 205 miles and in 1961 it was 40 miles. This is important. The number of tourists in pre-1951, in a country divided from the outside world by a wall of steel in the words of the Foreign Minister, was 27,207; in 1961 it was 71,000. The number high and higher secondary schools in 1947-48 was 52; in 1961 it was 262. The figure of literacy were 6.6 per cent before 1947; in 1961 it was 12 per cent. The number of hospitals and dispensaries in 1947-48 was 89; in 1961 it was 349. The average life expectancy before 1951 was thirty-two years; in 1961 it was fortyseven years. What a distressing picture of a country again to quote the phrase used by the Foreign Minister, "under the colonial domination of India!"

I will now turn to the baseless and mischievous connexion which Pakistan has sought to establish, in its letter of 16 January 1964, between these changes in the constitutional relations between India and one of its constituent states and the deft of the holy relic from the Hazratbal Shrine. It is suggested that this sacrilege has served to provide a spark to the bitter discontent and indignation which has been mounting in Kashmir as a result of India's policies and which is now rampant amongst the people of Jammu and Kashmir against recent Indian moves to "integrate" that part of the state with the Indian union; that since the theft of the holy

## 29

relic the Muslim population of Jammu and Kash-

mir has given vent to its anger through massive demonstrations for more than ten days; and that hundreds of thousands of Muslims kept marching in mourning procession day after day through the streets of Srinagar. You will note that what is stated here is that the demonstration was by the Muslim population of Jammu and Kashmir; no one else joined. It will be immediately noticed that Pakistan has tried to give a communal turn to the incidents in Kashmir. To Pakistan everything is communal. It cannot observe any event except through communal glasses. It cannot understand how Hindus and Muslims can live peacefully in Kashmir and have the best of relations. Its philosophy is that in the very nature of things Muslims must hate the Hindus and the Hindus must hate the Muslims.

When the sacred relic was stolen, Pakistan expected that there-would be communal riots in Kashmir. Not only did it expect this, but it did its best to incite them, as can be seen from the statements that appear in the Press and also the utterances of responsible men in Pakistan. President Ayub Khan, speaking in Sukkur, on 4 January 1964 said :

"that the theft of the holy relic is a calculated political conspiracy to subject the Muslims of the Occupied Kashmir to more and more atrocities. . . He said, no Muslim, however sinful, could ever think of committing such a sacrilege. Therefore, it was certain that no Muslim could be held responsible for this heinous crime and as such it was evident that the crime was motivated by a political conspiracy"-and this without a tittle of evidence.

As you will see. the suggestion in this statement is that it must be a Hindu who stole this relic in Kashmir. and thereby incited the Muslims of Kashmir against the Hindus.

I am now quoting a very well-known news, paper from Stockholm. Svenska Dagbladet of 30 December said :

"..... it is difficult to believe that the theft of Mohammad's lock of hair that has caused such riots in Kashmir, would have been initiated by Hindus even if, naturally, there are fanatics in Hindu circles also. It is more probable that the deed has been done by some Pakistan agent, perhaps one of the Pathans who, during the last few years, have been recruited by the recruitment agencies on the Pakistani side to take part in a planned 'Algerian Liberation War' on the Indian side .... In this way Chinese interests are also served. The Indian defence of Ladakh is wholly dependent on the connection of Srinagar and the Vale. The only road from Ladakh goes straight down to Srinagar and, therefore, has an enormous strategic importance."

In quoting from the despatch from Richard Critchfield, Mr. Bhutto, the Foreign Minister, conveniently omitted a significant portion thereof. This is what he says in continuation of what Mr. Bhutto has quoted :

"Meanwhile. in Pakistan, Foreign Minister Mr. Bhutto urged Kashmiris to rebel against the Indian-controlled Government."

And the Foreign Minister comes to you here. to appeal for peace. I repeat: the Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto, urged Kashmiris to rebel against the Indian-controlled Government.

Does the Foreign Minister accept this presentation of his statement to be correct? The Economist of 4 January 1964, also quoted by Mr. Bhutto, says :

"Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Mr. Z. A. Bhutto, has charged Indian "occupation authorities with instigating the theft, apparently so as to terrorize the 'oppressed' Muslims into fleeing from their homes. This is an implausible accusation, to put it mildly, but the point is not that it is implausible, but that it is made."

So the Economist realizes the point of Mr. Bhutto, the Foreign Minister, in making this charge that the theft was instigated to terrorize the oppressed Muslims. The suggestion was that there should be trouble in Kashmir and the people of Kashmir, especially the feelings of the Muslims, should be inflamed and that they should rise against the Hindus.

Now unfortunately for Pakistan it is a fact which cannot be challenged that there was complete communal unity during the demonstrations that were held by the people of Kashmir protesting against the theft of the relic. Hindus and Sikhs joined their Muslim brethren in mourning this loss. To the Hindus and the Sikhs the relic was not a Muslim relic but was a relic belonging to Kashmir, indeed to the whole of India. We in India respect each other's religion. Hindus revere Muslim saints and vice versa. We all join in the celebrations of different communities. It requires a modern secular rational outlook to understand this phenomenon.

A further significant fact of these demonstrations is that not only were they not aimed against the Government of India but, on the contrary, they showed complete confidence in the policies of my Government and what is more they appealed to the Union Government that they, rather than the local administration, should investigate into this crime and bring the guilty to book. It was in response to the appeal of the

#### 30

people of kashmir that the Government of India sent its highest officials to Srinagar to investigate the matter and to recover the relic. The action of my Government was successful because the relic was recovered and restored. According to a report in The New York Times of 4 February 1964, datelined Srinagar, 3 February :

"A Committee of Muslim leaders decided today that the hair now enshrined in a mosque near here was the one that disappeared from there last December 26th."

According to the latest information that I have received, a special "didar" or exposition of the holy relic was held on 3 February at Hazratbal. A number of prominent religious personalities, most of whom were nominated by the Action Committee, to whom reference has been made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, saw the holy relic and declared it genuine in the presence of the large number of people in the mosque. Among those who identified the relic was Maulana Massoudi, about whom also a reference was made in the statement by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Investigation is in the final stage and the accused persons will be put on trial very soon. It is true that the demonstrations were aimed at the local administration. but surely it is a fundamental right in a democracy of the people to express their dissatisfaction with their Government. Such demonstrations are not unknown even in more sophisticated societies. The people of a democratic country have the inalienable right not only to show their want of confidence in their Government but to turn out the Government and elect another one.

What I have been saying about the nature of the demonstrations in Srinagar is amply borne out by the testimony of foreign correspondents who were on the scene and who witnessed what had happened :

The Guardian, a well known English newspaper, which Mr. Bhutto quoted, of 6 January 1964, has this to say :

"There was singing and dancing in the streets of Srinagar yesterday after the Government announced that the relic had been found. A sullen and angry city was suddenly transformed into a joyful one."

The New, York Times of 24 January 1964, has the following story from Thomas F. Brady :

"This dissatisfaction of Kashmiris with their local Government, but apparently not with the Indian national Government, found expression in protests and riots that followed the theft. . . The big Muslim majority there seems to have shown no animus towards the Hindu minority.... Indeed the indications are that main targets of the arson and looting that followed the disappearance of the relic were the extensive business interests of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, former Prime Minister of the State, and his brother and political right hand, Bakshi Rashid. Both are Moslems."

I am not here to defend either Mr. Bakshi or his brother. The point of the quotation is that the demonstrations were against the local administration and not against the Government of India.

The New York Times of 5 January 1964, had the following :

"One view that was expressed here was that the pro-Pakistani elements had stolen the hair in an attempt to discredit the pro-Indian Kashmir Government."

The Foreign Minister quoted the views of an Indian columnist in the Hindustan Times of 8 January. This columnist is obviously not friendly to the Government of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed or even to the present successor Government. In a free country with full freedom of the press every one is entitled to express his own views. In fairness to the columnist, I must, however, read two paragraphs from the same article which Mr. Bhutto left out for obvious reasons.

"But the striking fact has to be recorded that the dismay and anger of the people of Kashmir did not express themselves in communalism or in anti-Indian sentiment. The people did not turn to the pro-Pakistan elemerits for guidance and leadership. Their own demand was that India should intervene, for investigation of the sacrilege, to punish the guilty and to ensure that Kashmir does not lapse into Bakshi rule.

"The people of Kashmir have given their clear verdict and they are entitled to hope that they have struck the blow for a good and clean administration responsible to their needs and aspirations. They have put their trust in India doing the right thing by them. Can we afford to betray them again ?"

So the emphasis in all these quotations is that the people of Kashmir have confidence in India. that they want India to intervene and that they are not satisfied with the local administration.

Having failed in its evil design to stir up trouble in Kashmir, Pakistan diverted its attention to East Pakistan and serious riots broke out in Khulna and Jessore and the Muslims there attacked the Hindu minority. There were terrible incidents of looting, arson and stabbing. A large number of members of the frightened minority

# 31

started a trek towards India, which lay just across the frontier. It is strange that while in Kashmir itself the large Muslim majority did not suspect the Hindus of having a hand in the theft of the relic, 1,500 miles away the Muslims of East Pakistan were demonstrating against the Hindus and accusing the Hindu community in Kashmir of anti-Muslim actions.

May I quote the despatch of Jacques Nevard in the New York Times of 19 January 1964 :

"Few people here" ("here" means East Pakistan, where these riots took place) "give, much credence to the Government-supported view that the East Pakistan riots were caused by the disappearance three weeks ago of a reputed hair of the Prophet Mohammed."

"Officially approved processions to protest the loss of the relic got out of hand in the Khulna and Jessore districts of East Pakistan leading to riots against Hindus."

I request the Council to mark and note the words "officially approved".

The repercussion of the Khulna riots resulted in riots in Calcutta. Refugees from East Pakistan came to the city with lurid tales of what had happened to their co-religionists on the other side of the frontier. The passions of the Hindus in Calcutta were inflamed and unfortunate incidents took place where Muslim lives were lost and some houses in which the Muslims lived were burnt down.

Now by coincidence I myself was in Calcutta during four days while these riots were taking place. I had been there on official tour as Minister of Education, but I was an eye witness to what was done by the West Bengal Government to put down these riots. I express my admiration for the strong measures taken by the Chief Minister of West Bengal. He immediately called out the troops and curfew was ordered throughout the city. Our Home Minister, Mr. Nanda, also arrived in Calcutta and further action was taken. About 5,000 hooligans were rounded up, a citizens' committee was set up to help to restore peace and order, and assurance was given that no landlord would be permitted to benefit by the destruction of Muslim houses and that as far as possible Muslim would be rehabilitated in the same places where they originally lived. I was staying with the Governor of West Bengal, Miss Padmaja Naidu, a distinguished daughter of a distinguished mother, and

she threw open a large part of the Government House in order to give shelter to the Muslims who had lost their homes and their belongings. The Calcutta riots were put down firmly and sternly, and today there is complete peace and the normal situation has been restored. But the terrible talc of communal riots did not end here. There were subsequent riots in Dacca, Naravanganj, Chittagong, Barisal-they are all places in East Pakistan-and in many other districts of East Pakistan; terrible scenes were enacted, and even according to as important a news agency as Reuter about one thousand Hindus were killed. Our own information is that throughout East Pakistan; terrible scenes were enacted, and the trouble has not yet ended and the tension still continues. The Deputy High Commissioner for India in Dacca has so far received requests for migration of over 50,000 families, involving more than 200,000 people; into one district of Assam, namely Garo Hills alone, about 20,000 refugees have moved from East Pakistan. These are official figures.

I did not have any desire to cite these figures they are grim and unpleasant-but I felt that I should give the Security Council a full picture since the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan in his statement sought to present a one-sided picture before the Council.

I wish to make it clear that whatever may happen in East Pakistan, we do not condone the criminals who are guilty of taking innocent lives. To us a Muslim life is as precious as a Hindu life because both a Hindu and a Muslim are Indian citizens. We condemn bloodshed and looting and arson, whatever may be the cause or the provocation and wherever it may take place. We have respect for human life and we abhor communal frenzy or fanaticism.

As our Prime Minister said in his appeal to the nation from his sick bed on 23 January 1964 :

"We have had distressing news of happenings in East Pakistan in the past few days in which lives of many innocent men, women and children have been lost. These have naturally shocked and upset us. I hope that our countrymen will maintain calm and will refuse to be provoked by these events. Such restraint will be in keeping with age-old traditions of tolerance which is our most precious heritage. Whatever happens elsewhere, citizens of India should prove themselves worthy of their heritage and discharge their sacred duty to live in amity and goodwill with their fellow citizens whatever be their religion or faith. In that way alone. we can prove ourselves worthy of our heritage and the confidence which Mahatma Gandhi, our leader, reposed in us and our dedication to the principles of freedom and democracy and our secular state."

But I am sorry to say that the attitude of Pakistan is different. By its policy, by its

#### 32

actions, by its utterances, it has deliberately incited these riots. There was peace and harmony between the two communities in India before Pakistan preached Jehad, Holy War, and accused the Hindus of being at the bottom of the theft of the sacred relic without a shred of evidence. It deliberately and for set purpose created an atmosphere so that riots should break out in East Pakistan. Thousands of innocent lives have been lost It makes no difference whether these lives were of Hindus or Muslims. The physical act by which these lives were lost might be that of a Hindu or a Muslim fanatic or a Hindu or a Muslim ruffian, but the Pakistan Government cannot be absolved of its responsibility for the death of these innocent people. We in India treat all our citizens alike. We give them the same rights and we want complete communal harmony. We have successfully achieved this, and if we are left to ourselves we will have no communal trouble whatsoever; but whenever there is communal trouble we put it down with a heavy hand. Pakistan, on the other hand, has from its very inception based its policy on communal hatred and fanaticism. it has-incited the Muslims in Kashmir to rebel against India, and it has constantly harped on the theory that Hindus and Muslims are two separate nations.

Let me point out the attempts we have made to improve our relations, and point out also what Pakistan has done in return. Our Prime Minister appealed to Pakistan more than once to enter into a "No War Declaration". He said that both countries must settle their differences peacefully and resolve that under no circumstances and for no reason will either country go to war with the other. This offer was refused. Why? Has Pakistan got mental reservations, Does she intend to use violence against India under certain circumstances ? When the recent trouble broke out, our President appealed to President Ayub to issue a joint declaration to our respective peoples appealing for peace and harmony. This very reasonable proposal of joint appeal-which, by the mere fact of its being made jointly by the two respective Heads of States, would have had the most beneficial psychological effect-also was refused. We then proposed that the two Home Ministers of India and Pakistan should meet and visit the scenes of disturbance and suggest what further steps should be taken to prevent such happenings. We were met with a counter proposal which was tantamount to a refusal.

The Foreign Minister has referred to certain talks that took place between India and Pakistan over Kashmir and has sought to make out as if the talks failed due to Indian intransigence. Let me now state what the facts are. On the eve of the first round of talks in Rawalpindi, in Pakistan, the Pakistan Government announced an agreement in principle on the demarcation of the border of that part of the State of Jammu and Kashmir which is now under the unlawful; occupation of Pakistan and which marches with that of Sinkiang. At this stage, we could have legitimately broken off the talks, but, despite the provocation, we decided to continue them. In March, while the talks were still going on, Mr. Bhutto went to Peking and signed the agreement. Again, we showed restraint and continued the talks, though we had enough provocation. The talks were finally broken off by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Bhutto, in spite of all efforts on our part to keep the talks going. This proves that the intransigence was not on our side at all but entirely on the side of Pakistan.

Now let us contrast this with the attitude of Pakistan. When China attacked us and was guilty of clear and unabashed aggression, Pakistan carried on virulent propaganda against us and in favour of China. Not only did it use every effort to prevail upon friendly countries not to give us assistance in the hour of our dire peril, but it took up the attitude that it was not China, but India, that was guilty of aggression. The whole of the world, with the possible exception of a few States, saw and understood that we had been victims of cruel aggression.

The Foreign Minister has given expression to excellent sentiments with regard to the preservation of peace and the solution of international problems by peaceful negotiations rather than by violent means. We fully endorse these sentiments and we have always subscribed to them. It is one thing to come to the Security Council in the garb of innocence and to appeal to world opinion by emphasizing that the attitude of Pakistan has always been friendly and peaceful and that it has not given any provocation whatsoever to my country-but, when we look at the facts, we find quite a different picture. From time to time, there has been open incitement to violence by responsible opinion in Pakistan; constant suggestions have been made that, if the Kashmir problem cannot be solved peacefully, it must be solved by violent means. Even in the very letter of the Foreign Minister, dated 16 January, which the Council is now considering, the conclusion is very significant : that "the people of Azad Kashmir and Pakistan may, in desperation, turn to other courses". What are these other courses ? Courses other than peaceful courses are violence and bloodshed. I have rarely seen, in a public document addressed to body which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and good relations, an open threat being held out by a Member State to refer In violence tinder certain circumstances.

### 33

How, then, can we take the Pakistan Foreign Minister's statement here seriously?

I may refer to a letter that appeared in the Observer on 17 June 1963, by the late John Strachey, Labour M.P., who had visited both India and Pakistan in a Parliamentary delegation. Addressing the editor of the observer, he wrote :

"You complained that India still keeps a large part of her army on the Pakistan frontier. Before going to Pakistan last month this. seemed to me also to be an indefensible deployment of India's forces but during the week in which my colleagues were in Pakistan, a Pakistan Cabinet Minister declared publicly that the Kashmir question must be settled immediately by peaceful means or otherwise. Another Pakistan public man in a key position assured us that if China attacked again he and his friends would not miss the opportunity this time but would immediately attack India. And almost every Pakistani public man whom we met started the conversation from the assumption that India had attacked China.",

As you know, Mr. John Strachey was a very respected Member of Parliament who died recently. This is his own testimony as to what he heard from a member of the Pakistan Cabinet and from men high up in Pakistan public life. This clearly shows that Pakistan has all along intended to use violence against our country when the opportunity arose.

In this connection, I should also like to mention the real attitude of Pakistan with regard to Kashmir. When one analyses the speech made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, the underlying sentiment is this : India must settle the problem of Kashmir with Pakistan to the latter's satisfaction; if it does not, there will be communal disturbances, there will be trouble, there might even be bloodshed. Therefore, Pakistan has approached this Council not with an appeal but with a threat, and we are being asked to submit to this threat. It is unfortunate that Pakistan does not realize that it is making the lives of millions of people both in our own country and in Pakistan mere pawns in the game of politics.

India today is perhaps the only country which can stand up to Chinese expansion and aggression. If India failed, there would be nothing to control the Chinese forward policy. It is therefore not only in the. interest of India itself, but also, in the interest of peace, that India should be strong. We are very grateful for the aid that we have received from friendly countries. But the whole purpose of this would be completely nullified if India became domestically weak. No country can be internationally strong if it does not also have domestic strength. The domestic strength of India depends upon its secularism, upon the vital necessity of the different communities that reside within India living in peace and harmony. Pakistan does not want India to

be strong; it wants to weaken India, both internationally and domestically. Its recent flirtations with China are clear evidence of this fact. In this context, Kashmir assumes great importance. Pakistan has been complaining of India's changing the status quo with regard to Kashmir, and yet it has given away to China, in the border agreement, over 2,000 square miles of Kashmir. Pakistan hag no right or title to it, and yet it has been generous at another country's expense. If ever there Was a gross change of status quo, it has been by Pakistan. But, apart from the fact that legally and constitutionally Kashmir is part of India, apart from the fact that we do not Subscribe to the theory that Hindus and Muslims are two nations and that Kashmir is the symbol and guarantee of our secularism, Kashmir has now assumed vital importance because of the continuing menace of China. A mere glance at the map of India will be sufficient to illustrate this.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has sung paeans of praise in favour of Sheikh Abdullah. He has told us that Sheikh Abdullah is the Lion of Kashmir, leader of. Muslims there, and that we have put him behind bars. It is dangerous to have short memories. May I remind the Foreign Minister of Pakistan of what his own Prime Minister, Liaquat Ali Khan, said about Sheikh Abdullah :

"Speaking to pressmen at Srinagar on November 10th, during Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's visit to that place, Sheikh Abdullah was reported to have observed that there may not be a referendum at all, while this Quisling who has been an agent of the Congress for many years, struts about the stage bartering away the life, honour and freedom of Muslims of Kashmir who are rotting in gaol."

This statement was made by Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan on 16 November 1947. In other words, when it suits them, Sheikh Abdullah is a Quisling-and, when it suits them, he is a hero and Lion of Kashmir and the leader of the Muslim community. I do not know when the tune will change again.

Again, in a telegram dated 25 November 1947 to the Prime Minister of India, the Prime Minister of Pakistan said "I am extremely sorry that. you still support Sheikh Abdullah, who you know is a Quisling and a paid agent, to disrupt. the Mussulmans of Kashmir.

## 34

So here our Prime Minister was being accuse of supporting a Quisling. who should not have been. supported.

I should like to say a word-and I am sorry that I cannot say more because the matter is sub judice-about the trial of Sheikh Abdullah. We very much regret the delay that has taken place in concluding this trial, but it is being conducted according to the procedures laid down by law. The London Times in a despatch, when the trial started, pointed out how fair the judge was and how he held the scales of justice even between the prosecution and the defence. It is true, as the Foreign Minister has pointed out, that there are a large number of witnesses. This is inevitable in a conspiracy trial. I must also point out that the delay is partly due to the fact that there has been lengthy cross-examination of witnesses by the defence and from time to time adjournments have had to be given in the interest of Sheikh Abdullah himself. And the most significant feature, of this trial, is that Sheikh Abdullah has a counsel of his own choice, a very distinguished lawyer from the London Bar, Mr. Dingle Foot, Q.C. Therefore, the trial is public and every facility is given to the accused to defend himself.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer in the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. The Foreign- Minister has also spoken of the "wall of steel" that separates .... Kashmir from the outside world, " and has said that "India is trying desperately to conceal what is happening there under a massive blanket of censorship" (1087th meeting, page 8). Now one thing about which we are particularly proud is that Kashmir has always been open to any visitor from any country and of any nationality. We have nothing to bide in Kashmir, nor are we ashamed of anything we are doing there. Every year seventy to eighty thousand tourists, including a large number of foreign tourists, have been coming to this most beautiful spot.

Pakistan has made a great deal of play with the idea of self-determination. It has tried to appeal to world opinion by proclaiming that its interest in Kashmir arises from the fact that the people of that State have been denied the right of self-determination. Now, in the first place, we must determine what are the connotations of the word "self" in this expression. What is the "self" which has the right to determine its destiny, to determine whether it would be a part of one country or part of another country or would be independent? It is clear that the "self" contemplated in the enunciation of this democratic principle is not and cannot be a constituent part of a country. It can be operative only when one is dealing with a nation as a whole, and the context in which it can be applicable is the context of conquest or of foreign domination or of colonial exploitation. It would lead to disastrous consequences if the expression were extended to apply to the integral part of any country or sections of its population, or to enable such integrated part or sections of the population to secede. The principle of self-determination cannot and must not be applied to bring about the fragmentation of a country or its people. Let us not forget that the United States fought a bloody civil war to prevent, not a small part, but the whole of the South of the United States from seceding and constituting itself into an independent country. I have no doubt that a large majority of the people of that part of the United States were opposed to Abraham Lincoln and his policies and they wanted the freedom to refuse to emancipate the slaves; and vet the United States Government, very rightly and properly, in my opinion, refused to break up its country by permitting a part of it the right to secede. In the world today we have innumerable countries in Africa and Asia with dissident minorities. Many of these minorities might like to set up governments of their own. We should have to repaint the map of the world and many State Members of the United Nations would be broken up. Many countries today have living in them people of different races, religions and cultures, and the future of the world depends upon the evolution of multiracial States and nations in different parts of the world. Pakistan's thesis is a reactionary and obscurantist one. The thesis of self-determination, which Pakistan advocates, has been used in the recent past by colonialists and neocolonialists for the disruption of newly emergent States. Pakistan would have the hands of the clock set backwards and would go back to the days when countries permitted only one religion and persecuted those who followed another faith. I appeal to this Council not to listen to contentions and arguments which would be destructive of peace and progress and which would lead to the dismemberment of many nations.

Pakistan possesses the happy gift of preaching what it has itself never practised. It asks us to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir without even so much as thinking of holding an election in its own country. It wants us to concede the principle of self-determination to a constituent part of our country without looking nearer home. Has Pakistan ever thought of permitting selfdetermination to the Pathans who want a State of their own, which is described as Pakhtoonistan ?

Let me say a word about the allegation of eviction of Indian Muslims made by Pakistan against us. I shall refute this charge not by arguments but by cold statistical facts to which

# 35

there can be no answer. The Indian census figures for 1961 show that there was an increase of 25.6 per cent in the population of Muslim in India during the period between 1951 and 1961, against an over-all increase in the population of India of 21.5 per cent. Does this prove genocide or that Muslims from India are being driven out? Not only is no Indian Muslim leaving India, but the fact is that Pakistani Muslims in large number have been infiltrating into the surrounding Indian States of West Bengal, Assam and Tripura. This is clearly proved by Pakistani census figures. It will be seen from the Pakistani census figures that the Muslim population in East Pakistan increased by 26 per cent during the period 1951-61. It is significant, however, that Much smaller increases have been recorded in some of the districts of East Pakistan bordering India. Noakhali had an increase of only 4.7 per cent, Comilla 15.4 per cent and Bakarganj 16.8 per cent; and Sylhet indicated a rise of only 13.9 per cent, against the over-all provincial increase of 26 per cent. The Indian census figures in the neighbouring

border districts of Indian States are complementary and reveal that the population of Muslims in Tripura rose by 68 per cent, in Darjeeling by 200 per cent, in Dinajpur by 74 per cent, in Malda by 62 per cent, in Garo Hills by 49 per cent and Khasi and Jaintia districts by 88 per cent. These figures speak for themselves and are telling when it is remembered that the overall increase in the Muslim population in India as a whole was 25.6 per cent. Every natural demographic consideration will show that this big increase could have been possible only by large-scale influx from East Pakistan, particularly from those districts which, according to Pakistan census figures. show abnormally low increases in population.

Let us now examine the picture on the other side. After the partition and the consequential mass migrations and killings, Pakistan succeeded in getting rid of practically all non-Muslims in the Western Wing. In the Eastern Wing, 9.24 million were left, according to the Pakistan census figures of 1951. This was roughly 22.03 per cent of the total population of East Pakistan, which was 41.93 million. The corresponding figure for 1961, as can be seen from the Pakistan figures, is 9.38 million non-Muslims, which constitutes 18.45 per cent of the total population of 50.84 million in East Pakistan. It will be noticed that the percentage has gone down by nearly 3.6 per cent over the period of ten years. What is more remarkable is that the population of the Hindu minority in East Pakistan has remained practically stationary, although the increase in population of Muslims in Pakistan during this decade was 26 per cent. If there had been a similar natural increase in the number of non-Muslims, there should have been an increase of well over 2.25 million. Why has not there been this natural increase ? The answer is that they have all been squeezed out during this period. That fits in with our records, which show the arrival in India of refugees of approximately that number. If the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has any other answer, let him come out with it. Let him also think about who is guilty of evicting minorities.

I also wish to point out that no one is evicted out of India without complying with the provisions of the rule of law. In the first place, there is a careful administrative scrutiny as to the nationality of the person concerned and it is only after the scrutiny reveals that the person is not of Indian nationality, or that he has not the necessary permit for residence or visa, that he is served with a quit notice. Further, after he has been served with a quit notice he has a right to go to the High Court for a writ on which he can satisfy the Court that the decision of the Administrative Tribunal was incorrect. Recently, both in Assam and Tripura, judicial officers have been appointed even for the purpose of scrutiny before quit notice is served.

There is one other minor matter to which I would refer and that is that a large number of non-Muslims have been appointed in the recently constituted Ministry of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Under normal parliamentary procedure, it is entirely the right of the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir to constitute his Cabinet. In India we do not make appointments on communal considerations. It is true that we try to see, as far as possible, that no part of India and no large community goes wholly unrepresented in the Government, and that is a federal principle with which federal governments are familiar. It is a tribute to Kashmir that its Cabinet should truly reflect the inter-communal unity that prevails in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

The reference made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to the dismissal by Prime Minister Shamsuddin of officers of the State Government is not correct. These dismissals were made not for the motive suggested by the Foreign Minister, but as a part of the drive against inefficiency and corruption. All the officers were not dismissed, but many of them were retired. Sixty of these officers were Hindus and Sikhs. The 'communal colouring sought to be given is entirely without foundation.

Before I conclude, I would like to refer to some other points in the statements of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, both in his letter to the Security Council dated 16 January 1964

# 36

(S/5517) and his statement the other day. The Foreign Minister complained that the statement of Mr. Nanda, Home Minister of India, at the Bhubhaneshwar session of the Indian National Congress was inflammatory in character. Mr. Nanda spoke in Hindi and we have here the full text of his statement. I do not find anywhere in the speech that Mr. Nanda made anything even remotely suggestive or calculated to incite communal passions. On the contrary, Mr Nanda said :

"In case something happens there"-that is, Pakistan-"we should not allow anything to happen here"-that is, India-"and in case some trouble arises, stern measures should be adopted and immediately everything brought to normal."

Evidently. the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has relied on some erroneous English translation of Mr. Nanda's speech. As a matter of fact, far from inciting, communal passions, Mr. Nanda played a most worthy role in Calcutta in organizing joint Hindu-Muslim conciliation and peace squad s which in conjunction with the stem measures taken to bring miscreants to book, including police and military firing at them, whenever necessary, helped in bringing the situation in Calcutta-which, it should be remembered has as large a population as 6,000,000-within control and back to normal in two to three days.

It is inconceivable that on the platform of the Indian National Congress where Mr. Nanda spoke, which is always on the side of inter-communal unity, any Minister, far less the Home Minister of the Government, would make inflammatory speeches.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has in the course of his statement said that the President of India's reply to President Ayub Khan's letter was not helpful. What could be more helpful and sincere and earnest than the concluding paragraph of our President's letter of 16 January which has been circulated to members of the Security Council (S/5522). I might also refer to the statement made by our President on the occasion of our Republic Day on 26 January 1964, which is couched in the same spirit and I quote from that letter :

"In our democracy men of all faiths have the right to live in honour and harmony under the rule of law; life and liberty of every citizen, irrespective of caste or creed ought to be sacred to every other. Any departure from this is not only morally indefensible but politically dangerous: it weakens our internal unity at a time when the danger to our country from without is undiminished. The Government can and will take every step necessary to put down anti-social behaviour but the cooperation of people is no less important if peaceful conditions are to be preserved, for such peace is the basis on which we could build our future."

On the other hand, the President of Pakistan's letter contained some very serious allegations against India. In our President's reply attention had to be drawn to those inaccuracies in order to put the matter in proper perspective. It is clear, however, that the spirit of our President's message was one of cordiality and constructive approach to try to solve the very urgent problem of restoring communal harmony with which both countries are faced.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan characterized India's presence in Kashmir as colonial. I deeply regret that he has allowed himself to make such an outrageous allegation against my country. He is either. ignorant of or chooses to ignore the history of India during the last fifty years. He seems to have forgotten that it was India's epic struggle against colonialism, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, a long drawn struggle against the mightiest Empire in history, that brought about freedom for India and of his own country. He cannot be unaware of the tremendous impact of the Indian movement against colonialism on all freedom movements in Asia and Africa and the inspiration it provided and continues to provide for such movements all over the world. It is our great satisfaction to know that this is acknowledged by the newly emergent countries in Asia and Africa. He completely ignores the unceasing fight that India has waged in the United Nations and the support to freedom movements in Asia and Africa that India has given during the sixteen years of its independent existence and as a founder Member of the United Nations. To malign such a country as colonial shows the height of prejudice; to insinuate that India's present leaders, most of all Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru-the greater part of whose life has been spent as a freedom fighter not only for his own country but for Asia and Africa-should follow a colonial

policy is something which Pakistan alone could do. The fact is that Kashmir has. since the dawn of history, been a part of India, a repository of Indian culture and heritage. It has shared fully in the vicissitudes of Indian history. It has been a part of the Empire of Ashoka and Akbar. Srinagar, the capital of Kashmir, was founded by the Great Emperor Ashoka in the third century B.C. The people of Kashmir are blood of our blood and flesh of our flesh and Jammu and Kashmir as one of the sixteen States of the Indian Union and the people of Kashmir as Indian citizens, share in the total freedom which India enjoys.

# 37

To say that Kashmir is under India's colonial hold is gross calumny and an insult to the people of Kashmir who are Indians and have been Indians ever since one can remember. The fact is that it is time Pakistan examined is own conscience and looked into its own heart and asked itself how it is that it is holding two-fifths of Kashmir; that if anything, is colonial occupation.

It has often been said and, I think, it has also been repeated by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, that the only bone of contention between India and Pakistan was Kashmir and that if the problem of Kashmir were solved to Pakistan's satisfaction, then there would be friendship and lull co-operation between our two countries. I beg to differ. As I have pointed out Wore, it is difficult to understand the basic philosophy on which the policy of Pakistan is based. In every aspect of its foreign policy, it has disclosed an anti-Indian bias. At one time we were told by responsible Pakistan leaders that the reason why they were driven into the arms of China was our Kashmir policy; as China did not like this reason for Pakistan's friendship for China, they changed the tune and suggested that even if the problem of Kashmir was solved, Pakistan would continue to support China. In other words Pakistan's present attitude of hostility towards India is not due to the Kashmir problem alone, but it is something more deep-seated.

The same is the attitude of Pakistan with regard to communal riots. The argument is that riots would miraculously stop if the Kashmir problem were solved. Again, there is no connection between Kashmir and the riots. Riots come about because of the communal policy of Pakistan and because of the incitement to communal passion of which it is guilty and of which I have given ample evidence in my statement earlier.

I wish I did not have to take so much time of the Security council and that I had been spared the need for refuting the many allegations made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan against us. Repetitious recriminations and fault-finding in the Security Council do not help. If these had been fruitful, we would not have been sitting here today after so many years. I was bound to set the record straight in the face of the grave and unfounded alterations made against us by Pakistan. I would like to assure you, Mr. President, and the Security Council that, despite provocations, we shall continue to work towards amelioration of our unfortunate relations with Pakistan. We do not want our relations to be built on recrimination but on friendship and cooperation and mutual respect. And here I wish to may categorically on behalf of my Goveminent and the Indian people that we wish Pakistan prosperity and well-being as a free and sovereign State and want to build our relations as between two friendly and neighbouring countries on the basis of equality, integrity and sovereignty.

You might as well ask me what steps should be taken to alter the present unhappy situation and bring about better relations between India and Pakistan. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that the people of both countries want to be friends. They belonged to the same country sixteen years ago. They have shared the same tradition and the same past, and even today citizens of Pakistan and India have connexions and ties of relationship. If only the Government of Pakistan made a proper gesture and gave up its present attitude, my Government would meet it more than halfway. With the greatest respect. I wish to suggest that passing of resolutions will not be helpful. It is likely only to aggravate feelings. No resolution, however well drafted, will satisfy both the parties. What is necessary is action and what we have to remember is that first things must come first.

The first thing, therefore, is to restore normal conditions in the disturbed area of India and Pakistan and to bring about inter-communal unity and harmony in both the countries. For this purpose, we are prepared to take any and every step in co-operation with Pakistan. My Government will welcome a meeting of Ministers from both countries to discuss ways and means. We must see to it that the disgraceful incidents which took place recently never take place again. They are scandal to any civilised Government. Secondly, threats of violence which have emanated from Pakistan from time to time, as I have pointed out, must cease. Let Pakistan unequivocally declare along with India that the two countries will never resort to war and will settle all their differences by peaceful means. In this connexion, we welcome the appeal recently issued by Chairman Khrushchev and, as you know. our Prime Minister has warmly endorsed that appeal for the peaceful settlement of territorial disputes. President Johnson has also, in principle, welcomed the renunciation of the use of force. Once a better atmosphere prevails it will be possible-and we are prepared-to discuss with Pakistan all our outstanding differences. We believe in discussion and debate, we believe in the resolution of differences by sitting around the conference table and we will welcome Pakistan to sit with us and resolve our differences. Let me implore Pakistan to remember that we are most anxious that our two countries, constituting the subcontinent of India. should remain on friendly and cordial terms. The future prosperity and well-being of our two peoples depend on it.

# 38

Following is the text of Shri Chagla's statement dated February 10:

I have listened to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan more in sorrow than in anger. One can control one's anger, but it is difficult to control one's sorrow. My sorrow is due to the fact that the representative of Pakistan should have given expression to sentiments which vilify my country and my Government, which are a calumny to the record of peace and progress that it has set up since its independence. And this by a neighbour against us whose only desire is to live in peace and amity with the people of a country which only a few years back constituted, along with itself, the sub-continent of India. I do not propose to imitate the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. I do not wish to wear out the patience of the members of the Security Council by a lengthy dissertation. Their patience has been sufficiently taxed. I think, therefore, it will be a waste of time to reiterate what I have already said in my earlier statement. That is on the record and it speaks for itself. It clearly defines the position and attitude of my country and I stand by every word I have said there.

The representative of Pakistan has realized that the only way he can seek to justify his approach to the Security Council is to make out a case of trouble and discord in Kashmir or, to quote his own words in his opening statement : "Kashmir is in open rebellion against India". If the facts show that there have been no communal disturbances in Kashmir; that on the contrary there has been complete harmony; that far from Kashmir revolting against India, Kashmir at every stage of this unfortunate incident of the loss of the sacred relic has turned to India for help and support, then it is clear that no change has come about in the situation in Kashmir which, according to him, justifies the present application of Pakistan to the Security Council-not that the fact of disturbance or trouble in Kashmir would justify any intervention by Pakistan since we have repeatedly stated that what happens in Kashmir is entirely a domestic matter for India.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has quoted President Ayub as saying that recently there was a spontaneous referendum in Kashmir. How right he is ! And what was the result of that referendum? The clear verdict that Kashmiris gave was that while they were opposed to the local administration, they had full confidence in the fairness and sense of justice of the Government of India. In my earlier statement I quoted utterances of responsible Pakistan statesmen inciting the people of Kashmir and inflaming communal passions. I said before and I repeat that Pakistan expected that the loss of the sacred relic would lead to bloodshed in Kashmir and the Muslim community would rise against the Hindus and the Sikhs. Even here the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has stated that at this very minute blood is flowing in Srinagar. May I ask whether it is a statement of fact or a wish and a hope !

Let me categorically state to the members of the Council that there is no trouble in Kashmir whatsoever today. The sacred relic has been found and, what is more, it has been identified by the respected religious leaders of Srinagar including Maulana M. Masoodi, who is not only not a supporter of the Government but who is in the opposition.

We have been told that Kashmir is a vital question. Vital to whom ? To the people of Kashmir or to Pakistan ? President Ayub in moments of self-revelation has more than once stated that Kashmir was vital to Pakistan's economy and defence. I quote

"Kashmir is vital for Pakistan, not only politically but militarily as well. Kashmir is a matter of life and death."

This is what President Ayub said in December 1959.

And again the President of Pakistan said

"You might say, why can't you give up Kashmir ? Well. we cannot give up that dispute not because we are bloodyminded but .... for example, for the reason that Kashmir is connected with our physical security. Thirtytwo million acres in Pakistan are irrigated from rivers that start in Kashmir."

This is from the speech delivered by President Ayub at a luncheon meeting at the National Press Club, Washington, on 13 July, and as reported in the Pakistan Times of 14 July 1961.

Again I quote the President

"Kashmir is important to us for our physical as well as economic security."

This was what President Ayub said at Karachi on 19 July, as reported in the Pakistan Times of 20 July 1961.

# One more quote

"Pakistan's President declared that Kashmir was a life-and-death question for Pakistan and without the solution of this problem we cannot be assured of the safety of our territory, esspecially the western wing of our country .....

President Ayub made this statement at Dacca oil 18 October, and it was reported in the Pakistan Times of 19 October, 1961.

# 39

So the cat is out of the bag. Kashmir is not vital for human reasons or human considerations; it is vital to Pakistan for its own reasons namely its own security and its own defence.

This also explains what the founder of Pakistan, Mr. Jinnah, once said: that he was not satisfied with the Pakistan which he had obtained because it was a "moth-eaten, truncated Pakistan". It is therefore not out of consideration of human rights that Pakistan has been so ceaselessly and pertinaciously pressing the Kashmir case before this Council.

The truth is that Pakistan wants Kashmir in support of its two-nation theory that, because the population of Kashmir has a Muslim majority, it must necessarily form part of Pakistan. It we are thinking only of the people of Kashmir, of their rights, of their security, of their desire to live in peace and quiet, then it is time that an end be put to this unending controversy. Pakistan talks glibly of a plebiscite. Does it realize what its consequences will be ? In the place of peace and quiet, we may have bloodshed. If the theft of the sacred relic could be exploited to produce riots 1,500 miles away, the stirring of communal passions on a large and massive scale may lead to serious communal riots all over India and Pakistan and to migrations. The only people who would suffer are not the politicians in Pakistan who preach a holy war but millions of innocent people who are not interested in politics and who want to be left in peace to carry on their normal avocations. So, if we are thinking only in terms of maintenance of peace, respect for human beings, then we would think a thousand times before we would disturb a situation which has existed since India became independent.

The whole burden of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan's song has been that the only thing which poisons relations between Pakistan and India is the Kashmir problem; and, if the Kashmir problem is not solved, relations between the two countries will not improve, and communal troubles will continue. This, to my mind, is an open threat to the Security Council. Pakistan is telling you, Mr. President, in strong, strident and threatening tones, that, if the Kashmir problem is not settled, there will be bloodshed and war. Is anyone going to submit to this threat and intimidation ?

The iron fist is concealed in a velvet glove. The representative of Pakistan has quoted Chairman Khrushchev and President Johnson and has relied on what they said about the settlement of territorial disputes by peaceful methods. Even the devil can quote Scriptures for his purpose. I cannot imagine a more perverse interpretation of the very noble sentiments to which Chairman Khrushchev gave expression, which were whole-heartedly endorsed by the Prime Minister of India and to which President Johnson responded, than for a country to talk of peace while brandishing a sword.

The reliance of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan on the appeal made by Chairman Khrushchev makes even more inexplicable his refusal to join with India in a no-war declaration. It is true that these sentiments are embodied and enshrined in the Charter, but they require constant reminders and reiterations. On behalf of my Government, I wish to declare that India under no circumstances will resort to war for settlement of differences with Pakistan. I repeat that India under no circumstances will resort to war for settlement of differences with Pakistan. Will the Foreign Minister also make a similar declaration ?

It is true that Pakistan wants peace, but it wants peace at the point of a bayonet and on its own terms. Why have we had no refutation from the representative of Pakistan of the statements made by responsible Pakistan leaders threatening violence against India? As I have said before, even in his letter to the Security Council of 16 January there is a threat of violence which is not even decently veiled but which is open and flagrant.

The representative of Pakistan has repeated the slander against India that Kashmir is under India's colonial rule". Kashmir became part of India not as a result of conquest, nor is it a case of one race ruling over another; Kashmir has always been part of India since time immemorial, and the people of Kashmir and the rest of India are racially and ethnically the same. Even religiously, although in that part of India Muslims might be in a large majority, this majority professes the same religion as 50 million Muslims in India. It is here that the basic difference between Pakistan and ourselves arises. The bond that Pakistan finds with the people of Kashmir, and which makes the representative of Pakistan say that the people of Kashmir are their kith and kin, is not common nationality, it is not a common race" it is not common traditions or common history; but the mere bond of religion. We emphatically deny and repudiate a philosophy which equates nationality with religion. The basic philosophy on which our State is based, and our Constitution is enacted, is a multi-racial society, a society in which people of different religions can live together happily and can be treated as equals before the law and can enjoy the same rights and opportunities.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has spoken with great indignation of the way the Muslims are treated in India and of the frequency of communal riots. It is a gross travesty of truth to say that at every Muslim festival Muslims are beings attacked. Is the Pakistan case so bad

#### 40

and so weak that it has to rely on such patent falsehoods? Muslim festivals are celebrated from time to time with members of other communities rejoicing with their Muslim brethren. Fairs are held at Muslim shrines where tens of thousands of Hindus and Muslims attend and pay their respect to the saints. Even recently in Kashmir, as I pointed out, the loss of the sacred relic was mourned not only by the Muslims but by Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs, and when the relic was recovered the rejoicing was not confined to the Muslim community, but extended to all the communities in Kashmir and the rest of India. On the contrary, there was no rejoicing in Pakistan, where the recovered relic was described as a fake, presumably to incite further hatred against India. Pakistan has a mentality which makes it impossible for it to understand that Hindus and Muslims can live side by side in peace and concord.

The Foreign Minister has painted a lurid pie-

ture of communal riots in India. He has mentioned the figure of 550. This is a gross exaggeration. Here I might say that we inherited a bad legacy from the British period of communal riots throughout the Indian sub-continent. This was a phase which both our countries have reasons to be ashamed of, but the whole orientation of Indian policy since India became independent has been to create confidence so that these communal incidents should become a thing of the past. Since Pakistan has mentioned certain figures may I also give the Council some figures. Between 1950 and 1956 alone, there were 8,021 cases of communal incidents in East Pakistan, in which members of the minority community were victims. These incidents were brought to the notice of the East Pakistan Government. Since 1956, of course, there have been several hundred more cases. We condemn these riots, whether in Pakistan or in India. We regret the loss of innocent lives, and we do our best to prevent such riots.

Here again the attitudes of India and Pakistan are diametrically different. As I pointed out earlier, the incitement to communal riots has been a part of Pakistan's policy. The representative of Pakistan has quoted some statements of members of the Hindu Mahasabha, which is a communal party in India. The representation of the Hindu Mahasabha in the Indian Parliament one member out of 500--reflects the following it enjoys among the people. The Indian National Congress, which is the party in power today, is strongly opposed to the philosophy underlying that party. He Foreign Minister is not in a position, and cannot be in a position, to quote leaders of the Indian National Congress or the members of the Indian Government inciting the Hindus in India to attack the Muslims. Indeed, that would be opposed to the basic policy of the Indian National Congress. Mahatma Gandhi gave his life in the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity, and, notwithstanding the grave provocations we have had from Pakistan, the party which he led and which won the independence of India has always preached communal harmony. There is not a Muslim in India who does not look upon our Prime Minister as a true friend.

May I refer to the testimony of an exalted and impartial observer of the Indian scene. Even Pakistan will not be able to challenge the importance and the significance of his statement. His Majesty King Saud of Saudi Arabia at the conclusion of his visit to India said this-and I would draw the Council's attention to his words :

"When I set foot on this precious soil," that is, India-"two questions engaged my mind: the fate of the Muslims of India and the general administration of this sub-continent after withdrawal of the British rule......I desire now, at the conclusion of my visit to India, to say to my Muslim brethren all over the world, with greater satisfaction, that the fate of the Indian Muslims is in the safe hands .... This assurance has been corroborated by all Muslim leaders whom I met."

Here is another piece of impartial testimony; I am quoting it from a document of the United Nations Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities-an official document of the United Nations:

"In the course of a discussion at the United Nations Sub-Commission on 11 January 1959, Mr. Richard Hiscocks (United Kingdom) said that in India Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Nehru, two outstanding leaders of the world, had the courage to swim against the current and bring about a revolution in the approach to untouchability and to minorities. Mr. Nehru particularly in the last ten years was responsible for sponsoring legislation in the battle against discrimination of religious minorities.

"He wondered whether leaders in other countries, for instance Pakistan, had the courage to emulate the example of the Indian leaders.

"Senor Herman Santa Cruz (Chile) said he had been in India recently and felt that Mr. Nehru and the Indian-Parliament played a notable role in promoting tolerance and getting the viewpoints of minorities appreciated"

Look to the Press. As in every other country. we have a few irresponsible newspapers also, but the Government has always appealed for restraint, and I am glad to pay a tribute to the Indian Press. which has shown commendable restraint in the reporting of views and in their comments on the communal holocaust in East Pakistan and

### 41

has assisted the Government of India in the restoration of law and order. Ours is a free Press, and those who are familiar with a free Press know how difficult it is to restrain it; but in Pakistan, where the Press is controlled, important papers, papers which have official backing, have carried on a raging campaign against India. There is hardly a day when hatred against India and the Hindus is not preached. Here are a few in stances of what has appeared in Pakistan newspapers recently. This is from an Urdu paper, The Hurriyet, Karachi, 4 February 1964

"Kashmir is affame. Rivers of Indian Muslims' blood are flowing in 13harat--that is, India--"and Muslim women are being outraged."

One can imagine the effect of a statement like that on the minds of the Muslims, both in India and in Pakistan. If ever there was a statement to inflame passions, it is that. They paint Kashmir as aflame, with rivers of Muslim blood flowing and Muslim women being outraged. If that is not incitement, I do not know what it is.

I now quote from The Dawn, Karachi, 1 January 1964--a paper, blessed by the Government :

"They"-that is, the people of West Pakistan-"have called upon the Muslims in India and Pakistan to declare Jehad"-holy war-"one the issue and save Muslim shrines in that country from the further sacrilege." Which Muslim shrine has been sacrileged ? Will the Foreign Minister tell me that ?

I quote again from The Dawn, Karachi, 17 January 1964 :

"The President, Sardar Mohammed Alam Khan, directed the Muslim Conference officebearers to recruit Razakars"-that is, fanatics "for Jehad and make them ready 'till second directive'."

That is an order for recruitment, a declaration of war. They are only waiting for the proper time to march on Kashmir.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has taken pride in the way the Government of Pakistan has treated its minorities. Now, there are various ways of treating minorities, and one that Pakistan has adopted is perhaps the most effective one. It has driven out all but a few Hindus from West Pakistan, and it is resorting to policies which are gradually driving out Hindus from East Pakistan. If the objective of Pakistan's policy was to have a State with only men of one religion living in it, that objective could not be better achieved than by the actions that Pakistan has been taking since its inception. And here may I say in passing that out of the 30,000 odd refugees who have crossed over from East Pakistan into one district of Assam, namely, Garo Hills alone, 3,000 are Christians. So it is not only the Hindus who do not feel safe; it is also the Christians, who are also a minority in Pakistan.

It is, perhaps, easy and possible for Pakistan to get rid of its minorities. for us, we look upon the Muslims not as a minority but as an important and integral part of our nation. Fifty million Muslims live with their Hindu brethren in all parts of the country, in every village, town and city. To us the very thought of exchange of Hindus and Muslims is abhorrent. We realize that India would break up and disintegrate if it cannot give all the communities which live in it protection and full rights.

The Foreign Minister does not like cold statistical facts. He prefers to rely on his fancy and his imagination. I am not going into the figures which I gave in my earlier statement on the subject of the illegal movements of persons from East Pakistan across the borders into India. The patent fact remains, which has not been disputed and cannot be disputed by Pakistan, that while the population of Muslims in East Pakistan has increased by 26 per cent during the census period 1951-61, the Hindu population has remained stationary and that the Muslim population in West Bengal has increased much more than the natural rate. The Foreign Minister is surprised that any Muslim from East Pakistan should want to go to India. Perhaps even the Muslims of East Pakistan find India a better and a more peaceful country in which they can enjoy democratic and fundamental rights. Forty thousand Pakistan Muslim nationals today are working and earning their living in India on a proper visa. Besides, about a quarter of a million Muslims from Pakistan visited India during 1963 on shortterm Indian visas. If Muslims were insecure in India, would such a large number of Muslims from Pakistan be travelling to India ? The Minister also suggested that with strict passport regulations imposed by India, it would be impossible for Pakistani nationals to migrate into India. He forgets that there is an open frontier of 2,000 miles between eastern India and eastern Pakistan and no passport regulations and not the strictest police surveillance in the world can prevent people from crossing the Frontier. He also quoted the London Times. May I quote from a despatch in an equally important English periodical the Economist of 5 October 1963 by a correspondent who claims to have been lately in Pakistan :

"The sub-continental strategy of irritating India has received its latest expression on the Assam-East Pakistan frontier. India has long complained of 'infiltrations' from East Pakistan, numbering, some say, up to half a million since 1951. The exodus is probably more an index of East Pakistani misery than a cold

#### 42

political calculation from Rawalpindi. When the sad emigres are returned over the frontier Pakistan protests that India is attempting to depopulate Assam of its Muslims."

Mr. Richard Critchfield, whose article the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has quoted with approval, says this about Pakistan in the New York Herald Tribune of 1 January 1964 :

"West Pakistan still receives 51 per cent of the national budget but provides 90 per cent of the Central Government staff and almost all the armed forces.

"East Pakistan, with more than half the country's population but not 15 per cent of its land area, cams 70 per cent of the export income, but until recently received only a third of expenditure allocations, a fifth of United States aid and almost no new private development money.

"It is these Pakistanis who have not found

the conception of Pakistan a really captivating idea. Restoration of adult suffrage and the rights of free press, speech and assembly could help to remedy this"--which do not exist in Pakistan. "President Ayub cannot form the durable political base he needs on hatred of India alone."

According to Mr. Critchfield, the only durable base that Pakistan has for its foreign policy-and this is what I said in my earlier statement alsois the hatred of India.

With such a situation in East Pakistan, is there any wonder that the people should be leaving for better opportunities elsewhere ? Infiltration of Pakistanis has not created a problem only for India but apparently also for Burma, which is the only other country neighbouring East Pakistan. Burmese Press reports indicate that the number of such illegal entrant- in Burma is of the order of a quarter of a million.

There has been no change in our policy concerning migrations from Pakistan, but on compassionate and on humanitarian grounds we are obliged to give all facilities and expedite the processes concerning the examination of applications or migration certificates from East Pakistan into India. All States, as you, are aware, give compassionate consideration to the request of refugees fleeing in fear of persecution. It is ridiculous to suggest that the announcement by our Home Minister of better facilities for migration of the Hindu minority from East Pakistan to West Bengal would aggravate communal feelings. If there are riots in East Pakistan which cause much loss of life, if the tension continues, if the Press keeps up its unceasing propaganda, is it surprising that the Hindu minority should be in a state of panic and should want to migrate to India where it would have such safety.

In this connexion, I should like to mention that the following report has been received from the State Government of Assam in India. It is a harrowing tale, and I am sorry I have got to read it before this Council. While a batch of refugees numbering about 1,000 were crossing into Assam from East Pakistan on the evening of 6 February, the East Pakistan Rifles, a quasi-military force of the Pakistan Government, opened fire on them. Eleven refugees, including some women, were injured and two children were killed by this fire. The injured persons and the dead bodies were brought by the refugees into Assam. The Assam Government has lodged a protest with the East Pakistan Government and has appealed to the Pakistani authorities to put a stop to the shooting down of unarmed persons seeking refuge in India.

I am surprised at the suggestion made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that there should be an inquiry by an impartial tribunal to decide whether the Muslims who have been evicted were Indians or Pakistani nationals. The representative of Pakistan has stated that the maintenance of communal harmony was a domestic problem for India and Pakistan. Is it less of a domestic problem for India to decide whether a particular person is or is not an Indian national ? May I ask, with all respect, whether any of the countries which have the honour of being represented on the Security Council, and who are sitting around this table, would agree to abdicate their sole sovereign right of deciding which aliens they should admit or permit to reside on their territory or of determining who is a national and who is an alien ? I have said before that we do not throw people out arbitrarily and we have done our best and we are doing our best to give a fair hearing to anyone who has been aggrieved by the quit notice.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has made an unworthy attack on Hindu society and the Hindu religion. I cannot expect him to understand the philosophy or the tenets of that religion. Similar attacks have been made by the President of Pakistan during his goodwill tour of countries of South and South East Asia. Apparently goodwill was to be advanced by attacking the Hindu religion. It requires broadmindedness and tolerance to appreciate a faith which is not one's own. It is true that there is still the caste system in India but we are pledged to achieve a casteless society and we are ceaselessly working towards that end. It is not easy to change institutions that have existed for centuries. As the representative of Pakistan has himself admitted we have proscribed untouchability, it is illegal. We have made it a penal offence for any person to deny to one who was known as untouchable any public right, and in the making of our appointments in the framing of our policies, in the development of

# our industries, caste plays no part whatsoever, and even in social matters, its hold is becoming more and more tenuous.

I do not envy the representative of Pakistan in the choice of his metaphors. I think they are in extremely bad taste. He has compared India to a senile person showing his false teeth. India is a young country as far as freedom is concerned although it is old in tradition and history. It is it country which, since its independence, has maintained democratic institutions and has launched upon its economic development in the setting of freedom. These are not false teeth. They are the teeth which we acquired with our birth as an independent nation.

The distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan has shown surprise that we should resent Pakistan's friendship with China. We do not. We ourselves believe in friendship with all countries and we were friendly with China before it committed aggression oil us. The distinguished Foreign Minister objected to my expression of Pakistan's flirtations with China. Perhaps Pakistan has serious matrimonial intentions. What we object to and resent is Pakistan's attitude towards us from the time the Chinese aggression began. One would have thought that when China attacked us Pakistan would have said to us, "We have our guarrels, we have our differences, but we are neighbours and we will not add to your troubles." That would have been a helpful attitude. But not only did Pakistan not stand by us, but it used every argument to prevent friendly countries from giving us aid. It has used the same tactics which it is using now with the Security Council, and its threat to its allies in SEATO and CENTO was that if they gave aid to us Pakistan would walk out of the alliances.

The distinguished Foreign Minister has said that Pakistan has always been loyal to its allies. In this connexion I shall content myself with quoting a statement of Premier Chou En-lai to the Associated Press of Pakistan. made on 10 April 1963. Premier Chou En-Jai disclosed that the leaders of Pakistan had assured him in 1954 that Pakistan had joined the Western Military Alliances only to gain political and military ascendancy over India and that "Pakistan had

#### 43

no other motivation in joining the pacts". I wonder whether the distinguished Foreign Minister is going to say, "Save me from my friends". Having tried its best to prevent us from strengthening our defences in the hour of our peril, Pakistan carried on, and carries on till today, a propaganda in support of China and seriously suggests that we are the aggressors and China the aggrieved party. This seems to be the favourite gambit of Pakistan--always to accuse the innocent party of aggression.

The distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan has insinuated that it is not only with China but with other neighbouring States bordering on India that we have strained relations. The motives and objects of this uncalled for and malicious propaganda which Pakistan has been carrying on against us are all too obvious. Our nonaligned policy is based on friendship with all countries, whatever their ideology and whatever their political or economic structure. We have very friendly relations with our immediate neighhours, Afghanistan, Nepal, Burma and Ceylon. We were on equally friendly terms with China, but China attacked us and took violent and unlawful possession of a part of our territory.

Pakistan has gone to the length of comparing us with South Africa. I vividly remember the year 1946 when I was at the United Nations as a member of the Indian delegation and I handled the resolution which India had tabled against South Africa and which India succeeded in getting adopted in the United Nations General Assembly by a two-thirds majority. We were the first to lead the crusade against racial discrimination and South Africa's racial policies. Pakistan's crude attempt to set us at odds with our African brethren will not succeed. I suppose what Africans say is more authentic than what the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan alleges. May I be permitted to quote, as an example, what Albert Luthuli has said in his recent book, Let My People Go? As the Council is aware, Chief Luthuli of South Africa is an outstanding African leader, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize and wrote his book in 1962. At page 210 of his book he states :

"The way in which India at the UNO has taken up cudgels on behalf of the oppressed South African majority and dragged the whole scandal of apartheid into the open has heartened us immeasurably."

If any parallel exists, it is between the policies of Pakistan and South Africa. The Government of South Africa, instead of putting down racialism and apartheid supports it, glories in it and gives it a legal and official backing. Pakistan too, instead of working for a multi-communal society, preaches hatred of one community against the other and exhibits intolerance and fanaticism in every aspect of its policy. Here I may mention that the General Assembly at its seventeenth session adopted resolution 1761 (XVII), which called upon Members, among other things, to cease all trade with South Africa. As is well known, India has had no trade with South Africa for the last seventeen years. In spite of the adoption of resolution 1761 (XVII), and in spite of its cosponsoring and voting for the resolution. Pakistan continued to carry on trade with South Africa. and here I would like to quote from United Nations document A/SPC/94 of 22

### 44

November 1963. That document contains the replies received from Member States in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) and the security Council resolution of 7 August 1963. The replies were contained in communications to the Secretary-General or to the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa or in statements before the General Assembly or the Security Council. I quote from the Pakistan statement contained in the aforementioned document :

"It has prohibited import of South African goods into Pakistan, and has banned the sale of arms, ammunition and all types of military vehicles and other strategic goods to South Africa. It is still carrying on a certain amount of export trade with South Africa in pursuance of earlier commitments, but is actively considering the termination of such exports." (A/SPC/ 94, page 21)

The General Assembly adopted resolution 1761 (XVII) as long as 1962, and this reply of Pakistan that I have quoted was submitted on 22 November 1963.

Pakistan is one of the few Afro-Asian countries which has still diplomatic relations with Portugal; and not only those, but it has had extensive commercial and air traffic relations. India broke off diplomatic relations with Portugal a long time ago. Surely, it is not merely a vivid imagination but a diseased and perverted one which can compare Kashmir with Angola and Mozambique. Again, to equate the question of self-determination in Kashmir with the question of self-determination in Angola and Mozambique or in other African territories is ridiculous. While Jammu and Kashmir is a part of India, Angola and Mozambique are non-self-governing territories, specifically so declared in United Nations General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV) adopted in 1960, whose people have, under the Charter, the inalienable right of independence in accordance with the wishes of the people.

The distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan has waxed eloquent over self-determination. I note that though he used many words he had no answer to the question whether he was prepared to concede the right of self-determination to the Pakhtoons, the Baluchis or to East Pakistan whose people, as a matter of common knowledge, racially, ethnically and linguistically, are different from the people of the rest of Pakistan.

Let me repeat that the principle of self-determination is applicable to nations and nation States and cannot be used for the breaking up of a State or the fragmentation of peoples. It is this principle which the United Nations and all African States invoked to oppose the self-determination of Katanga. No one questions the rightness of this decision which saved the Congo and perhaps a large part of Africa from further division and fragmentation and chaos.

I repeat our position which I think I had already made clear in my statement of 5 February. We fully endorse the principle of self-determination, and I repeat-we fully endorse the principle of self-determination. But no Member of the United Nations will accept it as an instrument for the fragmentation of the States and the nations.

As a Member State of the United Nations we have already exercised the right of self-determination. Through a Constituent Assembly of elected representatives in which the representatives of the Jammu and Kashmir State participated, the Indian people gave to themselves a Constitution which has been in force for fourteen years. Under that Constitution three general elections based on universal adult suffrage have been-held, in the last of which there was an electorate of 216 million-the largest known in history. The Indian people inhabiting Jammu and Kashmir have fully shared in that self-determination. They have already exercised their right of self-determination, but when it is suggested that there should be self-determination for the people of Kashmir, as distinct from the people of India, this is a proposition which we cannot accept, as indeed any other suggestion based on the premise that the majority of the people of Jammu and Kashmir happen to profess a particular religion.

Did Pakistan permit the people of the Princely States in Pakistan to exercise the right of selfdetermination after the Ruler acceded to Pakistan? As was disclosed in the West Pakistan High Court a few years ago, the accession of Bhawalpur 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, and I emphasize the word "purchased", the territory of Gwadur from the Sultan of Muscat, what happened to Pakistan's solicitous regard for the 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.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has sought to counter my argument with regard to accession when I said that the question of religious complexion did not enter into the legal validity of the instrument of accession executed by the Ruler of Kashmir. He has relied on the instance of Junagadh. Now in that case, the accession would have contravened the principle of contiguity, apart from the fact that the large majority

# 45

of the people of Junagadh, it is beyond dispute, were totally opposed to the Ruler- acceding to Pakistan. You have only to look at the map of that part of India to realize how absurd Junagadh's accession to Pakistan would have been. In the case of Kashmir not only have we a legal, unconditional accession, but we have also the principle of contiguity satisfied, and even if we were, at the time of accession, to take into consideration the wishes of the people of Kashmir, there can be no doubt that the National Conference, which, as I have already pointed out in my earlier statement, was the party representing the large majority of the people of Kashmir, were clearly and emphatically in favour of accession to India. In the case of Hyderabad and Jodhpur also the principle of contiguity applied and the people of these States were in favour of accession to India. I do not wish to repeat what I have already said about the effect of the Ruler of Kashmir executing the instrument of accession and the Governor-General of India accepting it. I have also pointed out that various statements made by the Prime Minister of India and others with regard to consulting the wishes of the people were made in the context of the situation then existing and on the clear understanding that Pakistan would discharge its obligations solemnly given to the Security Council and vacate its aggression.

During the discussions between the United Nations Commission and the Prime Minister of India regarding the Commission's plebiscite proposal of 11 December 1948, which later became resolution of 5 January 1949, the Prime Minister of India said :

"The Prime Minister emphasized firstly that, if the Government of India were to accept the Commission's plebiscite proposals, no action could be taken in regard to them until parts I and II of the Commission's resolution of 13 August had been fully implemented; secondly that, in the event of Pakistan not accepting these proposals or, having accepted them, of not implementing parts I and II of the resolution of 13 August, the Indian Government's acceptance of them should not be regarded as in any way binding upon them."

This is what the Prime Minister said on 5 January 1949, and this is the exact position I am taking up today in the year 1964. The Prime Minister made it clear that unless the terms of parts I and II of the resolution of 13 August were implemented, the Government of India's acceptance would not be regarded as binding upon us. There is no difference whatever in the position taken up by the Prime Minister in 1949 and

the position I am taking up at this table in 1964.

Dr. Lozano, Chairman of the United Nations Commission, accepted the points made by the Prime Minister of India-from paragraphs 2 and 3 of Aide Memoire 1, S/1196. Mr. N. Gopalaswamy Ayyanger, whom also the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has quoted, said this in the Constituent Assembly of India on 27 May 1949:

"The accession was offered by the Maharaja and it was accepted by the Governor-General of the time....It is an absolutely unconditional offer....The accession is complete."

The position is quite clear that India it selfoffered, not as a part or pre-condition or postcondition of accession, but unilaterally to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, that after the soil of Kashmir was cleared of the invaders and law and order had been restored, the wishes of the people would be ascertained. It is in this limited sense that accession was said at that time to be subject to the wishes of the people. This did not and could not affect the legality of accession, which, as I said in my statement and as I maintain, was absolute. The Indian Independence Act of 1947, which surely the Foreign Minister of Pakistan would not repudiate, does not speak of conditional accession or any right of secession of a constituent State. Can he tell us if tinder that Act accession could be anything but complete and absolute ? Does the Act contain any provision even remotely contemplating partial, temporary, inchoate, or conditional accession? Are there any words in the relevant provisions of the Act dealing with accession which are other than plain, straightforward and unambiguous ?

The Prime Minister of India reaffirmed the same position while speaking to Parliament on 8 August 1952 :

"All the States in India acceded in July or August or later that year (1947) on these three basic subjects-foreign affairs, communication and defence. Can anybody say that accession of any State was not complete in August or September or later in 1947 because it came in only on these three subjects? of course not. It was a complete accession in law and in fact. So the accession of Jammu and Kashmir was complete in law and in fact on a certain date in October ...... There the matter rests and it is not open to doubt or challenge."

Therefore, we have never changed our position. Our position has remained the same from 1947 until today.

When I said that the two UNCIP resolutions which we had accepted had become obsolete, I did not say it out of any disrespect for the Security Council. We are a founder Member of the United Nations and we have the greatest respect for that Organization and particularly for the

# 46

Security Council. But how else can you characterize a resolution which was adopted sixteen years ago and which has not been acted upon by Pakistan, except as obsolete? It is obsolete in the sense that its very bottom has been knocked out by the conduct of Pakistan itself. The Foreign Minister has very wisely not referred to the false statements made by Pakistan with regard to its presence in Kashmir. The Foreign Minister has tried to get rid of those inconvenient facts by suggesting that they are irrelevant, because these events happened prior to the arrangement arrived at between ourselves, Pakistan and the Security Council. That is a total misreading of the UNCIP resolutions. I have said it before and I repeat that these resolutions were conditional and the condition was the vacation of aggression by Pakistan, which condition was not satisfied and has not been satisfied until today.

Pakistan apparently finds it difficult to explain its unlawful presence in Kashmir. The Foreign Minister has sought to dispose of this inconvenient question by saying that :

"The controversies which existed before the acceptance of an agreement cannot be revived; once the agreement is reached you cannot revive the controversy which led to the agreement."

It is a strange argument that because we had agreed to a compromise formula on certain conditions, the compromise becomes sacrosanct even if the conditions were not satisfied. It would indeed be a strange situation if one could not discuss tentative plans without being bound by them for all time. How could then one carry on negotiations? In the course of discussions many offers and suggestions may be made. These offers become binding if they are accepted. If they are not accepted, they terminate. If an offer is made and it is not accepted or not implemented, it cannot stand for ever. We have made this clear on numerous occasions in the past and we have done so once again.

At no time did we abandon our sovereignty over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and we have never agreed to any resolution which even by implication questioned this sovereignty. We have taken pains to see that this basic position adopted in the UNCIP resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949 is not departed from. We were naturally not prepared to modify these resolutions which had been accepted by both parties, particularly as the suggested modifications were only in favour of Pakistan. All the subsequent talks about "synchronization" and about "balanced forces" and so on were not contemplated by the Commission in its resolutions.

I have just stated that the resolution of 13 August 1948 has become obsolete and the bottom has been knocked out of it by the conduct of Pakistan itself. May I briefly enumerate some of the major violations of the terms of this resolution by Pakistan :

First, continuing presence of Pakistan forces and Pakistan personnel in Kashmir.

This is not disputed by Pakistan.

Second, introduction of additional military equipment into occupied territory.

This again cannot be disputed by Pakistan.

Third, construction of airfields in occupied territory, thus creating bases for attack against India endangering its security.

Again, this is an undisputed fact.

Fourth, consolidation and incorporation of the occupied area of Jammu and Kashmir into Pakistan.

Again, there can be no dispute about this.

Fifth, using its membership of military pacts to increase Pakistan's military potential in Kashmir, and to strengthen the so-called Azad Forces, officered, trained and equipped by Pakistan.

I do not think this can be challenged either.

Sixth, occupation of Northern areas.

They have been occupied by Pakistan.

Seventh, continuous threats of force and the creation of a war atmosphere, which are a constant menace to the cease-fire line.

I have given the Security Council innumerable instances of these threats of force and the creation of a war atmosphere.

Eighth, organizing and financing of subversion and sabotage in Jammu and Kashmir.

Almost every month in Kashmir there are instances of subversion and sabotage organized and financed from Pakistan.

Ninth, having no common border with the People's Republic of China, Pakistan has nevertheless negotiated with it Kashmir's border with Sinkiang, thus disrupting the territorial unity of the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

This is the most recent violation, giving away over 2,000 square miles of Kashmir to China in a socalled treaty rectifying the border between Pakistan and China. Pakistan has no border with China. The only border is our border, the border of Kashmir. They are in unlawful possession of that part of Kashmir and they try to give away somebody else's property.

#### 47

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has referred to certain statement alleged to have been made by Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, until recently the Prime Minister of Kashmir. I do not know the source from which he has obtained them. My instructions are that these statements are not genuine, and this is borne out by a clearcut straightforward statement made by Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. President of the National Conference, on 6 February 1964. He appealed to all patriotic elements in the State as well as in other parts of the country to Join hands in defending the country's freedom against increasing threats from Pakistan. He drew attention to the everincreasing threats from Pakistan to the security of the State and, "the malicious hate-India campaign unleashed by Pakistan Press Ind Radio". and he added :

"The need to close our ranks and forge unity among all those who believe in democratic secularism and planned economic progress of the nation has become paramount. It is time to forget and sink our past differences."

#### I quote again :

"Our representative in the Security Council"he is referring to my humble self-"has voiced the true feelings of the people of Jammu and Kashmir by asserting once again that since the people of the State had already thrice expressed their verdict to become an integral part of India, the question of holding a plebiscite must be treated as closed. "He"--that is, myself, has correctly stated that Jammu and Kashmir is as good part of India as any other State. Therefore, Pakistan has no right to meddle in our internal affairs. The issue which still remains unresolved is the continued illegal occupation of a large part of our territory by Pakistan. Immediate vacation of Pakistan's aggression is the only relevant subject needing consideration by the Security Council. It is. therefore, earnestly hoped that no further delay will be permitted in resolving this basic point."

I might point out that I received this very morning a telegram from Delhi saying that the statement on which the Pakistan Foreign Minister had relied is described by official circles in New Delhi and by Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad himself in Srinagar as a crude forgery. I really think that when one relies on statements and flourishes them in the Security Council, one might take a little care and find out whether they are authentic and genuine. A false statement was relied upon by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and we have just received a telegram that it is a crude forgery and we have the statement of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad himself contradicting the statement relied upon by the Foreign Minister.

There is a minor matter, but I must clear up the position. It may be true that as between the United Kingdom, Pakistan and India, India and Pakistan were successor States to the United Kingdom, but there is no doubt that internationally Pakistan was a new State and India was the successor State to undivided India. If that was not so, it was not necessary for Pakistan to have been admitted as a Member of the United Nations. If both of us were successor States then both of us would have automatically become Members of the United Nations. The Foreign Minister has also referred to mediation and arbitration. Need I tell him that in the matter of sovereignty, there cannot be mediation or arbitration. It is the clear insignia of sovereignty that the country which claims sovereignty cannot permit adjudication about it or leave it to some other country to decide whether, in fact, it is sovereign or not.

We have been told that four Indian Divisions are stationed in Kashmir. I am not here to disclose military secrets. As in other sovereign States, our army, wherever stationed within our borders, is intended for the defence and security of our land and our people. Our people in Kashmir have nothing to fear from their own army. Indeed, aggression in Kashmir, by Pakistan on the one side and the People's Republic of China on the other, compels us to take adequate measures in self-defence. This is exactly what the late Mr. John Strachey, Member of Parliament, from whose communication to the Observer I quoted in my earlier statement, felt about our action.

I do not want to go again into the question of the Calcutta riots. I have already dealt with it. But it is totally false to suggest that the landlords have been allowed to make profit out of the property of poor Muslims which was burnt down. Both the Chief Minister of West Bengal and our Home Minister have made it clear that no one will be permitted to benefit by the troubles and misery which has been suffered by our Muslim fellow citizens. The Home Minister went further: that, if necessary, even the Constitution would be changed to prevent landlords from making money out of the misery of the poor. Already the West Bengal Government has promulgated an ordinance to deal with this situation.

To sum up, Pakistan came to the Security Council on two specific charges. One was that we were trying to integrate Kashmir further into India, and the second was that there is a grave situation in Kashmir which called for some action by the Security Council. In my submission, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has failed to substantiate either of these allegations, and therefore there is nothing before the Council on which it need take action.

#### 48

In conclusion, may I end on the same note that I did in my earlier statement. These recriminations, this unending debate, this making and answering of charges lead us nowhere. We are prepared to discuss all our outstanding differences with Pakistan, including Kashmir, once the bitter feelings and the communal passions have subsided. Pakistan can help in this by eschewing propaganda at home and abroad and by taking every measure to prevent incitement to communal passion in its Press and on its Radio. I wish to assure the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, with all the emphasis at my command, that Pakistan has nothing to fear from India. We have no aggressive intentions. We feel that in the prosperity of Pakistan lies the prosperity. of the whole sub-continent of India, and this prosperity, both of India and of Pakistan, depends upon Hindus and Muslims in both the countries living peacefully side by side. Let us make every effort to come together and see whether we cannot take the necessary steps towards this end. This is essentially a matter for us to decide-Pakistan and ourselves. No intervention of a third party can be of much help. There are certain matters which can only be settled bilaterally, and the question of communal peace and harmony in India and Pakistan is one of these.

# INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA ANGUILLA LATVIA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM SWEDEN MALI SAUDI ARABIA CHILE BURMA AFGHANISTAN NEPAL SOUTH AFRICA PORTUGAL ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE CONGO OMAN

**Date** : Feb 01, 1964

# Volume No

#### 1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

#### Shri M. C. Chagla's statement in Lok Sabha on Kashmir Debate in Security Council

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of Education and Leader of the Indian delegation to the U.N., made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on February 24, 1964 on the Kashmir debate in the Security Council :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, may 1, with your permission, make a short statement dealing with the debate that took place in the Security Council on Kashmir ?

As the House knows, Pakistan went to the Security Council on two specific charges. One was that Kashmir was in open revolt and the other was that we were trying to integrate Kashmir with India. On the first, I think, it was practically accepted by the Security Council that if ever there was communal unity shown, it was shown in Kashmir during those days. We pointed out that when the relic was lost all the communities mourned it and when it was found all the communities rejoiced and that far from the demonstrations being against India they were in support of India.

On the second charge we pointed out that Kashmir was an integral part of India, legally and constitutionally, that the Resolution on which Pakistan relied had become obsolete and that under no circumstances would India ever agree to the holding of a plebiscite. I think, we have laid the ghost once and for all of the holding of a plebiscite.

We also pointed out that if a plebiscite was held what the political repercussions would be. If the loss of the relic in Kashmir could produce serious riots 1,500 miles away in Khulna, it could not possibly contemplate the consequences of the holding of a plebiscite in Kashmir.

## U.K. DELEGATE'S STATEMENT

Now I would like to say a word about the debate that took place and first I would like to deal with the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom. I must confess that that statement came to me as a great surprise and as a great shock. We at least expected that if the United Kingdom did not support the cause of India, it would at least be impartial as between two Commonwealth countries. But we found that the statement of the United Kingdom representative was entirely partisan and supported the case of Pakistan.

I say this on three grounds. Firstly, Sir Patrick Dean made an astonishing statement that the question of the legality of the accession was unrealistic. I ask this House how can you decide the accession of a country except on legal grounds. And the accession was brought about according to the provisions of an Act passed by the British Parliament. Yet, here was the representative of the United Kingdom saying that to consider accession on legal grounds was unrealistic !

Secondly, we were surprised to find that throughout that statement there was no reference whatever to the aggression committed by Pakistan. Let us not forget that it was we who went to the Security Council with a complaint that Pakistan had committed aggression on us. And the British representative never made any mention of it.

But what made us really indignant was when the British representative tried to equate India and Pakistan with regard to our communal policy. According to the British representative, there was no difference in the way Pakistan behaved towards its minority and India behaved towards her minority. They forgot the raging tearing

#### 49

campaign that Pakistan had carried on against India, me cry for jehad, the inciting of communal riots. And may I say that the reaction in this Parliament, in the Press and in the public had a very salutary effect on the. situation? My hands were tremendously strengthened when I read of what hon. Members of Parliament, the Press and the public here had been saying about the statement. It was because of this, if you study the subsequent debate, that the whole tone of the speeches which might have been against us was in a lower pitch. Take the speech of the United States representative. It was against us; but it was pitched in a much lower key.

# SUPPORT FROM USSR AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Both the USSR and Czechoslovakia supported us. I wish to remove a certain misunderstanding which I have noticed in certain criticisms in this country, namely, that the speech of the USSR representative was not as strong this time as it was on the last occasions.

If you read the speech of the representative of the USSR, you will find that he clearly states that the people of Kashmir have already decided to which country Kashmir will belong. Now, nothing can be clearer than this and the reason why the Russian representative did not go into the details of the case perhaps was that Russia like other countries, was most anxious to have a consensus--I will just come to that shortly.

# SELF-DETERMINATION

With regard to Morocco and Ivory Coast, they really tried to uphold the principle of selfdetermination. We pointed out that we ourselves were the staunchest supporters of the principle of self-determination, but self-determination had to be understood in the context of Kashmir; if Kashmir was a part of India, you do no, have self-determination for parts of countries or for parts of people and if that were so, not only would India break up but many African and other countries would break up....

An Hon. Member : Pakistan will break- up.

Shri Chagla : If you accept self-determination in East Pakistan, I do not know what will happen.

But I do wish to say this because I have seen adverse comments against Ivory Coast and Morocco. Let us appreciate the fact that Pakistan could not persuade either the Ivory Coast or Morocco to sponsor a resolution which Pakistan wanted. To that extent these two countries stood by us.

Coming to the other countries, it is true that although the President of Brazil worked very hard to bring about a consensus, his speech was against us. But when you look at Bolivia, Norway, even Nationalist China and France, you will find that these speeches revealed a getting away from the old positions. They may have referred to the old Resolutions but they did emphasise the fact that you must look to the realities of the situation, that you must have a new approach and that the passage of time had made a difference. Therefore, my opinion is that on the whole the debate was favourable to us.

# CONSENSUS AND RESOLUTION

I would just like to say one word about the consensus and a resolution because I see in the debate here a mention was made. about it. We fully realised the difference between a consensus and a resolution. Our eyes were open and there was no question of a trap.

A consensus which all the members were trying to bring about-and I emphasise the facts including Russia and Czechoslovakia was a consensus of eleven members of the Security Council and India and Pakistan. That means an agreement to which not only the eleven members of the Security Council would be a party to it but India and Pakistan would also subscribe to it.

I realised from the beginning that the difference between the attitude of Pakistan and of India was so wide that a consensus would not be possible, but I was prepared to give all assistance and not to take up a rigid attitude. If such a settlement could be brought about, it would have been for the first time in the history of the Security Council that such a thing could have happened. I must say that throughout our discussions Russia and Czechoslovakia were in contact with us.

If the consensus had been arrived at, we would have been a party to it. I made it clear

that we believed in international ethics and morality and if I subscribed to the consensus I would loyally and faithfully stand by it; therefore, I would not agree to anything which went against our fundamental position. The main difference between Pakistan and ourselves ultimately resolved itself into this. I said that we are prepared to talk to Pakistan but first the talk must be about the communal situation, that tension must go and proper arrangement must be made to see that there are no more riots and that all these troubles must come to an end; it is only when an atmosphere of understanding has been established that we can discuss our outstanding differences. What Pakistan wanted was that we should go to the conference table on the basis of the old resolutions, which means

#### 50

plebiscite. I said that is a fundamental position to which India can never agree. And, therefore, the consensus did not come about.

I could say that if a resolution had been passed, it would have been under Chapter VI of the Charter, which is not mandatory but merely persuasive, and either Russia would have vetoed it or we could say, 'We do not accept the resolution'. But a consensus would have been binding on us. But I assure the House that I would not have agreed to a consensus which in any way undermined the position of India or militated against the stand we have already taken.

Now, Pakistan went to the Security Council to get these two reliefs about Kashmir, and she wanted a definite interdict from the Security Council that we would not further integrate Kashmir. She failed to obtain either of these two reliefs.

# INTEGRATION OF KASHMIR

And may I say one word about the integration ? I made it clear that whatever steps we had taken were in the interest of the people of Kashmir or for the welfare of the people of Kashmir. I said we will go on with that integration. I hope-the Prime Minister is here; he used the expression gradual erosion of article 370'--I hope that erosion will be accelerated. I hope and trust that very soon article 370 will disappear from our Constitution.

Let us not forget the article 370 is in a part which talks of transitional and temporary provisions. I think the transitional period has been too long.

Therefore, in my opinion, Pakistan suffered a severe diplomatic reverse. She came to get a resolution. She could not get any member to sponsor such a resolution. Whether the mission was successful or not, it is for this House to say.

An Hon. Member: What, according to the assessment of the leader of our delegation, were the goings-on behind the scenes or other factors that brought about a change of attitude-he used the, word 'unexpected'; I would say nearperfidious--on the part of Albion, the UK? What influenced her pro-Pakistan stand in spite of the latter's unholy alliance and conspiracy with China ? What were the goings-on behind the scenes, the factors--if he knows?

Shri Chagla : We must not forget that Pakistan is an ally of the U.K. and the U.S We are not their ally. We are non-aligned, and we are proud of our policy of non-alignment. So that if there is a leaning on the side of Pakistan, we must understand it. There has always been a leaning. I have seen it in the U.K.; I have seen it in the United States. There is always a feeling there that Pakistan is closer to us than India. That, is, really the explanation.

An Hon. Member: Could he throw some light on an aspect on which he touched briefly? This is about the Bolivian and Nationalist Chinese stand on this matter and the factors leading to it. We would also like to know whether the concept of concensus as expounded by him is shared by all other members of the Security Council, because that has caused some anxiety in this country.

Shri Chagla : I am glad the hon. Member mentioned about Bolivia. I apologisc for not having mentioned it. I should have mentioned Bolivia in my statement.

Bolivia completely supported India. I should have mentioned that earlier. It is an important

Latin American country. I do not want the House or the public to feel that I have not appreciated the attitude taken up by that country.

With regard to the concensus, almost every member country praised India for the flexible attitude it took up, the reasonable attitude it took up. We were prepared to go as far as possible, subject to our fundamentals. I assure you, whether it was Russia,, or Czechoslovakia or other countries, every country wanted a concensus but no country wanted a resolution. That is the position with regard to consensus.

Replying to a question Shri Chagla said : No country likes to exercise its veto, if it can help it. That applies to the U.S.S.R. as well. But as I said, the hon. Member has only got to read the delegate's speech to see that Russia still stands by us; and throughout the negotiationshe stood by us.

An Hon. Member: May I know what will happen to the request of Pakistan to the Security Council, is it shelved ? Or if it is to come up again, in what form will it be?

Shri Chagla : I read that Mr. Bhutto is going to New York in March. Technically, Kashmir is an item on the agenda of the Security Council---it has been there since 1948. Again technically, any member of the UN has the right to apply to the Security Council to bring it on. But I do not see how the Security Council can waste its time discussing this item, unless some case is made out. That is why I have. been saving that we must be vigilant and watchful and see that Pakistan does not create a new case to go to the Security Council.

51

# INDIA AND THE COMMONWEALTH

Mr. Speaker : The question is whether our representative had made it clear that there is a feeling here in India created by the attitude of the U.K. delegate that we should go out of the Commonwealth.

Shri Chagla : The foreign policy of a country should not be based upon anger of indignation.

Pakistan bases its policy on hatred of India. We are much too civilised. Whether we should remain in the Commonwealth or get out of it is a matter for serious consideration, not to be decided by what the UK representative says in the Security Council.

# INDIA PAKISTAN USA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NORWAY SLOVAKIA RUSSIA MOROCCO BRAZIL BOLIVIA CHINA FRANCE

**Date** : Feb 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

# INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Kashmir Debate in Security Council

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of Education and Leader of the India delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement on February 24, 1964, in Rajya Sabha on the Kashmir debate in the Security Council

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would make a short statement about the debate. that took place in the Security Council on Kashmir. This House knows that Pakistan went to the Security Council on two specific charges. One was that Kashmir was in open revolt and the other was that India was trying to integrate Kashmir.

With regard to the first we pointed out that far from Kashmir being in revolt against India, both when the sacred relic was lost and when it was recovered, all communities joined in the first case in bemoaning the loss and in rejoicing at the recovery and that all the demonstrations in Kashmir were held in favour of India and not against India. That was the answer with regard to the charge of Kashmir being in open revolt.

# NO PLEBISCITE IN KASHMIR

With regard to the question of integration, we pointed out that legally and constitutionally Kashmir was a part of India and the so-called integration was merely a domestic matter of relations between the Union and one of its States and therefore no question of further integration or annexation could arise. We also pointed out that India would never agree under any circumstances to bold a plebiscite and I think that once and for all we have laid the ghost of plebiscite. This ghost often rises up in the Security Council and elsewhere and we made it clear that no question of plebiscite could arise. We also pointed out the terrible political implications if a plebiscite was held.

We pointed out that if the loss of the sacred relic in Srinagar could cause riots 1,500 miles away in East Pakistan what could be the result of stirring up communal passions in the vale of Kashmir. This was our answer to the question of integration.

#### U. K. DELEGATE'S STATEMENT

Now, I would like to say a word about the discussion that took place. Frankly, we were shocked and surprised at the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom. If I did not expect a speech that was favourable to India I at least expected a speech which would try to hold the balance even between the two countries but I am sorry to say that the speech of the representative of the United Kingdom was a very partisan speech. And it was partisan on three grounds. First, Sir Patrick Dean, the representative of the United Kingdom, made an astonishing statement that to consider the legality of the accession was unrealistic. Now he is a lawyer and I happen to be a lawyer myself and I cannot understand how you can consider the accession of any country, except on legal grounds. It is a question of international and constitutional law and in this case the accession was the result of an Act passed by the British Parliament and yet the British representative said that to consider the legality of accession was unrealistic.

Secondly. throughout this speech, no mention was made by the British representative about Pakistan's aggression. As the House will remember. we went to the Security Council as complainants. It was our case and it was practically accented by the Security Council that Pakistan had committed aggression on us by invading Kashmir and being in possession of two-fifths of Kashmir even today; yet there was no mention of it.

And the third aspect of his speech which I think was the worst was that he tried to equate India and Pakistan with regard to the communal question. The British representative seemed to think that we in India treat our minorities in the same way as Pakistan treats hers. He forgot the hate-India campaign in Pakistan. the

#### 52

articles in the Pakistani Press about waging a holy war against India, the inciting to riots; all that was forgotten and, therefore, as I said, the speech of the British representative--and I am using a very mild expression--was extremely disappointing.

I am glad that there was such a strong reaction in this country against the stand taken by the United Kingdom. That reaction had a very salutary effect in the Security Council. It strengthened my hands. I know the reaction in this House, in the Press and in the public and therefore it you study the speech of the United States representative you will find that although substantially it supported the position taken by the United Kingdom, the whole speech was pitched in a much lower note. It would have been a much stronger speech, I am sure, if the United States had not realised how strong the reaction was in this country against the United Kingdom.

# SUPPORT OF RUSSIA AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Then about Russia and Czechoslovakia, I wish to remove some. misunderstanding that existed in this country. It is not correct to say that the U.S.S.R. did not stand by India. If you read the speech of the representative of Russia, be says that the people of Kashmir have. already decided to which country they would belong. Can there be anything stronger than that ? it is true that the representative did not go into all the other questions but there was a good reason for it--I shall presently come to it--and the reason was that Russia and every other country wanted, if possible, to get a consensus.

# SELF-DETERMINATION

Now, with regard to Ivory Coast and Morocco, it is true that they supported the principle of self-determination. He pointed out that we ourselves were in favour of self-determination; we had fought for self-determination for ourselves and for other countries in Asia and Africa, but self-determination had to be understood in the context of Kashmir and if Kashmir was part of India there cannot be self-determination for a part of the country or for a part of the people. If such A principle was to be accepted India would break up; many African countries would break up and even in Europe there might be trouble. I want this to be made clear that we must appreciate the attitude of Morocco and the Ivory Coast because neither country in the ultimate analysis was persuaded or could be persuaded by Pakistan to sponsor a Resolution. They held firmly against Pakistan's desire that either one of them should sponsor a Resolution.

With regard to the other countries, Bolivia was entirely in our favour. And if you look at the speeches of Norway, France and even Nationalist China, you will find that they are trying to get away from the old Resolutions. They talk about the realities of the situation. They talk about a fresh approach. And, therefore, I think, on the whole, these speeches were in our favour. Brazil, unfortunately, supported the case of Pakistan though as the President of the Council he did his best to bring about a consensus.

#### CONSENSUS AND RESOLUTION

Now, I would like to say a word about this consensus and Resolutions, because I see that were has been some misunderstanding about our trying to agree to a consensus. Now, it is wrong to say that a consensus was a trap, or that our eyes were not open as to what we are in for if we accepted a consensus. Now, the difference between a consensus and a Resolution is this. What the Security Council wanted was something unique in the history of the Security Council and unique in the history of the United Nations, to have the agreement of all the eleven members of the Security Council And India and Pakistan, if such a thing could be brought about. We said we were prepared, provided we were not asked to sacrifice any of our fundamental positions. We were prepared to talk to Pakistan, provided the first talk must be with regard to calming down of tension, trying to see that no riots took place. When there was an atmosphere of understanding, then we were prepared to discuss our outstanding differences. But what Pakistan wanted was that we should go to the conference table on the basis of the old Resolutions, or in other words on the basis of a plebiscite and we firmly declined to accept that position.

I quite realise that if a Resolution is passed, it is not binding on us. First, it may have been vetoed by Russia. Even if it was not, under Chapter VI of the Charter it is not mandatory but persuasive. If we had said we did not accept the Resolution there would have been an end of the matter.

I fully realised that a consensus was binding on us and, therefore, I made it clear that we believe in international morality and I would not subscribe to anything on behalf of my cointry which I was not prepared loyally to carry out. Therefore, the consensus did not come about because our attitude on the question of the conference table was basically different from that of Pakistan. But I assure you that if we had agreed to a consensus, it would have been a consensus where our fundamental stand would have been accepted.

#### 53

#### INTEGRATION OF KASHMIR

Now, Sir, that is the position. Mr. Bhutto went to the Security Council with a specific request. The request was that the Security Council should interdict India from carrying on further integration. Now, may I say a word about integration ? I told the Security Council that every step we had taken was in the interests of the people of Kashmir. The Prime Minister the other day spoke of the gradual erosion of article 370 of the Constitution. I only hope that the erosion is accelerated and I also hope that very soon that article will disappear from the Constitution of India. After all, it is an article which is transitional and temporary. I think the transitional period has been long enough.

#### DIPLOMATIC REVERSES FOR PAKISTAN

What I am pointing. out is that Mr. Bhutto went there saying that there was an emergency. He himself asked for an adjournment and lift without getting a Resolution. In my opinion, it meant a serious diplomatic reverse for Pakistan. Whether it meant success for India or not, it is for this House to decide.

#### NO MEDIATION

Replying to a question Shri Chagla, said : The first point raised by my hon. friend is the question of mediation. I made it perfectly clear that there can be no mediation or arbitration on a question of sovereignty. Even here, as far as I remember Mr, Sandys was here; we had six rounds of discussion; the expression used was "good offices" which is very different from mediation or arbitration, but under. no circumstances would we agree to mediation.

With regard to Pakistan's propaganda, I assure my hon. friend that if he looks at my statement, both the statements, we drew attention to what was being said in the Pakistan Press, what was said by Mr. Bhutto, what was said by President Ayub Khan, which did not make very good reading.

With regard to the third, about taking the issue out of the Security Council, I do not know how that can be done. We went to the Security Council. We put the item on the Agenda, and if the item remains on the Agenda, any member can bring it up, unless we leave the United Nations and I am sure hon. friend, does not suggest that.

Replying to another question Shri Chagla said: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. Member himself realises, I cannot possibly divulge my conversations with the British Prime Minister. All that I can say is that I had fifty minutes talk with him and I was given to understand--I am trying to put it as diplomatically as possible; I have ceased to be a diplomat but still I remember diplomatic finesse--I was given to understand, and that is true of the United States too, as far as I can judge, that both the United Kingdom and the United States did not want Pakistan to go to the Security Council. If that was so, then this attitude becomes even more difficult for us to understand. But I do not agree with the hon. Member that this was due to any aberration on the part of Sir Patrick Dean, and people normally do not suffer from such aberration in high political or diplomatic matters. The policy was laid down in Whitehall, and whether it was due to the Commonwealth Secretary taking a different view or whatever it might be I do not think it would be right to say that this represented the personal, individual view of Sir Patrick Dean.

With regard to consensus, I want to assure my friend that all that we were prepared to agree to was in the first place a meeting on a high Ministerial level, as we ourselves had suggested, to calm down the tempers and the passions, to take steps to see that no communal riots took place again, and only when there was an atmosphere of understanding would we agree to discuss outstanding differences with Pakistan. That in no way committed us with regard to our position that Kashmir belonged to India.

My hon. friend is forgetting that we had six rounds of talks in India itself with Pakistan. I do not think in a democracy we should at all object to sitting at a conference table and discussing things. We do not give up our position. As I said, there are other differences with Pakistan besides Kashmir.

54

INDIA PAKISTAN USA RUSSIA NORWAY SLOVAKIA MOROCCO BOLIVIA FRANCE CHINA BRAZIL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Feb 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Intervening in the debate in the Lok Sabha on February 19, 1964 on the Address of the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President, the Minister without Portfolio, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there has been a lengthy debate on the Vice-President's Address in this House and many important matters have been raised, both national as well as international. I do not want to take much. time of the House on national problems as my colleague the Home Minister would be dealing with them.

Sir, I shall. have to refer to some of the matters concerning external affairs. It is but natural that we in this country have taken interest and our-notice was specially drawn towards deliberations in the Security Council.

# KASHMIR DEBATE IN SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council took up the matter of Kashmir and in spite of out protests that it was hardly necessary for the Security Council to consider the, question of Kashmir at the present moment, it was ultimately decided that there should be a, discussion.

I know that the speech made by Sir Patrick Dean has created a furore in our country and the serious-note. taken by the members of Parliament; as well as by people outside, is only just and fair. I do not want to deal much with his speech now as the Security Council has adjourned. However, we have to consider the reasons for the kind of speech Sir Patrick Dean made.

As far as I can judge-and I am prepared to consider his approach philosophically--there are two main reasons on account of which the U.K. representative was unable to take a dispassionate view. The first is, they are members of SEATO-U.K. and Pakistan--and they have entered into a military alliance. U.K., therefore, finds herself in a position not to take an independent view. It must side with their allies. And, as I said, if we consider their approach with some sympathy we can somewhat appreciate that approach, whether we agree with it or do not. agree with it at all (interruption).

# BRITISH STAND ON KASHMIR

I would like to say, as I was saying, that there are two main reasons on account of which the British delegate took up that attitude. And I have dealt with one. The other is because the present ruling party in U.K. still continues to think in old terms and in old ways.

The ruling party has always felt that Kashmir should go over to Pakistan. They have been thinking in that way-they may not say itbecause they have the feeling that the Jammu and Kashmir State could easily be divided into two, the Muslim majority part going over to Pakistan and the Hindu majority part going over to, India. They think that it is an easy division, just a division of two territories. But they do not visualise the consequences, the true consequences of these steps. It is not merely a question of division of two territories.

The implications, as I said, are much more complex. In spite of the fact that the Britishers say that they are non-communal, and they are, and they believe in a secular kind of state, yet, they have never given thought to what has been happening or what has happened in Pakistan and how the minorities have been dealt with in that country.

#### KASHMIR'S ACCESSION

The question of accession of Kashmir has been dealt with or has been referred to by many Members of this House., I must pay my compliments to Shri Krishna Menon who spoke at length on this matter. He has said in his speech that in so far as the legal accession of Kashmir with India is concerned, it is final and complete. So, we stand on that basis. It is quite clear that the Government of India have nothing to say further on that matter.

But it is unfortunate that a reference was made by Sir Patrick Dean on this aspect of the problem. It is true that I have gone through the full text of the speech of Sir Patrick Dean. It was given to me by the High Commissioner of U.K., and I have gone through it. I am prepared to admit that he has not said so in so many words, and yet the implications are such that if one will read through it, one can easily interpret it in that way. I am also prepared to admit that fie had said something in his speech on communal harmony etc. It was a brief reference, but it is regrettable that the Security Council or the members, who took part in the discussions did not put the first questions first.

55

# COMMUNAL RIOTS IN PAKISTAN

At the moment when there were communal riots in Pakistan, when there was terrible communal frenzy and killings were taking place. it was the duty of the members of the Security Council to have considered that matter first, and how to bring about communal harmony and communal peace in Pakistan and in Calcutta or some other areas where communal trouble broke out in our country.

As I said, the Security Council did not pay any attention to that, and instead of giving high priority to that question, they started discussing Kashmir.

I might add with your permission that my feeling is that the discussion in the Security Council on the Kashmir question led to or considerably increased the bitterness in Pakistan and in our country. Instead of, as I said, keeping peace in both the countries, the discussions in the Security Council have led to further troubles; it might be that some countries might be interested, or I would not say, some, but at least Pakistan has really no case in regard to Kashmir.

If some trouble is created in India or in some form in Pakistan, it may lead to repercussions which might go against the stand of India. In their judgment, the Security Council considered or thought it proper to consider this matter, but. however, it has now ended. Ended in the sense that at least for the time being it has ended. One does not know; Pakistan might like to raise it again. However, for the time being, the Security Council has adjourned, and I think that the Security Council has ultimately taken the right decision. The Security Council has to consider, whenever it wants to consider the matter; whether they will do or not, the best thing for them would be not to do so, because in this matter it is only direct talks which can help in evolving something which would bring about some kind of settlement. But nothing can come in the way of or touch our sovereignty or our full rights over these territories and areas.

# PAKISTAN'S AGGRESSION IN KASHMIR

However, I want to add that two facts must be considered by the members of the Security Council. While they discuss about plebiscite etc., they are apt to forget that the Security Council itself had declared Pakistan as aggressor, and when the Security Council itself had accepted Pakistan as aggressor, it should first ask Pakistan to vacate the occupied territories. Unfortunately, they do not do it; and perhaps they do not think of it at all: and On the other hand. ask us to hold a plebiscite.

Plebiscite and vacation, in a sense, go together, and if there is going to be no vacation, the question of plebiscite should never arise. If the matter is discussed or considered in this context, I have no doubt the Security Council will be able to arrive at a correct decision.

As I said just now, it does not mean that we are not prepared to meet and discuss. But we certainly do not want any kind of intervention from outside. We want to make a sincere effort, if possible, if Pakistan agrees, to solve our dispute or the problem concerning Kashmir. But the success of it more or less depends on direct talks and discussions.

#### CHINESE AGGRESSION

As I said just now, it does not mean that we aggression on our borders has not been vacated. An hon. Member said that the emergency should not become, more or less, a normal affair. I agree that there is a stalemate, and no progress had been made since the Colombo Proposals were put-up. As the House will remember, China had agreed to the Colombo Proposals--in fact, a statement was made at that time that China had accepted them without any reservations. It is quite clear that they have gone back on their assurances and have almost negatived the Colombo Proposals in action.

The position remains the same. I know some of us get impatient. But, that would be diplomatically wrong. India has taken a moral stand, and we should stick to it. If the House will allow me to do so. I might put it to the House or to hon. Members a major question : whether we want war or peace I know how strongly we feel against the Chinese aggression.

Every young man and woman in this country was touched to the quick and spoke with one voice to resist the Chinese aggression. This spirit is still there., and should be there. However, I feel that in human affairs, one cannot always take a completely rigid and fixed view. The point is, is there any other alternative to violent conflict?

Our Prime Minister has already talked of referring the matter to the International Court. He had also suggested that the matter could be referred to arbitration. The House will remember that both the Houses had Approved of these when the Prime Minister had made those suggestions. If we think only in terms of war, then there is hardly much point in making these suggestions. I know the House will generally agree that India will always like to avoid any kind of conflagration, any kind of step which would lead to a major conflict. Therefore, I say that the door for discussion and negotiations

#### 56

should never be closed. But no one in this country, and especially those in power, can conceive of any kind of negotiation's or discussions which will not be in consonance with the dignity and honour of our country.

What I wanted to suggest was only this, that there is no point in leaving these things in suspense for a tong time, whether it is Pakistan or China. If it hangs fire for a Ion- time to come, it does not serve the interest of either one country or the other.

I have merely put it to the House. I only want that the House might give thought to it. We have to take a realistic and practical view of things. But as I said, it is an exceedingly delicate and difficult matter. It is not for me. to make any suggestion. But if Parliament wants that a major conflict or war etc. has to be avoided, it might give thought to the alternative aspect of the matter or to the other side of the picture.

# CHINESE BUILD-UP ON BORDER

As regards the attitude of China, of course, they say so many things. But the way they have been behaving creates suspicion and doubts in our minds. The kind of build-up they have made on our borders is full of dangers. Therefore, when I say this, I do not forget the fact that our country has to build up its defence strength. We are faced with an enemy which is a very mighty military power today. It is armed to the teeth. So India must build up her effective strength. We must become militarily strong so that if any critical situation arises, we can meet them on our frontiers, we can meet them in the battlefield, and meet them successfully.

This process is, no doubt, a slow process. Of course, we are in the thick of it. The defence department and the Government of India as a whole is doing its best to build up our defence strength. But one could not suggest that it could be achieved in about a year's time or so. Of course, we Are making progress every day. The point is that we have to go ahead with our work vigorously. And yet, we will have to show some patience.

An hon. Member suggested that the entergency may not become a normal affair of the people. of our country. We do not want to do it, and it should not be the attitude of our people if things take time. However, we must realise the fact that these preparations have to proceed steadily and we should try to reach a certain target as early as possible. For example, it is not in the case of our country alone that China has behaved in this manner. Even with Russia, the Chinese have claimed quite a bit of their territory on the frontiers between Russia and China.

After the establishment of the People's Republic of China, Russia had withdrawn its border guards and forces along the long frontier with China, and yet, as a Russian statement pointed out, there have been no fewer than 5,000 border violations by China. Sometimes during the question hour, questions are asked here about our frontier troubles, border troubles between Pakistan and India. This is not something new to our country. I was surprised to read that there had been no less than 5,000 border violations by China on the Russian frontiers (interruption).

# ROLL OF CHINA

I was merely referring to the role of China. The point is this. The House has to appreciate that-aspect of the problem, what kind of Attitude China has. I was merely referring to that, and pointing out that if they could-do this in the case of a friendly country like Russia, a powerful country, they could do the, same or much worse things with others. I am not suggesting that we have to adopt a, particular attitude, or Russia's attitude. That is a different matter. There is no comparison between the military strength of Russia and that of India. A country which is strong can put up with it....

# COMMUNAL RIOTS IN EAST PAKISTAN

I shall now refer to another matter, and it is about the communal riots in East Pakistan. Much has been said in this House in regard to these riots, and I do not want to cover the same ground again. However, during this period, even during the last week or ten days, we wrote to our Deputy Commissioner to take up the matter further with the Pakistan Government.

We wanted that some of our officers there should be allowed to visit the riot-affected areas and meet the minority community there. We said we were prepared to give the same freedom, we would give permission to their officers in India to go round and see things for themselves. But in spite of that suggestion, the Pakistan Government has totally refused it. They have said that they are not in favour of our officers going round the affected areas.

#### COMMENTS IN PAKISTAN PRESS

I do not want to say much myself, but I would like, with your permission, to quote sonic of the comments made in the Pakistani newspapers on what happened in Fast Pakistan.

# 57 Ittefaq, Dacca; writes : "Pakistan's Image Tarnished" and says :

"Any decent citizen of Pakistan would be saddened and ashamed by these incidents. It is natural that there should be concern among the Pakistani people over theft of the Holy Prophet's relic in Hazratbal. But those who have created internal discontent, disorder and riots on the pretext of this incident, are not motivated by religion, nor are they well-wishers of Pakistan."

Sangbad, another paper, published an item entitled "Communal Elements Must be Checked", and criticised "reactionary circles" for inciting communal passions over the Hazratbal incident resulting in the Khulna riots. It says :

"The reactionaries did not feel pangs of conscience in using this terrible weapon in their own interests. The Hazratbal incident is deplorable. It has naturally upset the simple religious-minded people in both countries."

"But we feel even more upset over the manner in which some well-known elements are inciting communalism by raising the slogan that Islam and Muslims are in danger."

The Pakistan Observer, Dacca, in an item entitled "Enemies of Peace" says that while condemning the undesirable repercussions already seen here "We strongly condemn what has happened in Khulna. We condemn violence as a means of reprisal". The Morning News, Dacca, dated January 12 in an item entitled "Editors Appeal for Peace" referred to a joint statement issued in Dacca on January 11 by seven newspaper editors, said :

"The recent happenings in which human lives were lost due to frenzy and recourse to violent methods by some rowdy elements in Khulna have shocked and horrified us."

The fact that the. disturbances in Calcutta and the adjoining areas in West Bengal were the

direct reaction to the communal riots in Khulna and its adjoining areas, has been admitted in an article in the Bengali daily Ittefaq, Dacca, which said :

What we feared has happened. Communal riots have flared up in some parts of Calcutta as a reaction to the recent communal disorders in Khulna...The West Bengal Government has taken strong measures to control the situation. Besides the police, it has called in the Army. Disorderly crowds have been fired upon."

The Pakistan Press continued to incite communal passions. I shall read one more quotation. This is what Pakistan Observer said:

"It is to be regretted that some West Pakistan newspapers having some circulation in East Pakistan have been carrying inflammatory reports about Calcutta and West Bengal which are having an unfortunate effect on the passions of people here...."

Unfortunately, the Communications Minister of Pakistan had to say something entirely different; replying to some questions he said that the Indian press reports were exaggerating minor events. He was contradicting the Indian Press reports which suggested heavy losses of property and life in recent troubles in East Pakistan. Replying to questions, he said, the Indian Radio and Press reports were exaggerating the minor events. These rumours were far from truth, he is reported to have said. This is how communal frenzy was fanned up. I must pay my compliments to the editors and writers in these newspapers who have taken such a balanced and truthful view but the politicians there, one of their Ministers, had to paint a different picture altogether.

There is a good deal of suppression of news also and I will not myself say anything on this but here is an extract from the Times, London, dated 14th February, 1964.

"The Pakistani Press has at all times been much the more inflammatory of the two." The Baltimore Sun of January 22nd, in an item datelines, Karachi Pakistan, January 14 entitled "Pakistani Censors Hit" quotes from Pakistan weekly Outlook said :

"This clamour for secrecy is nothing but a bureaucratic contraption. For one thing the world press cannot be bamboozled or bought over like the Press in Pakistan. The home press has been tamed and maimed... Foreign correspondents have had their mail censored. travel restricted and queries to officials left unanswered."

I shall merely quote the headlines in New York Times, Washington January 23rd : "Suppression of news by Government from Dacca-Plight of foreign correspondents-How Rayerbazaar was ransacked and minority community wiped out."

There are the comments of Pakistan newspapers and foreign newspapers speaking the truth and I do not know if my hon. friend Mr. Badrudduja had cared to go through these comments. He should see and then decide whether he could put India and Pakistan at par; in fact he wants to put them on the same level. (interruption)

#### 58

#### SITUATION IN JAMMU AND KASHMIR

The question of the relic has been satisfactorily solved. Some minor off-shoots are there and I am sure there will be no special difficulty in considering them. It is true that the political problems concerning Kashmir have also to be carefully considered. Many things have been said here. I do not want to indulge in recriminations or find faults with others. We must act constructively and discuss all matters with different sections of the people in Jammu and Kashmir.

I am going there tomorrow and I have every desire to carry as far as possible everyone with me. It is important that the people in Jammu and Kashmir should be fully satisfied that they are being served satisfactorily and that they are being governed by those who are their truly elected representatives.

There are certain procedures to be followed in a democratic set-up and ultimately the will of the people will prevail. I have every hope that I shall get the fullest co-operation of all who are closely concerned with this matter. I may have to discuss with the Premier of Jammu and Kashmir and his other colleagues also.

I may, however, add that if there are some elements who want to create trouble in Jammu and Kashmir, they will have to be dealt with properly if they do not see reason. I need not have said it but I am surprised over sonic of the speeches and certain steps which have been proposed by some members of the Action Committee. When I went to Kashmir I gladly met the members of that committee, thrice and went far to meet their reasonable wishes and demands. But anyhow, in spite of all that has been done, if certain members of the Action Committee function in a way which will help any foreign country, no Government will ever like to tolerate it. I have been indeed pained that some of the members of the Action Committee have been --they may not be members of the Action Committee but at least in the meetings which are addressed by members of the Action Committee --raising most objectionable slogans. There may be some pro-Pakistan elements there, they may be agent provocateurs. But anyhow it has to be stopped. It is their responsibility and you cannot allow it in any part of the country, much less in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. However, I do not want to make any premature statement. As I said, I shall go there and try to do my best.

# WORLD SITUATION

I want the good wishes of all the bon. Members of this House. I can perhaps say with sonic confidence that humanity as a whole feels relieved over the lessening of tension in the world although there is a climate of cold war in some parts and signs of conflict and actual clash taking place in others.

The attitude and policies of the two great powers have helped in creating a new climate and the real contribution in this regard has been made by the late President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. Both have attained high positions in the world today and it was a very bold and courageous action on the part of the late President Kennedy to have differed with his other colleagues or with certain sections of the people in the United States; in fact, he took the initiative and extended the hand of friendship to the Soviet Union. He held it out to the end of his life. His life was cut short so soon and so suddenly. He is no longer there, but his successor, President Johnson, I am glad, has assured that he will follow in the footsteps of President Kennedy.

# DISARMAMENT

The recent disarmament proposals by Prime Minister Khrushchev are also to be welcomed. He has made out an important point in his proposals. He has said that the border disputes or the problems of territories on the borders between two different countries should not be settled by violent clashes and conflicts but they should be discussed and as far as possible agreement should be arrived at through negotiations. It applies to every country; it applies to us also. Therefore, the Government of India has welcomed the statement as a whole. I think that these proposals deserve the earnest consideration of all the countries in the world.

I have dealt with some of the external affairs matters, but there is no doubt that national strength is essential if we really want to become internationally strong. Two things in this connection are important for making the country strong. One of course is, economic changes with socialism as our goal.

I know that we are faced with a difficult economic situation at the present moment. But we have to pursue our objective and it is equally important that there should be unity and integrity within the country.

I do hope that we will take these factors into consideration, both national and international. In fact, they are closely inter-connected, and I must pay my humble tribute to the Prime Minister who has been a symbol of unity and who has always stood for economic changes in the country. It is the obligation of each and every citizen of the country, and more so of ours in the Government, to fulfil the great objectives he has placed before the country and thus make it self-reliant and strong.

# USA UNITED KINGDOM PAKISTAN INDIA SRI LANKA CHINA OMAN RUSSIA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU

Date : Feb 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

# INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Foreign Affairs

Intervening in the debate in Rajya Sabha on the Address of the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Minister without Portfolio, made the following Statement on February 20, 1964 :

Madam Deputy Chairman, without giving preface or a preamble to my speech, I might, with your permission, refer immediately to the discussions in the Security Council. I know we were rather anxiously awaiting the result of the meeting of the Security Council and I might as well refer or quote the purpose for which the meeting of the Security Council was summoned. I shall not read the whole of the request but briefly it said that "an immediate meeting of the Security Council should be held to consider the grave turn the situation in Jammu and Kashmir has taken and the danger it poses to the peace in the region." So it was mainly on the basis of the situation in Jammu and Kashmir that Pakistan insisted that this matter should be considered by the Security Council immediately.

# KASHMIR DEBATE IN SECURITY COUNCIL

As the House is aware, the Government of India were wholly opposed to the consideration of this matter in the Security Council, especially at the present moment. The situation was bad enough, more so in East Pakistan and also in Calcutta in our country and it was most important that the communal situation in both the countries was handled first. It was our duty to see to it that communal harmony prevailed and minorities in both the countries lived in amity and peace.

Unfortunately, Pakistan thought otherwise and instead of taking effective action-which perhaps they did much later--they took a pretty long time to deal with the situation effectively. They did it at a much later stage and in the meanwhile killings took place on a big scale; arson and loot also. And it is unfortunate that seasoned politicians and countries which have enough experience of our affairs should have lent their support to the holding of this meeting.

I know both the U.K. and the U.S.A. were not entirely in favour of holding this meeting and we are told that they dissuaded Pakistan not to summon the meeting of the Security Council. But in spite of what they did, the U.K. representative took a special and keen interest in the debates in the Security Council. Ivory Coast and Morocco also spoke but, as I said, the U.K. representative should have known the position better and the speech which he delivered has naturally caused much resentment in our country. I have gone through his full speech and I shall not say that Sir Patrick Dean denied the legal accession of Kashmir to India. He did not say that actually, but what he said could be interpreted, more or less, in the same way.

He said the legal accession was not so important. To have said that was to my mind wrong, because it created an erroneous impression in the minds of our people in this country. Sir Patrick had very little to say about Pakistan. He did say much about us, but he did not realise what the attitude of Pakistan has been throughout the last few years vis-a-vis India. We have tried our level best to keep peace with Pakistan A number of times our Prime Minister has publicly said that we will never go to war with Pakistan. Even when the last negotiations took place, even during the duration of the meetings between the two delegations, Pakistan took steps which were highly provocative.

The House fully remembers the way in which Pakistan entered into some kind of agreement with China. And when was it done? It was when our country was faced with a deep crisis and one of the most difficult situations that we had to face. There was aggression by China on our country. When high dignitaries from both the countries, the United Kingdom and the United States. came to India, they pressed us to start some kind of talk with Pakistan. It was difficult for the country to swallow that. especially in that context. Yet, the Government of India, under the leadership of our Prime Minister, took a bold step and very courageously decided that we would send a team with one of our Ministers to have a discussion with Pakistan.

I do not want to relate the old story, but in their very first visit, suddenly this agreement between China and Pakistan was announced. Naturally it came as a great shock to Sardar Swaran Singh, who was leading the delegation. He, of course, consulted the Government of India. In spite of that provocation, we decided to continue the discussions. The discussions were held and they broke down. Of course, I have no doubt that the whole House will agree that it was only because of the intransigent attitude of Pakistan. They wanted to discuss nothing else but Kashmir. Our

# 60

delegation did discuss Kashmir and mostly Kashmir. What was their demand? Almost they wanted that Jammu and Kashmir not only the valley, part of Kathua and some sub-divisions might be left out-the whole of it should be presented to them on a silver plate. This was the attitude which Pakistan took up. In the circumstances, it was not found possible to carry on the discussion because it would have resulted in nothing.

This has been our effort and recently, as I said, we have been trying to maintain peace and communal harmony in our country. We have had difficult situations. We have had communal riots. The Government of India and the State Governments have done their best to take effective action. No one feels more pained and hurt than our Prime Minister

when there is any kind of harassment caused to the minority community in our country. Yet what has happened in East Pakistan is something which is unimaginable.

## HAZRATBAL INCIDENT PLAYED UP

I do not want to quote what the Pakistan newspapers themselves have said in regard to the happenings in East Pakistan. There are a number of telling editorial comments which have appeared in Pakistan newspapers, English and Urdu. I am sorry I have not got them here. They themselves have said that there was constant propaganda and exploitation of the Hazratbal incident in West Pakistan and East Pakistan, especially in East Pakistan. The kind of propaganda which was made by the newspapers and the Radio did create an impact on the Muslim community that Muslims were being killed and being victimised in this country. What was the fact? As I said, the Hazratbal incident was played up.

As the House is aware, what actually happened in the Hazratbal incident? It is highly regrettable that the relic should have been lost. There may be some elements. I do not know who they were. Some of the names have been mentioned. But every section, every community in Jammu and Kashmir highly regretted this incident, in spite of Azad Pakistan radio broadcasts. They tried that there should be some kind of conflict and clash between Hindus and Muslims. They tried all the time to give it a communal colour. Yet, we must pay our compliments and, if I might say so, homage also to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, Hindus and Muslims, who refused to believe that the loss of the relic had anything to do with the Hindu community in the valley. As I said, complete communal harmony, perfect peace and peaceful demonstrations are there. Now Pakistan has said that all demonstrations were made against the Government of India, which is palpably false.

There was no conflict between the Jammu and Kashmir Government and the people there, in so far as the importance and the urgency of the discovery of the relic were concerned, and they decided that we should employ our best agency to deal with this matter, and there was a desire expressed that the Intelligence Department of the Government of India should give a helping hand. It was on their wishes that our officers went there, some of our administrative officers, because one did not know what turn it might take because of the wrong kind of propaganda that was being carried on all the time across the border. So our officers went there.

There was hardly any question of taking over the Jammu and Kashmir Government. I do not know, perhaps Pakistan would have welcomed it so that it might get an opportunity to say that the Government of, India had taken over the Jammu and Kashmir State completely, taken over the rule of the State. The suggestion that the Government of India tried to shape things as they liked in Jammu and Kashmir or that there was a revolution or a severe or serious agitation against the Government of India is, as I said, beyond the mark. There is no truth in it and the Government of India tried to help them as they did in West Bengal. Pakistan and some friends of Pakistan might say that we did it as we wanted to take over West Bengal also.

In West Bengal the situation grew worse, and it was but natural that the Chief Minister should have asked for help from the Government of India, from the Army. Similarly there was a situation in which the Jammu and Kashmir Government felt that they needed our help, the help of the Government of India, and we gave it to them.

All the time throughout this period and today it is the Jammu and Kashmir Government which is running the whole administration. So, the purpose of summoning a meeting of the Security Council was basically wrong. To suggest that an immediate meeting should take place to consider the so-called grave turn the situation has taken in Jammu and Kashmir and the danger it poses to the people in the region is wrong. There is no danger at all and there is no grave situation in Jammu and Kashmir. Of course there are certain internal matters with which we will have to deal, and I shall say a few words about that later.

I referred to all this in the context of Sir Patrick Dean's speech. I was telling the House, how experienced politicians like, Sir Patrick

## 61

Dean had gone the wrong way. As I said, I can understand some other countries doing that, but to have raised this matter in the Security Council in the way he did has created a very wrong impression in our minds.

In fact there have been demands both in this House and in the other House that we might as well consider serving our relations or getting out of the Commonwealth. Well, we cannot act in a huff. These are matters which have to be tackled at the diplomatic level (interruption).

I do not want to repeat what I have said in the other House. I had exactly said the same thing. I know their feelings. A delegation of the members of the British Labour Party came to India some time back and I had a long talk with them, and I know how they feel about this question. They have an entirely different approach.

You might have read in the papers that when the same delegation visited Pakistan after visiting India, there were comments that these people were pro-India and that they did not appreciate the difficulties of Pakistan. So, it is not the United Kingdom as a whole that adopts this attitude and we should not look at it that way.

## BRITISH SUPPORT TO PAKISTAN

There are two reasons on account of which perhaps the United Kingdom tries to lend its support to Pakistan. There are two reasons. One is the membership of SEATO. The United Kingdom and Pakistan are both there and they have entered into a military alliance. It is not possible therefore sometimes for the United Kingdom to take a dispassionate view of things. They must help their allies and they must lend their support to them. The other reason I had referred to was the ruling party there at present. The Government there still has not been able to act rid of the old complex, of the old British days when they ruled in India. That complex, is, they wanted to rule and govern the country and they had always believed in the policy of

divide and rule. Unfortunately when they went away, they implemented the policy fully the divide-and-rule policy, and we have two countries now.

It is not possible to know-they are of course secular in their approach, there is no doubt about that--but so far as India is concerned somehow they think only in terms of Hindus and Muslims. In regard to Jammu and Kashmir also they feel : "What is the problem there? Divide the territory and the Muslim majority area should go to a particular State and the Hindu majority area should go to the other State." (interruption).

The solution is not so easy. I was talking to two or three prominent Indian Muslims, to my Muslim friends, only the other day and they said that the entire Muslim community in India stood for the accession of Jammu and Kashmir with India. They said that they were not prepared to accept it for a moment that there was still some integration left to be implemented. The accession is complete and it is final. As I said, there are certain internal matters. In the Security Council, as I said, these discussions did exhibit ignorance on the part of many of the members who should have understood it much better.

Now, about the decision of the Security Council, 1, must say that they have done the right thing. One is not quite clear; yet, the adjournment of the Security Council was quite appropriate, and I think the members of the Security Council will, in calmer moments, give further thought to the various aspects of this problem. If there has to be a settlement over the disputes between India and Pakistan, it will have to be done through direct talks and discussions.

We have always suggested that we want discussions on all matters pending, not excluding Kashmir. But unfortunately, Pakistan takes the other view. They are prepared to discuss only Kashmir and no other matter. I do not think that even if we find a solution to the satisfaction of Pakistan, there will be complete peace; other matters will be raised after that, later on, and it is therefore that our Prime Minister has been suggesting that it would be better to discuss all the matters together. And there may be minor matters, there may be bigger matters, and there may be this major question of Kashmir. Let us discuss all of them together and try to find a solution. But any kind of intervention from outside creates hurdles and difficulties.

An hon. Member : What about the suggestion made about mediation ?

Minister: Well, in the Security Council, of course, during the talks and discussions, and even in the speeches, some kind of a reference was made.

I know the views of the hon. Member in regard to that particular problem, but I say this. We will most sincerely try to come to a settlement over various matters. Our efforts should be sincere. Maybe, I do not claim that we have done everything rightly. Yet, only direct talks and discussions will really help.

### 62

We still stick to it and we hope that Pakistan will also try to reconsider its attitude.

## CHINESE AGGRESSION

The question of the Chinese aggression is another difficult and complicated matter and I know how strongly we feel over the aggression which took place and about the way in which China behaved towards India. Well, something better was expected of China. In the beginning we said that because we were friends. Now, we are all disillusioned. We know how China functions, how its mind works, and China definitely says one thing and does something else.

There is a stalemate there at present. The Colombo Proposals are there and it is a glaring example of how China works. It was clearly said. The Colombo Proposals were taken to China first and discussed with Mr. Chou Enlai first and they said in fact, it was- said and it had appeared in the newspapers that they had accepted the Colombo Proposals; in, fact, the words "without any reservation" were also mentioned. And now, the Colombo Proposals are still hanging in the balance, and nothing has happened so far. In fact, as I said before, China has negatived the proposals in action. We still feel that if the Colombo Proposals are accepted, India would be willing to take further steps in the terms of her discussion with the Colombo Powers who had come here.

I may not be quite correct, but I feel that these matters should be settled, or an effort should be made at least to bring to an end the present deadlock, if possible early, because it does not pay to any country. About Pakistan, this thing is hanging on for a long time. The Chinese aggression is also there since long. However, it is not in our hands; it is not only in the hands of India to settle these problems, it is in the hands of the other party.

## DEFENCE PREPARATIONS

However, we have to make our preparations, we have to build up our strength, the defence strength, whether it is the Army or the Air Force or even the Navy. They have all to be built up and developed so that the country and our defence forces really become strong enough to face the Chinese, if such a situation arises.

The preparation in itself takes a long time. I mean, we may be critical and sometimes it is possible that the Government work may also not be up to the mark. There might be delays, there might be bottle-necks. But for that the Government should be prepared to rectify its mistakes, its shortcomings. But by and large, we have to realise that the kind of preparation we want to make might take a long time; whether it is technical personnel, training or the manufacture of arms and ammunition in all these things we have sometimes to take the help of others and we have to produce many of the things in our own country.

We have to put up our own industries, our factories. All these things are being done and no one will disagree that these things will take time. And yet, there should be no complacency. There is the emergency; I know that the old feelings do not continue and they cannot continue always but those who are in the midst of work, who are in the midst of preparations', they have to continue it with the same spirit, whether they are Ministers or whether they are others. But mostly for those who are working in the fields and factories, it is essential that they feel what their responsibilities are.

So, we must know, as I said, we should accept the fact that the emergency is there and that we have to build up our strength. However, the point for us to consider sometimes is this. The Prime Minister had suggested once that the matter could be referred to the International Court at The Hague. Later on, he suggested that the matter could even be referred to arbitration. These are peaceful methods; India has pursued these methods, and it is difficult for me to say as to what should be our definite attitude or definite policy.

However, it is clear that if we can avoid a major conflict or a major clash, we should do so, and it is obvious that we cannot do anything else; we cannot enter into any kind of agreement which would not be in consonance with the dignity and honour of our country. That is the basic fact, and keeping that basic fact in mind efforts are to be made to resolve these complexities.

Well, without giving any explicit view on the matter, I think it would be in the fitness of things if the hon. Members of this House give thought to this problem, to this aspect of it and at an appropriate time give their advice and lead to the Government.

## RUSSIA AND USA

In this connection I must pay my compliments to the two great men in the world--I am referring to late President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev and in that connection to the policies that both the countries were pursuing before they came to power. The House remembers what the attitude of the U.S. Government was before President Kennedy took over, and what the attitude of the Russian Government was before Mr. Khrushchev took over.

## 63

During the Stalin regime Russia was a closed book; generally the word used in those days was that there was an iron curtain there; you could see nothing; you could know nothing. But Premier Khrushchev almost created a revolution, and now Russia is open to us, to others, to go there, to visit their country, to visit their factories, to send for their technicians here, to get into collaboration with them, to enter into trade and commerce and expand our trade and commerce with them.

Similarly you remember the policy pursued in the United States by the late Mr. Dulles, which was anti-Communist: no one will have anything to do with Communism; it was almost impossible to talk of Communism or negotiate with Russia. In the same manner no one could talk of those who lived in Russia, no one could talk to the Premier or the Prime Minister of Russia. It was almost considered a sacrilege. But in the United States it was President Kennedy who, in spite of the differences he had to face in his own country, extended-it was he who extended his hand of friendship to Soviet Russia, and with difficulties in between --which may often happen-President Kennedy continued that attitude till the end of his life. Of course I need not refer to that, but at least for a man like me, the death of President Kennedy is not an ordinary death; it has made a deep and lasting impact on my mind and, I think, on the minds of those who had been associated with Gandhiji in political work even for some time; I mean, it is more or less the same kind of martyrdom as that of Gandhiji.

Gandhiji may have been a man of a different stature pursuing a different objective and yet the courage of conviction there was with President Kennedy, and for a man to die so courageously for the views he holds is something which raises the stature and prestige of humanity as a whole. So it was in that context I cited these two gentlemen.

Now President Kennedy has gone, and Premier Khrushchev has, in the same context, come up with proposals of disarmament, and one of the important points which are mentioned in those proposals is that in regard to border disputes, in regard to territorial disputes, violence or force should never be used, that these disputes should be discussed amicably, should be discussed round a table and effort should be made to come to an agreement. But if there is no agreement, even then, as far as possible, no violence should be threatened, no violence should be used.

To my mind it is a most welcome proposal. It is easy for a strong country to attack the other country, a smaller country, and take over certain areas or certain territories. There are disputes going on in a number of countries, whether it is Laos or South Viet-Nam or Malaysia; in many countries there are clashes and conflicts, and if the bigger powers intervene, and because of the strength of their brute force take over certain areas and territories, well, they can certainly do so, but it would be monstrous; it would mean that the weaker or the smaller countries could not co-exist side by side with the bigger countries or stronger countries. Therefore, this proposal of Premier Khrushchev is most welcome, and I think our Prime Minister and the Government of India have lent their general support to the proposal made by Premier Khrushchev, and I hope the other countries of the world will also give their earnest consideration to it.

An bon. Member: Madam, what should the smaller or weaker countries do when they are attacked by a big country? Should they keep quiet ?

Minister : They should not keep quiet; they should resist to the fullest extent. But it is possible that, if these proposals were agreed to, there may be countries, friendly countries, or there may be some agency which will come to the help of the smaller countries and the weaker countries. Then the problem will have to be considered, those attacks will have to be considered in the context of the world situation.

## RELATIONS WITH AFRICAN COUNTRIES

Some points were mentioned about Zanzibar and some other African countries. I shall only briefly refer to them. It is true that our relations with East African countries have been friendly, and we still have the same feelings and keep on the best of relations with them.

Sometimes it happens that in the wake of freedom, well, there are certain urges of the people and they come up to the surface, some-

times in a wrong way. But, however, we hope that both in Asia and Africa, those who have gone there from outside and have lived for generations will be allowed to live there and to carry on their avocations in peace. Of course, if there are individuals who do not behave, that is a different matter. But to make any kind of discrimination between one section of the citizens and the other would be rather unfortunate. I have no doubt that when normal conditions are restored, all those who will move on from India or other Asian countries to those places will get their due place in the social, political and economic life of those countries.

As regards Cyprus, trouble broke out in Cyprus, as you know, over the proposed amendment of the Constitution, which was pressed by the Greek Cypriots and opposed by

#### 64

the Turkish People living in Cyprus, and as the House is aware, the British troops went over there at the request of the Cyprus Government in order to restore law and order. The present question which is under consideration is some kind of a peace keeping force to be located or stationed in Cyprus. The matter has been under discussion between Great Britain, Cyprus, Turkey and Greece. Nothing has been, as far as I know, finally decided but we hope that there will be some kind of cease-fire or peace and these countries will be, able to come to an agreement.

Similarly, we know that there have been difficulties in Malaysia, Philippines and Indonesia. The latest report is that Malaysia and Philippines have more or less narrowed down their differences. It is not so in the case of Indonesia, but they are also discussing matters among themselves and we are informed that Thailand is taking keen interest and they have agreed to supervise the cease-fire between them but nothing is yet final.

## CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES

I might also say a few words in regard to the non-aligned conferences. As hon. Members know, it was decided between the U.A.R., Ceylon and Yugoslavia that a non-aligned conference might as well be held as early as possible. The House will recall that in the last Sessions of Parliament our Prime Minister fully supported the initiative and the Prime Minister of Ceylon and the President of the U.A.R., who took the initiative in the matter got a message from our Prime Minister in this regard.

The Prime Minister, in his letters to President Nasser, President Tito and Prime Minister Shrimati Bandaranaike welcomed the initiative to hold a conference of non-aligned countries and since then the Government of India has kept in touch with the countries concerned on further developments in connection with this joint initiative. It has always been the view of India that the initiative for calling the first preliminary meeting must rest with Ceylon, U.A.R. and Yugoslavia which had taken the initiative in announcing the need for this conference in joint communiques issued by them.

I might add that the recent press report emanating from Ceylon and referring to the visit of the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs to Cairo and Belgrade as an attempt on India's part to replace Ceylon in this triumvirate is without basis and quite wrong.

The Government of India hope that as a result of the initiative taken by the Prime Minister of Ceylon, President Nasser and President Tito, arrangements will be made soon for the holding of the conference of non-aligned countries this year.

I do not want to take more time of the House but there is no doubt that we will be internationally strong only when our nation is adequately strong to meet the internal and national problems.

## CHOU EN-LAI'S VISIT TO PAKISTAN

I know my other colleagues while replying to the debate will deal with those matters but there is one lurking fear in my mind and before I conclude, I might mention the visit of Premier Chou En-lai to Pakistan. He is in fact there at the present moment.

What is happening there one does not know but it has so coincided that it is just immediately after the Security Council meeting is over. Of course Mr. Bhutto, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, perhaps might rush to Pakistan or may have already gone there. They will be meeting there and both perhaps consider India to be their enemy and therefore they might hatch up something, one does not know.

I do wish that better counsel will prevail, but unfortunately the kind of propaganda and broadcasts being made from across our borders are frightening and one does not know what might happen. So we need not take an alarmist view and we need not feel nervous; yet the country has to be watchful and be strong enough to meet any situation as it arises.

65

USA PAKISTAN INDIA UNITED KINGDOM MOROCCO CHINA ANGUILLA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SRI LANKA RUSSIA LAOS MALAYSIA CYPRUS GREECE PHILIPPINES INDONESIA THAILAND YUGOSLAVIA EGYPT

**Date** : Feb 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

# PAKISTAN

Home Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Communal Disturbances in East Pakistan

Replying to the debate on the motion regarding communal disturbances in East Pakistan resulting in heavy loss of life and property of the members of minority community and their influx to India and consequential disturbances in West Bengal, Shri G. L. Nanda, Union Home Minister, said in the Lok Sabha on February 13, 1964:

I may reiterate my deep realisation of the gravity of the situation and the issues which emerge from it. May I confess, as I said last evening, that I feel a sense of awe--I feel awed -by the immensity of the problems, their urgency also and their baffling character. There are many questions, inter-related, complex questions, and I believe that in those questions is wrapped, in considerable measure, the destiny of this country. This tangled skin has to be unravelled some day; I hope it will be soon. On how it is done will, I believe, rest to a considerable extent, the future of India, and to an extent also the course of world events. Therefore, when we deal with these questions-say something about them, make our suggestions, take a particular line-we have to be aware of this, that the course we take will deeply affect our position, externally and internally-our economic progress, our political structure, all these things.

I made a statement yesterday. In that statement I have given a very frank, straight presentation of the facts relating to the situation. I am conscious of the fact that the speeches which were made, for the most part, were also based on an objective view of the facts of the situation and their implications. It was clear that the Members realised also that these things were a matter of deep national concern. We take these matters in that sense. I am glad that without any exception, all the Members of the House, shared that concern.

Very large national interests are involved, and therefore no lesser interest should be allowed to creep in, to conic in the way, and I feel again and state my appreciation of the course of discussion in the House, that this was also the approach of the Members. Their advice as the nation's representatives will be very useful to us.

What is the main question ? The question is of minorities here and in the other country, in India and in Pakistan. If it were just that simple question, possibly we would not have been faced with the awful developments, which, somehow, keep on occurring because it is mixed up with other things, other aspects, other considerations, other motives, and that is what brings about the trouble.

Our approach is very clear and straightforward. We have a certain view of our responsibilities of our minorities. There are several minorities in this country, in small and large numbers, but we regard them all as part of the same national structure. They are a part of us, all of us are one in the unity of the nation and integrity. I want to emphasize that. And whatever the numbers, there should not be any handicap for a minority. Therefore, provisions have been made and sought to be made that weaker sections will be given special consideration. So, it is not a question of treating them differently in a way which will be to their prejudice. Their rights, their privileges, are all the same--culturally, economically, politically, in every way. They are indistinguishable from the rest of the mass of the nation. That is our stand, and we want to maintain that.

I am aware of the fact that there has been religious strife in this country, and this virus has been handed down to us from the past. All of us know that recently another thing happened, namely the partition, which has left its scars. It cannot be effaced completely immediately, and the consequences are still haunting us, but on our side there is the greatest effort, endeavour, to see that all that taint of communalism is wiped out completely. This has been our effort all along, and will be so.

The question of religion, somehow, is imported into these things. I have deep appreciation of religious life, but I am also very emphatic that while there should be no encroachment on any religion, there should be no fanaticism, there should be no politics introduced into religion, and because the question of the national structure is involved, nothing should be done which will affect its stability. I am aware of the fact that there are individuals in various communities who, possibly, may not come up 100 per cent to these standards of patriotism. There may be small groups also. If it is a Muslim whose heart is not wholly with us, I will tell him that he betrays his community and

### 66

the nation. He is doing no good to his community. Similarly if there is a Hindu who by anything he does, word or speech or the influence that he produces, creates tensions in this country, whatever may be the provocation for him, he is an enemy of the country, of the majority community also. Because, if disorders occurring in this country are not checked, quelled and eliminated, what happens? It is our duty to see that they are put down.

Today, it may be communal disorder between one community and another. Tomorrow it will be one caste and another or on economic and political issues. Where is the end? Therefore, we will not tolerate such disorders. If we did, it will be the break-down of the nation. We cannot afford it, whatever may be the provocations from any side. No reason can be strong and good enough to put up with any communal hatred spreading and leading to disturbances and exposing life and property of anybody in this country. Our officers know this. At the least sign of trouble they have to act strongly and if they do not do so quickly and strongly, they pay for it. There will be more destruction, more loss of life.

In the course of speeches there was some mention here of some people who by their attitude or action create trouble for us. I have already mentioned about our own countrymen. Then there are people from other countries. We have a generous attitude towards them. Now, there are Pakistani nationals going about here; they take up various employments and pursue their avocations. Actually nobody knows if he is a Pakistani or Indian; that is how we are going on. But they provoke trouble in this country sometimes and certainly we have to deal with them. For instance, in Calcutta some persons are employed in Port Trust and I was told that some of them signed some kind of application or some affirmation saying : "we are not secure here" and they resigned. Let them resign and go.

I said yesterday when we started this motion, that I rose with a heavy heart because at that time I felt depressed. Apart from the information and reports which I have to read, hour to hour, about happenings across the border, there were those harrowing experiences narrated here about what the minority in East Pakistan has to go through. I really felt very sad. The speeches of the hon. Members gave me a great deal of encouragement. One thing which arose much prominently in the course of the speeches was the insistence and the emphasis of the Members on the integrity of the nation. I mean in the sense that we all feel our full responsibility towards the minority in this country. It was stressed again and again that whatever may be the provocation, that is not going to affect in the least degree our determination to protect the minority and give them full security. That was very encouraging and I feel very glad that that has happened. This is the nation's pledge to the minorities and this will be observed.

Then, may I also refer to another experience of the same kind? When I, was in Calcutta, I had met some representatives of various partics there. Shri N. C. Chatterjee does not seem to he present here. He led them; he came on behalf of about more than a dozen parties. Their representatives were there. They had passed a resolution and each one of them spoke and each one of them prefaced his remarks with this : that while we are going to ask for certain measures for the help of the minority community in East Pakistan, we are, all of us-and that included, I believe, the Jan Sangh also, and I mention "also" because there was something else said about the Jan Sangh to which I shall refer immediately-are bound to see that the Muslims in India are fully protected; that is, all of them expressed themselves that whatever report or news comes about the atrocities perpetrated on the Hindus in East Pakistan, we have said that there can never be, in any sense, in the remotest sense, any kind of justification for any tension being created in our country which might have any consequences to the detriment of the minority community in India. They said that.

Then the question was raised about the Jan Sangh in the meeting which 1, had with them, with all the party representatives the next day. The previous meeting was on the same night when he reached there. It is true that the representative of the Jan Sangh said-he complained against me--"Why did I say that the life of every single Muslim is sacred and we will all go out to protect them, and why I did not say the Hindus also?" Certainly, every citizen (interruption). I said that also. I explained to him. It was part of what I had said. It was a part that was repeated. I mentioned that it is the entire responsibility of every member of the community, of every person in this country. But I referred specially again to the Muslims because that was the context there.

Then I explained that, and that was very clear to all these people present there. There was no kind of misgiving or misunderstanding about that.

I may also pay my thanks to the members of the Jan Sangh who were present. They had thought of a hartal the next day or later, but they withdrew that.

So, this is our approach. I have mentioned that. This is embodied also in that document

#### 67

or agreement which is styled as the Nehru-Liaquat Pact. On our side we are carrying it out completely and fully. It is not being carried out on the other side. It is being violated day after day.

Let us see what has happened in West Bengal. Did anything happen in West Bengal on the 3rd January? It was all quite peaceful there; absolute peace reigned in that State and in that city, but on the third January trouble started in Khulna and Jessore. It was not spontaneous. It was not as if there was some local cause, something which arose there inside that area. It was not that. All the trouble in that part of East Pakistan was induced by responsible people in Pakistan. The ostensible cause was some kind of a protest being staged there in relation to the Hazratbal incident. The Hazratbal incident till that day had not led to any kind of communal discord in Jammu and Kashmir. There was complete communal amity and harmony in Jammu and Kashmir. If there had to be any communal discord, it should have been there, but it was not there. Yet, the leaders of Pakistan and the Press in Pakistan exploited that in a blatant fashion for the purpose of inflaming communal passions. I do not under-rate the intelligence of the leaders of Pakistan. When they were making these speeches and their Press was writing all these glaring headlines, was it that they did not know what the consequences would be?

I may not go further and say that all this was deliberately done by them. It was there and the consequences were inevitable in the situation in which particularly the people are living in East Pakistan, where the minorities are exposed to risk from day to day. Was it that there was an ulterior design in all that May be. This was what the Press and the leaders there did.

But when the trouble started later on as a consequence of that in West Bengal, what did we do? How was our Press behaving? They were requested to take a sober line about both the happenings-about West Bengal and Calcutta and also about what was happening in East Pakistan-and give unvarnished accounts. They accepted the advice. So far as the facts about Calcutta and West Bengal are concerned, they were given in a bald fashion, the truth of it was there. There was no effort to minimise it. The figures of casualties were also given; usually it is not given. Figures of casualtieshow many Muslims and how many Indianswere also given. So far as what was happening in East Pakistan was concerned, the advice was to see that it does not immediately have any kind of provocative effect. There is no attempt to suppress anything. But sometimes it happens that when you break a news dealing with human beings, it is sometimes better not to do that in that sudden way, because immediately the effect may be very bad. So, the whole effort was that it might not create immediate consequences of an untoward nature. The idea was that headings, photographs and pictures should not be of a provocative kind. Most of the papers abided by that advice; some possibly did not do it.

What did Pakistan do? It chose this moment to go to the Security Council. It was not content with creating trouble here in East Pakistan and therefore in Calcutta. It went further. Our main insistence was just this : There may have been occasions in the past for going to the Security Council and there may be occasions in future also. But this was not the time to go there, because if all that is happening in East Pakistan we bring it out. We made all the arrangements throughout the country. We took precautions in all parts of the country. We alerted the States and the whole organisation of administrative set-up, the police and the security, so that nothing untoward may happen. We did all that. But still there were grave risks and we did not want to be exposed to

those risks of trouble being created and that leading to further reactions and repercussions. That was what we had in our mind. That was not heeded to.

Well, at any rate, I am glad that we have succeeded in keeping our country calm and restrained. No trouble has arisen here. That is the difference between Pakistan and India. Some hon. Member there said that some deaths have taken place here and some deaths have taken place there. But in respect of deaths also there is no comparison. The figures have been mounting up there. Of course, even the loss of a single life is very bad, it causes agony and distress. But you have to compare the figures also.

The main thing is the approach, the attitude in Pakistan. Why is it that the trouble spread from Khulna and Jessore to Dacca and Naravangani and then into the interior? We did not allow it to spread. That is where the test comes. Troubles can start, disturbances can start and something may be happening or simmering underground which we may not be able to deal with at once. But the question is, what happens afterwards. It takes two or three days to see that these troubles are quenched. But there it is allowed to spread. The other difference is in what the leaders do. What do our leaders do? What does our Government do? What do the representatives of public opinion do? How do they behave? What happens there? That is the contrast. Therefore,

## 68

let not any kind of wrong impression be created that communal troubles are there, here also and these are to be equated with the troubles there. They cannot be equated.

I would like to say something about the events in West Bengal-they were mentionedand more especially in Calcutta. One or two misstatements of fact I would like first to clear. There was some mention of the police having left Bengal and gone to Bhubaneswar. I was rather surprised to hear that. I have made enquiries. No such thing happened. There was no police taken from Bengal or anywhere to assist in the arrangements in Bhubaneswar. That did not happen. Then, Sir, the main question about West Bengal, which I feel I will have to deal with, is that an impression is being sought to be created that there was a complete break-down of the administrative apparatus. That was the charge that some bon. Members made. Then, also, it is linked up with my going there, with my visit to that place. Various interpretations were put on that. I shall state my assessment of the situation a little later, but so far as the role of the Government of West Bengal is concerned I must put the records straight.

I shall tell you what little thing I had to do. What could I do ? What could a single individual do in that state. I can tell you, ultimately, if order came, if order was restored it was neither by myself nor the Chief Minister nor the police nor the army, it was the will of the people of Calcutta that prevailed ultimately and the other things were just a little bit of stimulus towards that situation. I have sat with the Chief Minister for hours now. For two or three days I was with him. He has certain "faults" which I will disclose here. He did not sleep at all. He had practically very little sleep for two or three days. He was working round the clock. He would not allow any kind of rest for himself. He was so much perturbed with any little sign of anything happening. He was alarmed whenever any news came.

Of course, the army was called in and the police battalion was called in and they were air-lifted because there was no time. We did not want any delay to be caused in our preparation for meeting any eventuality. The moment he saw trouble, he wanted to deal with it. Another person in his position might have said "All right, I will deal with it as it comes and face the consequences". But he was not of that type. He took abundant precautions. As one of the precautions, he asked me to visit Calcutta. I went there as it was my duty to do so. I was by his side and I saw that he was always thinking of taking every possible precaution and it is there that he exposed himself to some misunderstanding.

I moved about in Calcutta practically the whole day and I saw what was happening there. I met the people who were affected and they told me their views about the role of the police. It is true that some of the members of the police did not behave properly and did not give enough protection. But there were many affected people who have nothing but admiration for the police. But the Chief Minister was always thinking only of the failures. Possible, he wanted to do things quickly, speedily, properly and effectively. So he only saw where the weakness was, where the default was. I put it to him that there is so much good that is happening, the police are doing their work exceedingly well; if some are not doing their work well, let them suffer and pay for it.

The police is the sheet anchor of law and order in any State in normal times. Although the police force as a whole functioned well, there were some human failures. It is said that to some extent it was due to the fact that there were certain refugees in the police and they were affected by the tale of woe that they heard from people coming from the other side. Whatever may be said about those particular police officials, by and large, they functioned well.

A reference was made to connivance in this connection. It may say here that I have studied the situation very closely. It was said that petrol and trucks and all that were unmistakable signs of the disturbances being organised. I could also see that there was some organisation; but I went deeper into it. I found there were gangs of hooligans who organised the disturbance. That was the only organisation. They were after loot. May be the basti owners had their greed of their own and they incited or helped them, but they were the only people who did it. I know there were some instances where about 500 or more people went to some Hindu factory owners and demanded Rs. 500 or 1,000 failing which they threatened to burn their factories. It was nothing but hooliganism. They rounded up the hooligans. They issued an ordinance which protected the rights of the persons affected, to their hearths and homes from which they were displaced for the moment. They took all those steps.

The Chief Minister of West Bengal does not require any certificate from me. Only, I am giving my own testimony. Many people were involved in the disturbances, including some political parties. A mention was made to the Congress Party in this connection. May I put it to the hon. Members that there may be within the Congress also some black sheep but in some

#### 69

parties the black sheep out-number the others. I am talking of the political parties in which the black sheep out-number the others, whereas there may be an individual member here and there in the Congress also.

I may also add that taking advantage of the experience of the days, the West Bengal Government has strengthened its arrangements. It has added to its police strength and procured more vehicles for greater mobility. So, all the necessary steps have been taken. That was done while the trouble was on. All these things were thought of and done.

Some questions have been raised about what Jay behind these happenings. A part of it is very clear, namely, the sequence of events of the causation which began with Hazratbal and then advantage was taken of it in Pakistan. From that the chain of events starts. It was asked here whether right on the spot the Deputy High Commissioner of Pakistan moved about. He did move about. That is true. It was not so much during the days when the trouble was on. But he is free to move about.

There was mention of what was supposed to be a fact that some arms were discovered in places of worship.

I have got all the enquiries made. It has been ascertained that it was in one place and it was one revolver and one country-made gun. That is all. That is our information. There was no Chinese stamp on them though the Chinese are capable of doing any-thing. That is one part of the story. There is another one Ind the bigger one and the more important one. The main question before us was : what do we do about the minorities in East Pakistan? (interruption).

This is a big question and, I think, hon. Members should think of this because this is really what should occupy our minds, that is, the problem of the minorities in East Pakistan. This has engaged and exercised the feelings and the minds of hon. Members. About the plight of the minority community in East Pakistan there are deep feelings. Feelings of sorrow, distress and anxiety about them were expressed in this House. Those feelings are shared by us. There is our natural impulse that we should try to do everything possible to relieve the sufferings of those people. No stone should be left unturned. Whatever may be the legal and the other aspects of it, we are answerable to man and God. If we can do anything at all possible to help them, we should not deny that help.

Before I enter further into this question I must invite attention to certain basic issues and to certain limitations of what can be done by us. However regrettable it might have been, the fact of partition is there. A part of India was carved out and it became the sovereign country of Pakistan. Both countries have a majority and a minority community. Pakistan has its majority and minority; so have we and the minority becomes the nationals of that country, that, the Mussalmans of India and the Hindus of Pakistan. That was the basis of the Partition. Now, it is clearly understood that the Muslims of India are going to be protected fully. The entire responsibility for their security is ours, for giving them full equal rights with all our members of other communities. Similarly, it was expected that the Hindus will occupy the same position. In fact, that was the basis of the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact. (interruption).

The question is, what can be done? It was expected that the Hindus in East Pakistan will live with equal rights, equal status and equal security and safety. If Pakistan fails to discharge its responsibilities, those Hindus in East Pakistan do not cease to be the nationals of Pakistan. That one thing must be very clear. However much we may grieve over their fate, that fact cannot be ignored that they are the responsibility of Pakistan. Pakistan is failing in its responsibility and on human considerations we have to do something about it because, as I said, we cannot take purely the legal and constitutional view. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that they are the people who were part of ourselves, with whom we have ties of

blood and who are our relations and friends who live there. We cannot turn our face against their sufferings, the torture of their bodies and spirit and all that they are undergoing there. We cannot do that. Therefore, instinctively our hearts turn to them and it is a question of the human impulse. We want to do our best. We cannot help doing that. But there it is. We want to give them whatever succour we might like to send them. We are faced with the situation that there is a barrier. There is a barrier which separates us from them; they are on the other side of the barrier and we hear their cries for help. But our hands cannot reach there. What else can we do? That is the question. There is the human obligation. Somebody has taken objection to the word 'compassion'. That is a word which has been used in the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact. The human obligation is there. We emphasise the responsibility of Pakistan to look after their protection, relief and rehabilitation and it is for them to take back those people who have been affected and who are in camps to their homes and give them relief and rehabilitation. We welcome that. We will be very happy if they

#### 70

do that. If they do not do that, if they are not able to give them the new start, if they do not feel secure, if they find it impossible to breathe the air of security in their country aft that they must leave it, then we cannot bar their way. We have no heart to tell them, "You go on staving there and be butchered". We cannot say that. We have no heart to say that. We cannot just see that they are perishing in the flames of communal fire and let them perish. No. It will be inhuman to do so.

Then, there were certain provisions in the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact. How to deal with the situation? Somehow they are not in operation now because that country does not respect those provisions at all. I am reminded of a saying in Persian, which means "No room to stay, no outlet for escape". Now, that is their position and to the extent it is possible for us to enable them to come away, when they find that they are in complete peril, extreme state of insecurity, we have to see that they can come across. And this is what has been done. We have tried to do. Mr. Chatterjee representing a number of parties, who met me and the Chief Minister of West Bengal in Calcutta, with the resolution, made this representation. They said, "We know that it is not possible, it is not proper, it is not feasible to put forward the idea of exchange of population". They said that. It was very reassuring to learn from them that the exchange of population idea is something which is unthinkable with all its horrible consequences of it. They said, "Let us discard it completely". They said that. It was very good. Then, what they said was, "We may not ask for that. But can't we ask for something which you can do? That is, there are those migration restrictions. Why not relax them?" We said, "We will try to ease the conditions." And then we have tried to do that. But let me again emphasise this one fact that although they will come and we will give them the certificates and they will enter our country--we will provide for relief and rehabilitation also--it is a cheering prospect for them who come from there. It is not we can easily reproduce the conditions in which they live there, the environment in which they have been living there. It is uprooting and, therefore, nobody like to come and nobody would like them to just take it lightly and come because here, in spite of all that we can do, all that we can provide, things will be hard and it is not going to be easy to settle down with normal life. Therefore, when the question is raised by Pakistan that we are facilitating their entry and inviting them, how can we invite them, what can we do to invite them, the millions of people to come here? It is not possible. But it is only those who find it impossible to stay there. We have not got much land which can be given to them. There is the difficulty in finding more land for settling new persons in the country. But whatever we have, we will share with them. There is no escape from that. That is what we are trying to do and that is what the Chief Ministers of various States who came also fully entered into the spirit of the situation and they tried to help....

Then, about the question of liberalising the migration restrictions, there were some points made that it was not enough. I would like to state that when you take the earlier relaxations made, the various categories which had been made earlier for the purpose of granting of migration certificates and the new relaxations

that we add to them, then practically all the needs of the situation are met. It is not because they are not able to obtain migration certificates that the trouble arises for them. It is because of some harassments that are still there. They are being subjected to harassments. They are not allowing them to stay there. Even in the camps they have been subjected to severe ordeals and hardships; neither food nor medicine nor any kind of other needs Are being provided. Therefore, there is nothing for them either to stay in camps or to go back. That was the situation there. Now, we have learnt that income-tax clearance certificates and some municipal certificates are required from those coming at the border. What have they got? They have left everything, and still income-tax clearance certificates are required from them. That may be a normal obligation, but here when the people are fleeing because of insecurity, why is this being done?

I said that so far as migration certificates are concerned, they would apply to the new category plus the old. The question was raised : You have said about girls of marriageable age. But why not women?' Here it is: 'Unattached women and widows with no livelihood in Pakistan'. That is also one of the categories.

An hon. Member: The hon. Minister has allowed girls of marriageable age to come away. But what about young married women? He is preventing them. If a woman is married, she is not allowed to come.

Home Minister : If they come as part of a family, that is one thing. If there is a woman who has lost her husband she can also come. So, both ways, it has been provided for. There is another clause where the Deputy High Commissioner has got discretion, and such cases could be covered under that clause (interruption).

The larger proportion of those who have entered India from East Pakistan, I believe, so far as West Bengal is concerned, consists of

### 71

those who have come without any migration papers, and we have accepted them, and we are going to accept them, certificate or no certificate. I have tried to meet both the needs of the situation, so far as Governments are concerned. If there is any aspect which requires any further consideration, certainly we can meet and discuss it. I believe the things as they are make full provision for all contingencies. If there is anything more, we can discuss it. So, I shall leave it at that. There are about 46,000 people who have entered Assam and more are coming every day. Although we have no dearth of man-power here, certainly, we have to prepare to receive those others also. Also, on this side, in West Bengal, I think the number has reached 22,000 or so.

Now, this is what we can do on our side, and we can make arrangements for their relief, we can receive them and make it easier for them, so far as we are concerned, so that they can have the migration certificates, and we may simplify whatever the procedures are and make them quicker. All this is being done, and then, we can take them to wherever they can be resettled. This is a difficult task, a very difficult task, but we shall try to do that.

There are just one or two points about the future. Apart from this, how do we tackle and solve this problem? Everybody thought that enough was not being done on that score. I looked expectantly, anxiously and eagerly for some kind of a very positive and constructive suggestion, but after having scanned all the things that came out, I found that they reduced themselves to just one suggestion, namely, take things to the UNO. We have already got something at the UNO. It is said, take things to the UNO. We are doing whatever we can to put out our case. But, is there anything else that could be done? I believe still that although the UNO may not be the remedy, yet, the nations are. The facts of the situation here and in East Pakistan, the failure there, and our efforts to do our best and our having succeeded in doing that etc. must be brought to the notice of the people in the world, because that will create a world opinion, and we would like to do it, and we are proceeding to do it.

There is one more thing which I would stress at the end, and that is that we shall be con-

cretely assisted in successfully performing that duty and carrying out that task if in this country we maintain total peace and total tranquillity. If we are able to demonstrate that whatever happens there, on our side, there is complete and full determination to do our part, and that irrespective of any provocation we will maintain peace, then our voice will be heard very much better than it could otherwise be. Therefore that is the positive thing that we shall create the conditions here which will enable us to raise our voice everywhere in the world.

An hon. Member wanted me to tell him what happened to the Muslims there. We have not hidden any fact. We have not hidden their sufferings. Whatever happened in. East Bengal was in the papers. And more than anybody else, the West Bengal Chief Minister was giving out everyday everything that happened there, and all the occurrences there ...... Everything that was known to us was recorded by us and has been made known. It may be that there may be an isolated occurrence somewhere which might not have come to our notice.

I would then ask the hon. Members to look at the efforts that are being made for the relief and rehabilitation of these persons. How much money is being spent on relief both in rural areas and in Calcutta? Every possible consideration is being given. I can say this with authority that everything possible is being done.

I must make one thing clear. There was some insinuation that some Muslims were responsible for the occurrences in West Bengal.

An hon. Member: It is not the Muslim community--they behaved very nicely-but it is the Pakistani agents.

Home Minister: They may have a finger in every ugly pie; that is not any defence of that statement. But I am talking of the Muslims. Actually when things were taking place, some of them possibly may have become aggressive. The genesis of the trouble was not that. It was not done by the Muslims there.

# Volume No

1995

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## Indo-U.S. Loan Agreement Signed

The Governments of India and the United States concluded an agreement in New Delhi on February 24, 1964 providing for an American loan of \$ 225 million (Rs. 107 crores) to finance commodity imports required, to carry forward the Indian economy.

Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, and Mr. Chester Bowles, U.S. Ambassador to India, signed the agreement which covered one of the largest dollar loans ever extended to India by the United States. The Union Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, presided.

The loan is part of the U.S. commitment of \$ 435 million made in the context of the "Aid India" Consortium for the third year of the Third Plan. The broad commodity import groups for which the loan funds will be used are : steel, non-ferrous metals, lubricants, fertilizer, machinery and machinery parts, sulphur, rubber, tire, cord, carbon black, caustic soda, DDT, chemicals, vehicle components and other components. Within these broad categories the Government of India is free to set the amounts of imports according to the needs of the economy.

The bulk of the commodity imports financed under this credit-approximately 80 per centwill be for the needs of private industry. It is expected that over 6,000 individuals licences will be issued under this loan.

The loan has been channelled through the U.S.

Agency for International Development. It carries an interest of three quarters of one per cent per annum for the first ten years and two per cent per annum for the remaining years. Repayment in dollars will be spread through forty years after the first disbursement, with no payments for a period of ten years.

The United States extended to India non-project loans totalling \$460 million for the first two years of the Third Plan. Thus, with the loan announced today, the total of such financing to date for the Plan is \$685 million (Rs. 326 crores) and comprises 48 per cent of the U.S. commitment of \$1,415 million (Rs. 674 crores) for the first three years of the Third Plan.

Non-project imports contribute to India's developing economy by providing machinery and capital equipment for expanding industrial capacity. In addition, with the progressive diversification of India's industrial structure, the requirement for a flow of components and spare parts to keep existing plants operating has also increased. This requirement will become less as the indigenous component of Indian manufactures increases. Finally, such financing enables existing facilities to get raw materials necessary to operate closer to their capacity.

In granting commodity import loans to India, the U.S. Government has taken into account the urgent need for India to make full use of the industrial capacity already created. This will help India to achieve self-sustaining growth, and it will increase her ability to expand her exports.

73

## USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Feb 01, 1964

# March

# Volume No

### Content

Foreign Affairs RecordMar 01, 1964Vol.XMARCHNo.3

## CONTENTS

# PAGE

S FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Broadcast to Nation

75

FRANCE

Indo-French Economic Collaboration : Protocol on Talks Signed 76

GENEVA CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statements on Disarmament

78

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Statements in Security Council on Kashmir 85

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letters to the President of the Security Council 88

Shri Natwar Singh's Statement on Southern Rhodesia

91

IRAN

Three-year Trade Agreement Signed 97

#### PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Migration of Christian Refugees from East Pakistan

97

```
REPUBLIC OF IRAQ
President Arif's State Visit
98
Reply by President Arif
100
Iraqi President's Speech at Civic Reception
```

1995

100

RUMANIA Trade between India and Rumania : Letters Exchanged 101

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Indo-Soviet Collaboration for Expansion of Neyveli Thermal Plant 101

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC Agreement for Shipping Service Signed 102

UNITED KINGDOM British Loan Assistance to India 103

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

# FRANCE SWITZERLAND INDIA IRAN PAKISTAN IRAQ

**Date** : Mar 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

## FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Broadcast to Nation

Broadcasting from All India Radio on March 26, 1964 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said :

We have many difficult problems to face. There is the menace of China and Pakistan. There is the tremendous influx of refugees from East Pakistan and our duty to look after them and rehabilitate them. There is the problem of rising prices which affects all our people.

But I am speaking to you today about something which is more important than anything else. This is the communal disharmony which has resulted in many deaths in East Pakistan and in India and has created bitterness and fear amongst various communities. This feeling is fatal for all of us and, unless stopped completely, will lead to most dangerous consequences.

This communal trouble is entirely opposed to our policy and to our future, and I do appeal to you to fight it and to put an end to it.

India is a country of many communities and unless we can live in harmony with each other, respecting each other's beliefs and habits, we cannot build up a great and united nation.

Ever since the distant past, it has been India's proud privilege to live in harmony with each other. That has been the basis of India's culture. Long ago the Buddha taught us this lesson. From the days of Asoka, 2300 years ago, this aspect of our thought has been repeatedly declared and practised. In our own day, Mahatma Gandhi laid great stress on it and indeed lost his life because he laid great stress on communal goodwill and harmony. We have, therefore, a precious heritage to keep up, and we cannot allow ourselves to act contrary to it.

## TOLERANCE URGED

Pakistan came into existence on the basis of hatred and intolerance. We must not allow ourselves to react to this in the same way. That surely will be a defeat for us. We have to live up to our immemorial culture and try to win over those who are opposed to its. To compete with each other in hatred and barbarity is to sink below the human level and tarnish the name of our country and our people. One evil deed leads to another. Thus evil grows. That is not the way to stop these inhuman deeds. If we can behave with tolerance and friendship to each other, that surely will have its effect elsewhere. If not, this vicious circle will go on bringing sorrow and disaster to all of us and others.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that we should realise our duty to all our countrymen, whoever they might be. We must always remember that every Indian, to whatever religion he might belong, is a brother and must be treated as such.

## PRESIDENT AYUB KHAN'S REPLY

A few days ago, I wrote to President Ayub Khan of Pakistan appealing to him against these inhumanities that were taking place and suggesting that our Home Ministers might meet soon to curb these. Today I received a reply from President Ayub Khan in which he has entirely agreed with my proposal. I hope that soon a meeting of the Rome Ministers will take place, probably in Delhi, to consider this vital problem and what steps to take to meet it. I hope that will have a salutary effect on our people.

But it is not so much Home Ministers and others in authority who can put an end to this unhappy business. It is the people themselves who have to act rightly and speedily and thus promote an atmosphere of friendship and harmony between different religious groups and not allow their anger and bitterness to grow. I appeal, therefore, to all my countrymen to put an end to this inhuman behaviour. I would specially appeal to our friends and countrymen the Adivasis in Bihar and Orissa who have been agitated greatly by the stories they have beard. I hope that they will check-themselves and try to create an atmosphere of goodwill and friendship for our countrymen who are Muslims. Our mat public enterprises are suffering because of this commitnal trouble, and the whole of India's future is bound up with this.

## APPEAL TO PRESS

I earnestly trust that our efforts will be directed towards creating communal harmony and that all

#### 75

our people and especially our newspapers will appreciate the grave dangers that are caused by Communal conflict and disharmony. Let us all be careful in what we say or write which might create fear and conflict. Let us pull ourselves together and create an atmosphere of cooperation and work for the advancement of India and of all who live here as her sons. Thus only, can we serve our motherland and help in making her great, united and strong.

INDIA CHINA PAKISTAN USA ITALY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Mar 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

## FRANCE

## Indo-French Economic Collaboration : Protocol on Talks Signed

The Protocol on the talks between the visiting French Economic Mission and the Indian delegation. was signed by Mr. Jean Wahl on behalf of France and Shri D. S. Joshi on behalf of India. The Minister of International Trade, Shri Manubhai Shah, was present at the signing ceremony.

Following is the text of the Protocol:

On the occasion of the visit to Paris in May, 1963, of Shri Manubhai Shah, India's Minister of International Trade, the possibility of a visit to India by a French Mission for the purpose of examining the potentialities of an enlargement of exchanges and contacts in the economic field between the two countries was considered.

It was with this end in view that a French Delegation led by Monsieur Jean Wahl, Head of the Division of Commercial Policy in the French Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, came to New Delhi where, from 10th to 13th March, 1964, the Delegation had conversations with Shri Manubhai Shah and with an Indian Delegation headed by Shri D. S. Joshi, Secretary in the Ministry of International Trade.

The French Delegation also had a series of meetings with Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, Finance Minister, Shri Asoka Mehta, Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shri N. Kanungo, Minister of Industry, and Shri M. J. Desai, Secretary-General in the Ministry of External Affairs.

These conversations provided the first opportunity of considering the questions pertaining to the whole range of economic relations between India and France and made possible a broad exchange of views between the two Governments on the principal problems at present of common interest in the field of international economic relations. As a result, the scope of these talks has considerably exceeded the normal ambit of the meetings of the Indo-French Economic Commission created by Article 6 of the Indo-French Exchange of Letters of 1959 which, up to the present, had been exclusively concerned with the examination of bilateral trade problems.

The conclusions of these talks are summarised below :

## FACILITIES FOR IMPORT OF INDIAN PRODUCTS

The two Delegations have come to an agreement which will afford appreciably increased opportunities for the entry of Indian goods into France.

It is in this sense that, in accordance with the policy of progressive liberalisation followed by France, which was already expressed in the course of the year 1963 by the elimination of quantitative restrictions on a certain number of products such as cotton and jute yarn, the French Delegation intimated the adoption, in the very near future, of new measures of liberalisation relating to some products of special interest to India (woollen carpets, Kashmir rugs, basketware, sports goods, etc.). As regards the products to which restrictions are still applicable, increases In quotas have been granted. In particular, increased facilities have been provided for jute goods as a result of the liberalisation of jute bags temporarily imported for packing export products.

The Indian Delegation asked for improvement in the administrative measures which apply to the commodities under quota restrictions. The French Delegation has agreed to extend the simplified procedure which exists for some items to most of the quota items.

#### 76

# DELEGATION OF FRENCH IMPORTERS TO INDIA

To meet the wishes expressed by the Indian authorities, the French Government has organised

a Delegation, at present in India, consisting of eminent representatives of the different sectors of import trade, for which India might, in the near future, expand sales to France, namely, cotton and jute goods, manganese ore, vegetable oils, tobacco, tea, hides and skins, etc.

The despatch of this Mission is a token of the interest that the French Government takes in strengthening the personal and business relations between businessmen in both the countries which will lead to the best utilisation by India of the possibilities which have been created for Indian exports to the French market.

# INDO-FRENCH COOPERATION IN INDUSTRIAL FIELD

The French Delegation and Indian experts reviewed the principal projects in which there is a possibility of securing cooperation between India and France in the industrial field.

This study has made it clear that the quickest results can be obtained in the fields of petrochemicals and chemicals (manufacture of rilsan fibre, mechanisation of salt works, manufacture of fertilisers) as also in the metallurgical industry (pig iron, steel, special steel and aluminium). It has been suggested that specialist Missions of French Technicians be sent to India to carry out the necessary studies, in particular for the purposes of the Fourth Indian Plan.

Besides, the Indian Delegation expressed the desire to see established between French and Indian Undertakings agreements on technical cooperation for the production of glass, machine tools, measuring and control apparatus, scientific instruments and tractors.

### INDO-FRENCH COOPERATION IN PLANNING

The meetings of the French Delegation with members and senior officers of the Planning Commission have shown that there undoubtedly exist, between the Planning authorities in the two countries, certain common approaches which should enable them to find mutual benefit in having closer relations than in the past. These relations could take the following forms :-

(a) Exchange of working documents on the

technical and organisation problems which arise from the development and execution of plans, particularly as regards perspective planning, the relations between physical and financial planning and the relations between Planning authorities and private enterprises.

(b) Organisation of Study Missions and lectures on the French Plan which would enable private and public personalities of the two countries closely associated with the work of planning to establish contacts with each other.

(c) Training of technicians who wish to acquire a more detailed knowledge of the methods of planning.

(d) Participation by Indian and French experts in the work of respective organisations in the two countries.

# INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

The two Delegations have examined their respective positions regarding major international economic problems in great detail in a very cordial atmosphere. In particular, they considered the relations between India and the European Common Market as also the questions coming before the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

As regards relations between India and the Common Market, the Indian Delegation indicated its appreciation of the decisions recently taken by the European Economic Community in the domain of tariffs. The Indian Delegation expressed that these steps are just a beginning and would like the European Common Market to expedite further measures of broader positive decisions. Both the Delegations expressed their interest in finding, as soon as possible, the legal framework for the totality of India's economic relations with the Community.

As regards the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the French Delegation explained the background of the documents which they had communicated to the Secretariat of the Conference on which they commented at some length. The Indian Delegation clarified the ideas which are expressed in the Memorandum submitted by the Government of India and appreciate the positive character of the French thesis. Both the Delegations expressed a wish to see the Conference arrive at realistic and dynamic solutions which would meet sufficiently the desires of the developing countries.

The two delegations agreed that---

- (1) Stabilisation at sufficiently remunerative level of the prices of primary products and raw materials should be brought about;
- (2) The "Invisibles" element in the balance of payment in the developing countries should be improved; and
- (3) Steps should be taken to expand the imports into developed countries of manufactured products from the developing countries.

It was agreed that consultations between the

#### 77

two countries on the above points and the numerous issues coming up before the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development should continue during the Conference at Geneva.

FRANCE INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA SWITZERLAND

**Date** : Mar 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

GENEVA CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statements on Disarmament

Shri V. C. Trivedi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, and Member of the Indian Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, who led the delegation in the month of March 1964, made two statements in the Conference on disarmament on March 12 and 24, 1964. Following is the text of his statement on March 12 :

Before I come to the main topic of my statement today, which is collateral measures, and particularly non-dissemination of nuclear weapons, I should like to make a few comments of a general nature.

The delegation of India views the prospect before us with confidence. It is true that, although we witnessed some important developments last year, particularly the signing of the partial nuclear test ban treaty, we have since been unable to achieve substantial progress in other fields towards the building of mutual confidence, arms control and disarmament.

This is indeed a valid reason for some disappointment to the international community. As far as we in the Committee are concerned, however, this lack of substantial progress need not dishearten us. The General Assembly of the United Nations has asked us to continue our negotiations "with energy and determination ... and in a spirit of goodwill and mutual accommodation." This Committee has been regarded generally as the most promising body so far entrusted with this task, and, if I may say so, the presence of the non-aligned nations in the Committee has been widely welcomed. We have no reason to deprecate ourselves as long as we continue to negotiate with determination and goodwill.

Disarmament is not a matter which can be achieved overnight, as it were. It requires careful, detailed, patient and realistic negotiations. We must remember, firstly, the unprecedented nature of the world that we are negotiating to build--a world without arms, a world of justice, progress and security. That cannot be achieved by one stroke as was in effect proposed, for example, by China when it refused to sign the nuclear test ban treaty.

Secondly, the world we live in today is still bedevilled by fear, suspicion and distrust. The "cold war" and the political partisanship which it engenders are still with us. In that atmosphere, one is apt to see more the pitfalls of a proposal than its virtues. I repeat, therefore, that we need not be unduly disheartened at the lack of any substantial progress so far. The important thing is that we should continue to make a serious and constructive effort to negotiate what we are entrusted with. In doing so, we must always bear in mind that our endeavour should be to achieve a mutual building of confidence and a reduction of tension in ever-increasing measure so that we are able to bring the present nuclear nightmare to an end and achieve general and complete disarmament.

It is in this context, namely, that of the unprecedented nature of our objective and the existence of suspicions and distrust, that the collateral measures we are discussing assume the highest significance.

I should like to describe our Tuesday meetings and Thursday meetings as the "long-term objective" meetings and the "short-term objective" meetings. I should not like the phrase "long-term objective" to be misunderstood. By it I mean the full and complete objective. The Indian delegation believes that general and complete disarmament is the most vital and the most urgent problem facing mankind today, and if we are to survive, if our institutions are to survive and our civilization, as we know it, is to survive, we must achieve that objective quickly. It is only in a strictly relative sense, therefore, that I use the words "long-term" and "short-term".

#### 78

On the question of our short-term objective, namely, agreements on the, collateral measures, I should like to pose certain guiding principles.

First, we are a negotiating body. We are neither the Disarmament Commission nor the United Nations. Therefore, it is not desirable for us to assume the functions of those bodies. Our task is to negotiate a treaty on general and complete disarmament and to report periodically to the United Nations on the work done by us. That does not mean, of course, that all negotiations must necessarily be conducted and all agreemerits reached within the confines of this Committee. Even if we could stimulate by our discussions our proposals and our suggestions, serious bilateral or multilateral discussions on measures of disarmament, particularly in the context of the United Nations, we should be happy at such developments. In fact we should encourage such collateral negotiations. The Moscow test ban treaty is an example of a welcome development of that nature. We in the Committee have abundant reason to congratulate ourselves on the part we played in that consummation, and, if I may say so in parenthesis in all humility, so also have the Government of India, which kept on pressing for it at all international gatherings since our Prime Minister first proposed it formally ten years ago.

Second, we should negotiate measures which would hasten general and complete disarmament. That is our ultimate goal and our urgent goal. We must view each step according to that criterion. That is why, among other things, we welcomed the nuclear test ban treaty and the agreement not to orbit or station in outer space nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, for those are positive steps towards the achievement of a disarmed world.

Third, we should negotiate measures calculated to prevent developments--unhealthy developments--which would make our ultimate task much more difficult, if not impossible. The delegation of India places great emphasis on this principle, although it is couched in negative phraseology. I referred earlier to the justified disappointment expressed in many parts of the world at the lack of progress in our Committee. I said, however, that we should not lose heart. But, while we are discussing problems of disarmament, there are some people who are possessed by the mad urge to have their own bomb. They would call it the "Asian bomb". It is our duty and the duty of the international community to endeavour to prevent this proliferation of nuclear weapons; otherwise the world will never forgive us.

Fourth, we should negotiate measures which build up mutual confidence and trust. Unhappily, it is the absence of this quality in international relations which has so far proved a serious handicap to our efforts and to the efforts of the world community to achieve disarmament and security. We should, therefore, acclaim every step that leads to reduction of tension and to the building of confidence, whether it is taken in this Committee or elsewhere. Talking of developments elsewhere, the Legal Sub-Committee of the Outer Space Committee is at present meeting in this building. We in India and other non-aligned countries have been pressing for a total demilitarization of outer space. It has not been possible so far to devise an agreed formulation of this principle, as the problem is complex, and we appreciate its complexity. At the same time, we hope that the present session of the Legal Sub-Committee will be able to achieve progress in that direction. As far as our Committee is concerned, for the time being, however, the adoption of some of the measures included in the lists before us will make a vital contribution in our quest for mutual confidence and trust.

My fifth and last principle proceeds from the difficulties of the present. We are still in the very initial stages of consideration of disarmament problems. We should, therefore, at least in this initial stage, try to negotiate measures which do not require an onerous or complicated system of inspection and control. I hasten to add that we are all in favour of inspection and control. The Indian delegation has at all times regarded control and disarmament as being inseparable. Resolution 1378(XIV) adopted general and complete disarmament under effective international control as our goal, and that has been reiterated several times. At the same time, a difficulty has arisen in regard to the relationship between the degree of control and the degree of disarmament. It appears to me, therefore, that in this initial stage in which we find ourselves today we should particularly favour those collateral measures which require inspection and control to a minimum or, at least, to an agreed level. I am of course referring to collateral measures and not general and complete disarmament as such.

We have been referring to the three agreements which we have witnessed during the last year, namely, the direct communication link between Washington and Moscow, the partial test ban treaty and the agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons in outer space. Those were three measures in which international inspection did not come into consideration. I think we could profit by that experience which gave us fruitful results. We could perhaps for the time being select from the proposals made in President Johnson's message to the Committee and those contained in the memorandum of the Government of the Soviet Union such items as require less complicated measures of inspection or such

#### 79

measures of inspection as are acceptable to the two sides.

It is, therefore, those live principles which I should like to commend to the Committee for its consideration. When we are discussing a particular measure we should view it, I think, in the light of those five criteria. We in India have over the years placed great emphasis on a nuclear test ban. In the earlier stages we did not get much support from the great Powers. Eventually, however, international public opinion had its way, at least partially. We pressed for a cessation of tests because of the intrinsic value of that measure. At the same time, it appears to me that the conclusion of the partial test ban treaty was in large measure due to the fact that it fulfilled the criteria suggested by me. Firstly, we in this Committee made it possible by the constructive manner in which we discussed it and we stimulated the negotiations which led to the signing of the treaty. Secondly, it is a significant step towards general and complete disarmament. Thirdly, it is a measure which restricts the development of new weapons of mass destruction and prevents the situation from getting worse. Fourthly, we are all aware of the entente, howsoever limited, that it has created among the great Powers. Finally, it avoided the problem of what degree of international inspection was to be acceptable.

We realize, of course, that the Moscow test ban treaty is only a partial treaty. It does not cover underground tests, but we hope that it will soon be extended to cover those tests as well. We hope also--and in a way this is even more important--that the treaty will be subscribed to by all countries, particularly by all non-nuclear countries.

I refer to the nuclear test ban treaty only as an illustration of the validity of the five criteria advanced by me. I do not propose to deal with it today in a substantive manner. I have, however, given some emphasis to it, as it is relevant to the main topic that I wish to discuss.

The Indian delegation has already given its

final comments on many of the proposals before us, and I do not intend to make a general statement on them. For the purpose of this meeting I propose to confine myself to one item. This is item 5 in the United States list and item 6 in the Soviet list : namely, non-proliferation, or nondissemination, of nuclear weapons. I am doing so not so much because it is one of the items common to the two lists as because it is one of the most important issues facing us today. The non-aligned nations have stressed this aspect of disarmament time and again in the United Nations, and the Swedish and the Irish resolutions have been adopted in the General Assembly.

Secondly, it is the next logical step after the nuclear test ban treaty. By subscribing to that treaty over a hundred nations have, by implication, renounced the manufacture of these evil weapons. I say "by implication" because the treaty does not specifically prohibit manufacture, acquisition, receipt or transference of these weapons. Again, Article IV of the treaty provides for the withdrawal of a party from the treaty if "in exercising its national sovereignty... it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject-matter of this Treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country". Nevertheless, the fact remains that over a hundred non-nuclear nations have by implication renounced the doubtful and disastrous status of becoming nuclear Powers. Among the non-nuclear nations it is principally only one country which stands in solitary defiance-not desiring, to quote the preamble to the Treaty, "to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substance".

Thirdly, it appears to me that an agreement to achieve non-proliferation of nuclear weapons meets the principles I put forward at the beginning of my statement as being conducive to concrete results. In particular I should like to emphasize the third point I made, namely, that we should negotiate measures which would prevent developments inhibiting the achievement of general and complete disarmament. We may or may not be able to take steps immediately on some concrete measures of disarmament; but if we do not take steps now, or in the near future, which would prevent the situation from getting worse or which would make eventual realization of general and complete disarmament difficult, if not impossible, then we shall have really and truly failed-failed not only for ourselves but for our succeeding generations.

The Pugwash scientists, who met in Udaipur in India in January and February this year, devoted considerable attention to this problem. They felt that the next ten years or so were crucial. If things were allowed to slide during that period, without any check, the world would find itself in the position of having five, six or ten or "n" number of countries possessing nuclear weapons. This is a prospect too frightening to contemplate. War by mechanical failure, accident or miscalculation, or even by design, would then be more difficult to prevent, apart from the political, psychological and even blackmail repercussions of such a development. As the Soviet memorandum points out :

"A widening of the circle of States possessing nuclear weapons would increase many times over the danger of the outbreak of a thermonuclear war. At the same time a widening of the circle of nuclear States would also

#### 80

make it much more difficult to solve the problem of disarmament."

As Mr. Fisher pointed out at our meeting on 5 March :

"At present only a few countries can produce nuclear weapons. It is in the interest of all the world that their number not be increased."

That is the crux of the matter.

If we are unable to make much headway at present on the other issues which we are considering, we shall try and try again, and sooner or later we shall succeed. But, if we fail in our endeavour to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we may not get many chances to try; and even if we do try we shall have a smaller chance of succeeding.

The Indian delegation would, therefore, suggest that we fake up seriously and realistically the question of formulating an agreement on this question. We have the advantage of previous discussions on the subject, both in this Committee and in the United Nations General Assembly, Sweden and Ireland have successfully moved resolutions 1380(XIV), 1576(XV), 1664(XVI) and 1665(XVI). It is possible for us, therefore, to proceed constructively towards an agreement. Our objective is clear. It is not healthy that there are nuclear weapons in the world, but it would be suicidal if more countries possessed them. It is this that we have to prevent.

I believe that the basis of an acceptable agreement might be as under :

The four nuclear Powers should commit themselves not to transfer nuclear weapons or weapon technology, and the non-nuclear nations should pledge not to manufacture, possess or receive these weapons. Perhaps we could have a treaty similar to the partial nuclear test ban treaty which could be signed in the capitals of the nuclear Powers and which could be subscribed to by all countries.

I should like to quote at this stage from the final communique issued by the Pugwash scientists last month.

"In view of the continuing dangers of the spread of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, we believe the following additional measures to be necessary :

- all nations presently possessing nuclear weapons should jointly undertake not to transfer these weapons or technical information relating to them to any other state or group of states;
- (2) all nations not Possessing nuclear weapon should undertake not to produce such weapons or to acquire them or the special technical information necessary for their production; and
- (3) the government of each of the nuclear powers should take whatever measures may be open to it to prevent its nationals with experience in the field of nuclearweapons technology from contributing to the development of the nuclear-weapons capacity of an foreign power."

I should like to take this opportunity to refer to the question of inspection and control of production of nuclear weapons, and particularly to the extremely interesting statements made by the leader of the United States delegation last week at our 172nd meeting. Earlier the United Kingdom delegation had submitted an exhaustive document, on 31 August 1962. The views expressed by the United Kingdom and the United States merit particular attention, as they deal with the basic problem of diverting atomic energy from military purposes to the pursuits of peace. It is a much wider problem than the one which I have taken as my theme today, but, as references have been made to it during the current session in the context of non-dissemination of nuclear weapons, I thought I would indicate to the Committee the views of the Indian delegation.

We all agree that use of nuclear energy for production of weapons should be prohibited under international control and supervision. At the same time, it is not intended that checks should be placed on the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy. The "atoms for peace" programme holds great promise for the world, particularly for the developing nations. There is no doubt that atomic energy will play an increasing role in electric power generation; it is already competitive in many high-cost fuel areas, including those in the underdeveloped countries. We in India, for example, are going ahead with a modest nuclear power station programme. We have received valuable assistance from the United States and Canada in our plans for construction of two Power stations, one at Tarapur near Bombay and the other at Rana Pratap Sagar in Rajasthan. Our third station will be in the state of Madras. These power stations will make a significant contribution to our plans of economic development.

The first consideration we should bear in mind, therefore, is, as stated by Mr. Fisher, that an increasingly large number of countries have Peaceful nuclear programme and that it is in the interest of all that their number continues to increase. It would be running counter to this interest if we sought to establish a-control which would operate only against the developing nations.

The second consideration is that we should control what we wish to prevent. We want to eliminate military use of atomic energy; we

#### 81

should, therefore, control plants which produce fissile material. For example, as the United Kingdom paper has indicated, it is not really feasible to institute a control on uranium ore right from the mining stage. In any case, the uranium mines, the plants for fabrication of fuel elements and the reactors are not in themselves a military danger. They do not promote any military purposes unless they are coupled with plants and facilities for the fabrication of fissile material into weapons. It is these facilities which have to be eliminated and it is the chemical separation and gaseous diffusion plants which have to be safeguarded in order to ensure that the materials produced in them are not used for military purposes. When, therefore, we come to the question of stopping production of nuclear weapons, what we shall need to do is to institute a system of international inspection of all plants for the extraction, of plutonium and all gaseous diffusion plants. The Indian delegation believes that it is possible to devise a system dependent on the control and inspection of chemical separation plants and isotope separation plants for uranium-235, which will prevent any country from making weapons in any significant manner.

In his statement last Thursday, Mr. Fisher, referred to the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency. We have always been of the view that enriched uranium and plutonium should be supplied under adequate safeguards to ensure that they are used only for peaceful purposes. At the same time, we do not think that such safeguards should be attached to equipment and devices which in themselves serve no military purpose. Moreover, we believe that extension of the system of safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as at present established, to equipment and devices which serve a peaceful purpose would widen the gap between the developed countries and the underdeveloped countries, as it would operate only in respect of the underdeveloped countries.

We welcome the stress placed by Mr. Fisher on the first two considerations mentioned in the fifth point of President Johnson's message to our Committee. We have also heard with great attention to Mr. Fisher's account of the substantial assistance that the United States has given to many countries in developing peaceful uses of atomic energy and we welcome the decision of the United States Government to place the Yankee reactor under the International Atomic Energy Agency system of safeguards. India has always supported the system of international safeguards and believes that this system should be based on certain objective criteria which should apply to all countries and to all reactors. I am sure that most of us would deplore a situation in which the nuclear power projects in the developed countries would be exempted from being brought under the Agency's system of safeguards. For example, we would favour the International Atomic Energy Agency's recognizing EURATOM so that agreement could be reached whereby projects in which EURATOM participates could be brought under the international safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

As the Committee is aware, the International Atomic Energy Agency is considering these issues, and, as I said earlier, they form a much broader aspect of disarmament. Therefore I do not wish to go here, at this stage, into greater detail, except to repeat that the key to the safeguards problem is the safeguarding of gaseous diffusion plants, centrifuge plants and chemical reprocessing plants and not the imposition of control on mines, fuel fabrication facilities or atomic power stations, particularly as at the moment we are discussing not the question of dismantling the nuclear weapon apparatus of the present nuclear Powers but that of preventing manufacture of weapons by non-nuclear nations.

Coming back to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, we believe that a constructive step may be to formulate an international instrument like the nuclear test ban treaty in the light of the ideas expressed in the Swedish and Irish resolutions in the United Nations. That would be a beginning and a good beginning. Other steps towards perfecting the system car. follow.

Following is the text of Shri Trivedi's Statement on March 24 :

As our Prime Minister has stated on many occasions, disarmament is the most urgent and vital problem facing humanity today. In the uncertain and unstable conditions of the present--- political, economic, military and social--disarmament is concerned with the question of the survival of our civilization, and it is essential that the international community should pursue its efforts vigorously towards achieving a speedy solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament and of the security of mankind.

To be sure, disarmament is not an end in itself but a means to an end. In the context of the present-day piling up of armaments, the multiple saturation of nuclear weapons and the continuing quest for more lethal and more effective instruments of warfare, the objective of a peaceful, progressive and just world is impossible of realization unless the world is first disarmed. The goal we seek is that of peace and equality, of justice and economic progress, of security and development. That is the end to which disarmament is an inescapable means.

#### 82

As we all know, the Secretary General of the United Nations yesterday inaugurated in this building one of the epoch-making gatherings of our time. Trade and development also form an important means to the ultimate human objective of peace and plenty, of justice and security. The economic development of developing nations is closely linked with the issues which we discuss in our Committee. Our colleague from Brazil, Mr. de Castro, has spoken eloquently of the direct inter-relation between the two. Again this morning the Foreign Minister of Brazil, Mr. de Araujo Castro, referred to that issue in his cogent and constructive statement. In fact, viewing the problem from the angle stressed by the Foreign Minister of Brazil, the inter-relation between those two aspects of international endeavour is very profound and far-reaching. The menace posed by poverty, ignorance and disease is no less threatening than the nuclear menace that we face today. We have been talking in our Committee of the multi-megaton bombs, but the biggest and most dangerous bomb of them all is poverty and inequality.

We in the Disarmament Committee are thus negotiating the implementation of a very important means to the ultimate objective of mankind, and it is necessary to view our efforts from that criterion. It is in that context, therefore, that the Indian delegation views the significant proposal made by Mr. Gromyko for a reduction and eventual elimination of the nuclear menace. We are all agreed that real and lasting security can be provided by general and complete disarmament, by elimination of poverty from every corner of the globe, by establishment of a just and egalitarian society and by the rule of law. At the same time, every proposal which courageously and constructively deals with the problem of disarming the world merits our full and sympathetic consideration. At the eighteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, Mrs. Pandit, the leader of the Indian delegation, spoke of the significance of the "nuclear umbrella" proposal in the context of disarmament. In our own Committee, speaking at the 162nd meeting, Mr. Nehru similarly described that proposal as an important contribution. Other delegations, including those of the Western Powers, have welcomed the positive aspects of the advance made by the Soviet Union in the new plan.

The Gromyko proposal envisages a substantial reduction of the existing nuclear arms potential in the world in the initial stage of the actual process of disarmament, and the maintenance of a balance of nuclear security with the retention under control by the United States and the Soviet Union of a strictly limited number of agreed types of missiles until the end of disarmament.

I believe all of us accept that disarmament will lead to international security and that, in consonance with that proposition, the menace of nuclear arms has to be eliminated on a priority basis. The Gromyko plan is postulated on that premise. Some delegations have raised several pertinent questions on the details of the plan and on the need to satisfy certain basic considerations if the plan is to be acceptable. The Committee has been having an exhaustive debate on those issues during this session, and that has led to additional clarifications. At this stage, therefore, it appears to me that our work could be speeded up significantly And without affecting the position of any one it we could say that in principle we viewed the "nuclear umbrella" proposal favourably. We could then all go on to a detailed examination of the plan. The Indian delegation realizes, of course, that all delegations will need to be satisfied with the details before final agreement can be reached.

During the last few meetings the Soviet delegation and other Socialist delegations have been elaborating the basic features of the Gromyko plan, and the Western delegations have been specifying the problems which they consider to be the disadvantages of the plan. In that context I think it might be useful, from the point of view of the two sides as well as that of the non-aligned delegations, if the "nuclear umbrella" principle were accepted. Such acceptance could well break the circumscribing circle in which we find ourselves today.

I hope I shall be forgiven at this stage if I quote a relevant paragraph from the final communique of the 12th Pugwash Conference. The Pugwash scientists said :

"The concept of a nuclear umbrella or minimum deterrent force, which we have been discussing in our conferences since 1960, to be maintained by the two great nuclear Powers during the process of general and complete disarmament, is of major importance in providing the necessary guarantee against aggression by hidden weapons. We welcome the proposal of the U.S.S.R. to extend it to the end of the disarmament process. We regard the possibility of agreement on the principles of a nuclear umbrella or minimum deterrent force to offer one of the most hopeful avenues to reach agreement on comprehensive disarmament under effective controls."

This does not mean, of course, that our debate would not proceed more or less on the lines on which it has proceeded so far. It does mean, however, that we could now have more meaningful and more detailed discussions. In his able and penetrating analysis at our meeting on

#### 83

17 March, Mr. Burns said that as yet the Committee had not received an indication of what was meant in exact figures by the phrases "a strictly limited number" or "a definite, limited number" or "a minimum quantity". Such a definition, we presume, would be forthcoming once the principle is accepted.

The Western delegations have raised other pertinent points. Mr. Cavalletti said that there

were three series of problems : balance, control and peace organization. At one of our recent meetings Sir Paul Mason said that there were four problems still to be resolved : agreement on the size of the deterrent, agreement on the nature of the deterrent, differences on the rate and phasing of the reductions and peace-keeping arrangements. At our meeting last Tuesday Mr. Fisher listed five disadvantages of the Gromyko plan : those relating to imbalance, verification, linking of proposals, peace-keeping machinery and the philosophy of the threat of war. Some of those problems are of a fundamental nature and will need to be debated further, but insofar as they relate to the question of detail, I think, we should be taking a useful and constructive step if we proceeded on the basis of the "nuclear umbrella" thesis. What is even more important is that once we proceed on that basis it is possible that we may come to some agreed elaborations on the plan. That, in fact, is the purpose of all negotiation. If, for example, a hypothetical number of ten, or a similar figure, as the agreed number of missiles, is found to be inadequate because of considerations of international security, a higher figure could be suggested, negotiated and finally agreed upon. Again, Mr. Tsarapkin explained to us last Tuesday that, under the Gromyko plan as formulated, hidden missiles hardly presented a problem. On the other hand, the Western delegations are greatly concerned with such a risk. Once the "nuclear umbrella" thesis is accepted, however, and once we go into details, I think that the greater understanding of the Gromyko plan which will inevitably ensue may lead to a narrowing of the gap between the two sides on this question.

The Indian delegation is particularly interested in the question of security. As I said earlier in my statement, we view the issue of disarmament in the framework of international security. The Gromyko proposal for the "nuclear umbrella" has also to be viewed in the same context. Mr. Tsarapkin has emphasized on several occasions that the Gromyko proposal provides security for peace while at the same time it reduces the menace of a nuclear war.

The representative of Canada, Mr. Burns, pointed out last Tuesday that it was also necessary to consider in this context the importance of avoiding the possibility of a conventional war. It is true that a nuclear war means universal annihilation, and we must do all we. can to make it possible to eliminate this danger as quickly as possible. At the same time, we must also bear in mind the consideration that our efforts should not in any way give wrong notions to military adventurists in the world to commit aggression against their neighbours by conventional forces. The answer to this problem is, of course, not to discard the "nuclear umbrella" thesis but to ensure in our discussions and our negotiations that the plan which we finally agree upon maintains international security.

As I said earlier, the queries raised by various delegations are being debated in our Committee. The particular issue of security and danger of aggression by conventional arms will be also covered in the debate. I should like to repeat, however, that this particular problem need raise no obstacle in considering the Gromyko plan in greater detail. It could well be met, for example, by stipulating that all nations, and in particular all militarily significant nations, should adhere to the treaty on general and complete disarmament and implement its provisions right from the commencement of the process of disarmament. Then, again, it will be necessary to ensure the simultaneous compliance by all States to agreed limits of conventional manpower. At the same time, there should be agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as suggested by me at our meeting on 12 March. In fact, such an agreement should be arrived at now.

It is not my intention at this stage to go into the merits of the various queries and their answers. We shall have occasion to deal with them in detail as our debate proceeds further. The purpose of my intervention today is to state that the delegation of India views with favour the principle contained in the Gromyko proposal for a "nuclear umbrella" and to suggest that the Committee's discussions will proceed more fruitfully if this thesis is accepted by us all. This need not mean the abandonment for ever of any other thesis, which may be revived, if necessary, at a later stage.

At the beginning of our proceedings this morning, while welcoming the Foreign Minister of Brazil, I said that we were looking forward to another of his outstanding interventions in our Committee. The cogent and forceful statement he made this morning has fully satisfied our hope. It appears to me that the suggestion I have made in respect of our work in the future is along the general lines put forward by Mr. de Araujo Castro. He said :

"We must tackle concrete items in concrete discussions. We should have more details and less generalities."

84

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

**Date** : Mar 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Statements in Security Council on Kashmir

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following Statement in the Security Council on March 17, 1964, seeking an adjournment of the Kashmir debate

Mr. President :

It is not my intention to enter into a substantive discussion at this stage on the merits of the Kashmir case since the object of my present intervention is to seek an adjournment of the discussion. The circumstances under which the Security Council is now meeting are well-known to members, although my delegation is not quite sure if a majority of the members themselves were at any stage convinced of the necessity of this meeting. The Council meets when international peace and security are gravely threatened. The case has been on the record of the Security Council for all these years. It has been the concern of the Security Council to bring the parties together with a view to finding a peaceful solution. The threat to peace and security is not and has never been from us. The 16-year old Pakistani aggression, of course, remains a constant threat so long as it is not vacated.

When the Council met on the 3rd of February, our Minister of Education, Mr. Chagla, had urged that there was no new situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and that there was no grave emergency as alleged by Pakistan and as such there was no case for a meeting of the Security Council. The Pakistani plea was one of grave emergency. I would like to ask the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan how did this emergency suddenly disappear on the 17th February when he asked for an adjournment. Obviously he himself was not satisfied about the emergency. By agreeing to this request for adjournment, the Council also recognised that there was no emergency.

As you recall, Sir, the Education Minister of India, Mr. Chagla, protested against this adjournment and he said : "It suits the convenience of the representative of Pakistan to go to Pakistan for a few days and come back. It does not suit me. After all, it is a question of convenience. The convenience of both parties should be considered. Therefore, I strongly oppose any suggestion that this debate should be adjourned for a short time. I am ready to sit here today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow and conclude these proceedings".

Thereafter, on a motion by the representative of Morocco, the Council adjourned under subparagraph (2) of rule 33. Mr. President, an adjournment under rule 33(2) is an adjournment sine die.

Now, Sir, the ostensible reason given by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan on 17th February in support of his request for adjournment was to enable him to have consultations with his government and also to have more time for reflection. We know that the real reason why the distinguished Foreign Minister wished to return to Pakistan was his desire to play host to the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China. Although this fact was not given out at the time to the Council, Mr. Bhutto openly admitted as much, at a press conference, in Karachi. As the Council wig recall, on the 15th February, the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan had solemnly declared that "this problem is so difficult and so fundamental to us that all other considerations are superseded when it comes to the question of the problem of Kashmir". Did he think that discussions with his visitors were even more important than deliberations in the Security Council ?

We would have hoped that the Security Council would convey its displeasure to the distinguisbed Foreign Minister of Pakistan for the cavalier fashion in which he was treating the Council. He calls for a meeting of the Security Council whenever it suits his convenience and asks for an adjournment to suit his own timeschedule without considering the conveniences either of the members of the Security Council or of the Government of India. Despite our objections, the Council, in its wisdom, decided to grant the request of Pakistan and adjourned the meeting sine die. Again, when the Foreign Minister of Pakistan asked for yet another meeting, the majority of the members of the Council once more accommodated him in complete disregard of the convenience of my Government.

In my letter of 8th March 1964, I have already conveyed to you, Mr. President, the views of my Government with regard to the holding of a fresh meeting. We have also conveyed to you in that letter, the understanding of the Government of India of the circumstances in which the Security Council adjourned. We had also ventured to express our views that a further meeting of the Security Council can be convened only for substantial reasons with due regard for the conve-

#### 85

nience of the two sides. No such reasons have been furnished by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan in his letter dated 4th March 1964.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has now tried to introduce some arguments to justify an urgent meeting on the ground that the peace on the ceasefire line in Kashmir is threatened.

The Council will remember that during the period before Pakistan called for the last meeting of the Council in January, Pakistan had taken every opportunity of creating difficulties and bringing about an atmosphere of crisis in Kashmir. In his letter the Permanent Representative of Pakistan addressed to you in November 1963 (Document S/5450) had alleged military preparations by India on the ceasefire line and disturbances of peace in the area of Chaknot. This Pakistani allegation was investigated by the U.N. Chief Military Observer who came to the conclusion that India had concentrated no troops in or in the vicinity of Chaknot, but that, on the contrary, Pakistani troops had reinforced the area contrary to the ceasefire agreement. Accordingly, he gave an award of 'no violation' against India and an award of 'violation' against Pakis- $\tan(S/5503)$ . Thus the complaint of the Pakistan Government was proved to be false and baseless.

After the adjournment of the Council at the end of the last series of meetings, Pakistan has tried again to create tension on the ceasefire line to enable the Foreign Minister to make out some case for resumption of the Security Council meeting. It was Pakistan forces which fired first across the ceasefire line and thereby engineered certain clashes. India lodged complaints with the U.N. Observers for the ceasefire violations. According to our reports, Pakistan rejected a request by the Military Observer Group for an assurance of safety of personnel of the U.N. Observer Group who were to be sent into the affected area. India, on the other hand, has offered all facilities and cooperation to these personnel. No doubt the U.N. Observer Team, in due course, will be reporting on these incidents and also on whether Pakistan or India was at fault. There is no reason why the Council should at this stage submit to this kind of pressure from the Government of Pakistan.

Another reason for the urgency of this meeting given by Mr. Bhutto is that the new Prime Minister of Kashmir, Mr. Sadiq, has reiterated the demand for the so-called integration of Kashmir with India. The Council will remember that this was the main plea of Pakistan for calling the last series of meetings in January 1964. At that time the Pakistani Foreign Minister had also stated that there was a revolt in Kashmir. During the debate, Minister Chagla had clearly explained to the Council that this charge of so-called integration was a Pakistani propaganda manoeuvred to create the impression that there was a new situation in Kashmir, which, of course is not at all true.

As Minister Chagla had then explained, you cannot annex a thing which is already yours : you cannot make more complete what is already complete.

The Government of India fully recognise that the President of the Council or any member thereof, is empowered to call a meeting on any matter which is borne on the agenda of the Council. At the same time, they feel that this right should be exercised fairly and reasonably, If any meeting of the Council is to be convened, the convenience of the Government of Pakistan should not be the only consideration. The convenience of the Government of India certainly deserves equal consideration.

The Council has not once but twice taken into consideration the convenience of the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Is it too much to expect that our convenience should also be taken into account? The Minister of Education, Mr. Chagla, whom the Government of India have appointed their representative for the Security Council discussions on Kashmir is extremely busy with the Budget Session of the Indian Parliament. He is also the Leader of the Upper House of the Parliament and, as such, he cannot absent himself from the House during this important session of Parliament. It is for this reason that we had requested the Council to defer the consideration of this case till the beginning of May 1964, when the Budget Session of the Indian Parliament is expected to end. If there was in fact a grave situation or there had been some developments in which immediate intervention by the Council would have been helpful, that would have been another matter. This, however, is not the case.

Furthermore, no constructive discussions on Kashmir or any of the other outstanding problems can be expected unless and until the Pakistan Government stops the present persecution of its minorities. Members of the Security Council are even now witnessing the large exodus of minorities from East Pakistan into India. It is only with the flight, this time of the Christian minorities of East Pakistan that the Western countries are now becoming aware of the tragedy that is being enacted there. A reign of terror for the minorities has been let loose in East Pakistan which the Government of Pakistan is either unable or unwilling to control. Acts of violence, deprivation of property, assault on women, etc., have become the order of the day in East Pakistan. There is a daily influx of over 3,000 refugees who are fleeing Pakistan because of calculated persecution and continued

### 86

insecurity as regards their life and property. This, of course, is not a matter before the Council. We realise that but India is faced with the prospect of hundreds and thousands of refugees Pouring into India from East Pakistan. Already over 125,000 refugees have arrived in India. Nearly 75,000 people have fled from one neighpouring district of East Pakistan alone and of these about 40,000 are Christians. The Govern ment and people of India are directing their resources and energies towards meeting this tremendous human problem and are undertaking measures for rehabilitation and resettlement of these unfortunate people fleeing from persecution by Pakistan. My Government believe that first things must come first. The dimensions of this problem are assuming more and more staggering proportions everyday and are a source of grave concern to my Government. The Government of Pakistan does not seem to be concerned with this human problem but, with cynical disregard for the suffering of its minorities, is more interested in diversionary tactics and in agitating the Kashmir issue. We, on our part, have already twice made proposals to the Pakistan Government for tackling the problem by joint discussions at Home Minister's level but that proposal has been turned down.

My Government owes it to itself and to its people that it should do full justice to its representation in the Security Council on this important question which is bound up with the unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of India against which Pakistan has committed aggression. The main preoccupation should be to make a constructive contribution towards the settlement of this question. For this purpose and since no constructive advance is possible without the cooperation of both sides, it is necessary that India also should be represented by the Minister who has been specially designated by my Government to deal with this issue. It is relevant to point out that Pakistan as represented by its Minister of Foreign Affairs. In case the Security Council wishes to make a constructive advance, it should enable our Minister to participate in the discussions of the Council and to consider any proposals or suggestions that may come up. Mr. President, as I have stated earlier, there was no justification for an urgent meeting of the Security Council in February. There is no urgency for a meeting now either. In this view, I formally request that the Council adjourn to any certain day in the first week of May 1964.

This, Mr. President, is a very reasonable request and I hope the Council will accede to it. I also hope that the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan will give some consideration to our convenience and will find it possible to cooperate with us in this respect".

Following is the text of Shri Chakravarty's statement in the Security Council on March 19, 1964:

I am grateful to the Members who have been good enough to take our difficulties into consideration and who have agreed to the adjournment until 5th May. In doing so, some of the speakers have joined the Representative of Brazil in his appeal. Now I was wondering what was the occasion for these appeals in a purely procedural question of adjournment. When the question of adjournment was last considered, although it was an indefinite adjournment. an adjournment which we thought was 'sine die', the President of the Council who happened to be the Representative of Brazil made only this statement "as President I have to say that if there is no objection to the proposal, the meeting will stand adjourned. I think it proper for me in saying that to recall that the item is on the Council's agenda and has been for a long time. I would add that under the rules of procedure the President or any Member of the Council may at any time call for a meeting on this question".

This was necessary in the case of an adjournment of an indefinite character. But I wonder whether it is equally necessary when an adjournment to a certain date under Rule 33(3) is either necessary or even desirable. I am a little doubtful because I do not quite understand the implications of these appeals. I became a little doubtful when, if I understood the interpretations correctly, one of two Members in supporting the appeal made by the Representative of Brazil said "we agree to the adjournment on the same presumptions" and other members said on "the same conditions". If I had any doubts about it, these have been cleared by the statement just made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan who has said that the adjournment has been made under some conditions.

Let us go into these conditions or whatever it is meant to imply. I shall now quote from the statement of the Representative of Brazil when he spoke of the circumstances id which the Council would have to be called into session before 5th May. He said : "New developments of a political or military nature which, in view of the Council, might alter or worsen the situation now prevailing in Jammu and Kashmir, should in the view of my delegation be reason enough for the President or any Member of the Council to call for an urgent meeting". We all recognize that it is the privilege and prerogative of the Security Council to call a meeting at any time it wishes. But is such a reservation necessary? Does the Council not realise that any such reservation may only give a handle to Pakistan to create incidents and build up a tense atmosphere to justify the calling of a Security Council meeting earlier

#### 87

than the date now proposed for adjournment? I am not talking of hypothetical incidents. At the last meeting I referred to the Chaknot incident. This story was built up to justify bringing the case to the Security Council in January. At the time the Military Observer Group squarely laid the blame on Pakistan for creating the tension. On this occasion also we are confident that the United Nations Military Observers will give their verdict on the present series of incidents as well.

This is the second point that I want to make clear. Pakistan's allegation is that we are aggravating the situation by trying to integrate the State of Jammu and Kashmir. We have clearly explained to the Council and I do so once again that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and we are not prepared to accept the right either of Pakistan or of the Security Council to put an injunction against our sovereign right t make whatever constitutional changes we may consider necessary in a part of our own territory. That is the position and I must make it clear lest there by any misunderstanding particularly after the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan.

Intervening in the debate for the second time, Mr. B.N. Chakravarty said: I made my statement to remove all possibilities of misunderstanding. We have done nothing to change the situation on the ceasefire line and I do not have to give any undertaking on that. If however, it is necessary I do so now. We have not done anything and we will not do anything.

At the same time, in fairness to myself and in fairness to the Security Council I cannot give an assurance that we will not proceed with the constitutional processes which we may consider necessary in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, because it is entirely an internal affair of ours and let it not be made a ground for complaint later that despite the appeal India did not do this or that.

# INDIA USA PAKISTAN MOROCCO CHINA BRAZIL

**Date** : Mar 01, 1964

# **Volume No**

1995

# INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B.N. Chakravarty's Letters to the President of the Security Council

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed the following letter to the President of the Security Council on March 8, 1964 with regard to the postponement of the discussion on Kashmir:

With reference to the letter of the Permanent

Representative of Pakistan dated 4 March 1964 (document S/5576) addressed to you, I have the honour to state as follows:

In the Pakistan representative's letter it is stated that at the 1093rd meeting of the Security Council held on 17 February, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan had requested the Council to grant a few days postponement of the discussion on Kashmir, to enable him to have consultations with his Government and that the Security Council had granted an adjournment for a limited time. This latter statement is not borne out by the verbatim record of the proceedings of the Council meeting on the date.

It will be recalled that on 17 February, the Pakistan representative had requested the Security Council "to grant a few days postponement of this debate and meeting to enable us to have more time for reflection" and "to have consultations with my Government". The representative of India in opposing the suggestion that the debate should be adjourned for a short time had said among other things: "We are in your hands, Mr. President. You are the ultimate arbiter of the procedures of this body, but I have a right to protest against the way Pakistan seeks to treat India in this matter. It suits the convenience of the representative of Pakistan to go to Pakistan for a few days and come back. It does not suit me. After all, it is a question of convenience, the convenience of both parties should be considered. Therefore, I strongly oppose any suggestion that this debate should be adjourned for a short time. I am ready to sit here today, tomorrow and they day after tomorrow, and conclude these proceedings." Thereafter, despite the Indian delegation's readiness to be available so that the proceedings of the Council should reach a conclusion, on a motion by the representative of Morocco, the Council adjourned sine die under sub-paragraph 2 of rule 33.

It is also clear from the record that the President of the Council in putting the proposal of the representative of Morocco for adjournment under rule 33(2) observed as follows: "As President I have to say that if there is no objection to the proposal, the meeting will stand adjourned. I think it proper for me, in saying that, to recall that the item is on the Council's agenda and has been for a long time. I would add that under the rules of procedure, the President or any member of the Council may, at any time,

88

call for a meeting on this question. Since I hear no objection I take it that the Council is in agreement and I declare the meeting adjourned".

I am constrained to refer to the relevant portion of the verbatim record of the 1093rd meeting, because of the wrong impression that might, be created by the letter of the Pakistan Permanent Representative, that an adjournment was granted by the Council for "a limited time". This was not so. If the adjournment had been for a limited period the Council would have adjourned under rule 33(3) of the rule of procedure and not under rule 33(2) as it actually happened; and if the motion for adjournment had been under rule 33(3) there would have been an opportunity for debate as to what the "limited time" should be. On the contrary, as you will recall, the motion for adjournment under rule 33(2) had, in accordance with the rule, to be put immediately to the vote without any discussion. Therefore, it is clear that the adjournment of the Council was sine, die.

It is the Government of India's understanding that in the circumstances in which the Council adjourned, any further meeting has to be for substantial reasons and after a judgment is made by the members of the Council as to the necessity or desirability of any such meeting. No such reasons have been furnished in the Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter.

If any meeting of the Council is to be reconvened, obviously this has to be done with due regard to the convenience of both parties and not of only one party, namely, Pakistan in this case. The Government of India feel that as shown by the representative of India in the Security Council, there, was really no justification for Pakistan calling a meeting of the Council in early February. There is still less justification for reconvening the meeting now as there is no question of any danger to international peace, nor has anything happened during the less than three weeks that have elapsed since the adjournment of the Council. The present application of Pakistan has not the slightest justification. It would be unfortunate if Pakistan was allowed at its own sweet will and convenience and for its own reasons, external or internal, to call a meeting of the Security Council, to have a meeting of the Council adjourned, or to have a resumption of the meeting of the Council in disregard of the Council's convenience and the convenience of the other party viz. India.

The Government of India fully recognise that the President of the Council or any member of the Council is empowered to call a meeting on any matter which is borne on the agenda , of the Council. At the same time, they strongly feel, that this right should be:, exercised fairly and reasonably after full consideration of the desirability and the utility of such meetings and of the convenience of all Parties concerned. They would therefore hope that the Security Council will not be rushed into holding a meeting on the basis of the, letter addressed by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to you and that they would take the convenience and point of view of India into the fullest consideration.

I shall be glad to make myself available for any consultation that you or the members of the Council may wish to have with me in this regard, and I am instructed by my Government to say that they will be unable to participate in an appropriate way in any meetings of the Council before the end of the current budget session of the Indian Parliament which is expected to end by the beginning of May next.

Shri B. N. Chakravarty addressed the following letter to the Security Council President on March 20, 1964 in reply to Pakistan Foreign Minister's misleading interpretation of Prime Minister Nehru's statement in Parliament :

I have been instructed by my Government to refer to the letter dated 19 March 1964 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan addressed to you relating to an answer given by the Prime Minister of India to a question put to him in the Indian Parliament (document S/5612). It is regrettable that the Foreign Minister did not care to ascertain the facts before sending in this letter to you.

I have the honour to attach a full text of the question and answers from the verbatim record of the proceedings in the Indian Parliament. As will be seen from this text, the Foreign Minister has given a distorted picture and has placed a misleading construction upon the Prime Minister's observations in the Indian Parliament. The Prime Minister of India categorically said that India was not prepared to cross the ceasefire line to attack territory under occupation of Pakistan and that it was not our policy to cross the cease-fire line. The obvious meaning of his answer to interpellations in Parliament is that India will scrupulously observe the ceasefire line contrary to what Pakistan has been doing but that if India is attacked by Pakistan, then she reserves the right to defend herself even if such defence should involve a crossing of the ceasefire line.

What the Prime Minister has said is nothing new, has been said many times in the past and

#### 89

is entirely in accordance with international law.

Pakistan has tried to mislead the Council in order to hide its own sinister designs and flagrant violations of the ceasefire line that have been engineered by Pakistan, particularly during the last few months.

As will be recalled, the ceasefire line in the State of Jammu and Kashmir was brought into being through the Karachi Agreement of 29 July 1949 between the military representatives of India and Pakistan. That Agreement stands and the ceasefire line is a reality. The ceasefire line is under continuous supervision by a large number of United Nations Observers provided for under the Karachi Agreement. This line cannot be questioned or regarded as obsolete unless the Karachi Agreement is denounced.

The bellicose intentions of Pakistan are made clear in the Pakistani Foreign Minister's letter which says :

"My Government desires to inform the Security Council that we consider it our urgent duty to take whatever measures may become necessary to counter this threat promptly and

### effectively."

There is no threat from India to the ceasefire line, nor can any such inference be drawn from the statement of my Prime Minister.

Following is full text of questions and answers from the verbatim record of the proceedings of Indian Parliament on March 18, 1964 :

Shri P. R. Chakravarty : May I know whether it is a fact that Pakistan authorities are encouraging the raids with arms, booties carried by them from India and a reward of Rs. 100 for each Indian head taken by them and, if so, whether the United Nations Observers have been acquainted with these ugly facts to convey to the United Nations Headquarters, where Pakistan has admirers, to sponsor her case?

Shri Y. B. Chavan : I have no information about any bribe, but certainly this information can be made use of.

Shri Hem Barua : In view of this mounting Pakistani intransigence, shooting, arson, loot and all that and the offering of Rs. 100 per Indian head, may I enquire from the Hon. Prime Minister if he is prepared to tell the UNO that they must defend the Cease-fire Line and if they fail to do so, it will be our painful duty to violate the Cease-fire Line and occupy by force the so-called Azad Kashmir and withdraw the Kashmir case from the UNO?

Prime Minister : No, I am not prepared to say all that.

Shri Hem Barua : Why not? May I submit, Sir, that he has not replied to the first part of my question ? From January 1963 to March 1964, there have been as many as 52 cases of violation of the Cease-fire Line, and yet he is not prepared to say something in order to defend the national prestige. (Interruptions)

Speaker: Why should the Hon. Member, Shri Bade, interrupt? Shri Hem Barua is strong enough to put his case forward. (Interruptions). It is well known that Shri Hem Barua can defend himself very effectively.

Shri Bade : That means that Government can-

not defend our territory.....

Prime Minister : It is obvious that it is the duty of our people to defend our territory and to prevent anybody from coming across the Cease fire Line, and that is being performed. Occasionally, they do come over, and they do create mischief, but they are always driven back.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath : They create more than mischief.

Shri Hem Barua : It is a regular campaign.

Prime Minister : I know that there is a regular campaign.

Speaker : His question is whether in view of those violations which are usually committed there-and he was given a large number-we shall be advised to just tell the UNO that if they cannot protect the Cease-fire Line, we shall have to take some steps for that purpose.

Prime Minister : That is what I have said that we are not prepared to go across the Cease-fire Line and attack the territory under the occupation of Pakistan.

Shri Hem Barua : Is he prepared to tell the UNO like that because Pakistan understands the language of force ?

Speaker : Order, order. I have repeated his question already.

Prime Minister : No, obviously, if it becomes necessary in defence of our territory for them to cross the Line, they will cross it, but that is not a policy .... But that is not a policy.... (interruptions).

# 90

INDIA USA PAKISTAN MOROCCO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Mar 01, 1964

# Volume No

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

#### Shri Natwar Singh's Statement on Southern Rhodesia

Shri K. Natwar Singh, Indian Representative, made the following statement on Southern Rhodesia in the U.N. Committee of Twentyfour on March 9, 1964 :

The question of Southern Rhodesia is one of the most urgent problems before the United Nations and the Special Committee of Twentyfour. A majority of the members of this Committee are, therefore, rightly exercised about the grave and potentially dangerous situation in that part of Africa. The Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, which met recently at Lagos, Nigeria, addressed themselves to the Southern Rhodesian question and were greatly disturbed by the situation prevailing there. My delegation was naturally anxious that the Committee take up the discussion on the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Southern Rhodesia as a matter of priority.

As I said on Friday, 6 March, we had all looked forward to the statement of the United Kingdom delegation. That statement came as a major disappointment. We have studied it with the respect it deserves, and it is not the kind of statement that is likely to satisfy anyone, least of all those of us who believe that the United Kingdom has the sole and final responsibility in matters relating to the affairs of Southern Rhodesia so long as the Territory does not achieve the goal laid down in resolution 1514 (XV).

The representative of the United Kingdom in his statement on 6 March once again confronted this Committee with the United Kingdom position that

"...the United Nations has no authority to intervene in the affairs of Southern Rhodesia. My delegation maintains its position on this issue."

This view of the United Kingdom Government

has been categorically rejected not only by this Committee and its predecessor, the Committee of Seventeen, but also by the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly. Resolution 1747 (XVI) has clearly stated that the territory of Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. This view is shared by almost all the members of this Committee and of the United Nations, as was clearly evident from the vote that was taken in the Fourth Committee last year when that Committee adopted the resolution which the General Assembly, by 90 votes in favour to 2 against, with 13 abstentions, later adopted as resolution 1883 (XVIII). The delegation which did not vote in favour of that resolution were the delegations of Portugal and South Africa--and here I might add that we did not envy the United Kingdom in its being able to secure the support of only these two countries, in this particular case. The United Kingdom delegation did not participate in the vote in the Fourth Committee on this resolution, but the representative of the administering authority had cast his negative vote in the Security Council on the very same resolution which had been sponsored by the delegations of Ghana, Morocco and the Philippines. Had that resolution been accepted by the United Kingdom Government, we have no doubt that the situation in Southern Rhodesia would not have come to such a, state of crisis.

In the debate in the Security Council in this matter, the representative of the United Kingdom, stated on 9 September 1963, at the 1064th meeting of the Council :

"In the view of my delegation, the insistence by the delegation of Ghana on the consideration of the item on the provisional agenda today represents an abuse of the functions of the Council."

The representative of the United Kingdom continued :

"It is certainly a matter of great regret to my Government that the Ghanian delegation has contrived to persuade itself in an opposite sense and that it should be seeking to persuade this Council to diagnose the steps we are endeavouring to take towards a solution of the problems of Central Africa as amounting to a threat to the peace. Such a contention has, in my submission, no merit in law or in commonsense. My delegation believes that steady progress has been and is being made in that part of the world, and we have reason to think that this is widely understood, not least in Africa. We are greatly concerned lest this debate at this time should adversely affect this progress and that the initiative which has been taken by the sponsors of this item should produce results which would be precisely the opposite, as far as I can see, to those which they intend."

Now, let us pause and examine briefly this statement of the representative of the United Kingdom. It is not for me to try to evaluate the statement he made. His delegation is at liberty to express its views as to whether what we do at the United Nations or in the Security Council or in this Committee is an abuse of the functions of these bodies or whether it has any

#### 91

merit in law or in commonsense. As George Bernard Shaw put it in the mouth of Napoleon in his play, "Man of destiny" :

"There is nothing so bad or so good that you will not find an Englishman doing it; but you will never find an Englishman in the wrong. He does everything on principle. He fights you on patriotic principles; he robs you on business principles; he enslaves you on imperial principles; he bullies you on manly principles; he supports his King on royal principles. His watchword is always Duty; and he never forgets that the nation which lets its duty get on the opposite side to its interest is lost."

What I do wish to refer to is that portion of the statement in the Council where the United Kingdom representative stated that his delegation believed that steady progress was being made in Southern Rhodesia and that there was wide awareness of this even in Africa. This Committee and my delegation would be entitled to know something about this so-called "steady progress". Has the United Kingdom delegation accepted the view held by the United Nations that Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory : Have they made a categorical statement that power will not be transferred to the White racist minority?

Except for a mysterious declaration by the United Kingdom Government that it would be prepared to grant independence to Southern Rhodesia in the same circumstances as they have granted it to other British territories, we have nothing positive to go by. We have also been told that they were looking for a widening of the franchise so as to cover representation of Africans who constituted nine-tenths of the population but have less than a quarter of the seats in the Southern Rhodesian Parliament. We do not know what has transpired between Mr. Winston Field and the United Kingdom Ministers, but from document A/AC. 109/L. 99 of 4 March 1964, it appears that no substantial changes seem to be contemplated as far as the broadening of the franchise is concerned. Even in the 6 March statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, no fresh light was shed on this aspect. All that we were told was that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom had stated in the House of Commons on 27 February that :

"He would wish to see a negotiated settlement of this matter. The present constitution contains the principle of majority rule. It is a matter of timing."

With all due, respect, this is an extraordinary statement. Taking into account the present-day reality of Southern Rhodesia and the peculiarities of the A and B rolls, the means very little indeed if it means anything at all as far as the principle of "one man one vote is concerned. We agree with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom when hie says that "It is a matter of timing". The only difference between his approach and ours is that we have different conceptions of what this timing should be. The vast majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia are not going to wait indefinitely, especially at a time when the fires of freedom and independence are being lit all over Africa. Resolution 1514 (XV) has, to be implemented and implemented immediately. To that we are committed and there can be no going back.

Therefore, the United Kingdom Government has yet to make a categorical and unequivocal

statement that power will not be transferred to the White minority government. Hence, the position remains as it was some months ago and it would be fair to pose several questions to my United Kingdom colleagues.

Have they declared that fresh elections will be held on the basis of universal adult suffrage? Have they announced the calling of A fresh constitutional conference in which the undoubtedly complicated and difficult problems of this Non-Self-Governing Territory could be hammered out? All that we bear repeatedly is that there is a long-standing convention and that it is not possible for the United Kingdom Government to interfere in the affairs of Southern Rhodesia although Sir Garfield Todd, a former Prime Minister of the territory, would have us believe otherwise. Now, as far as we are aware, none of the steps or measures that I have mentioned above have been undertaken by the United Kingdom Government. On the other band, repressive legislation continues to darken the lives of the people of Southern Rhodesia. The Government of Mr. Winston Field continues to pass one lawless law after another and under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act. African nationalists are being fined. arrested, banished, and African political parties are banned.

The Southern Rhodesian Government is ruthlessly crushing African nationalism and is assuming extraordinary powers. According to the latest reports available, repressive measures have been directed against Mr. Nkomo and the People's Caretaker Council. The Council has been banned from holding meetings anywhere. and Mr. Nkomo himself is banned from entering any reserve. and is prevented from coming within fifteen miles of Salisbury. Every effort of Mr. Nkomo to register persons supporting him has been prohibited and the possession of blank cards has been forbidden under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act. About 100 persons have been arrested and detained without trial for an indefinite period. Extraordinary powers have

#### 92

been given to the Police to use force even against women and children, and the Minister of Justice has threatened to introduce legislation to make the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act even more severe.

Mr. Winston Field declared in the Southern Rhodesian Parliament on 26 February that: "The honeymoon is over. It is our task to keep order. We shall do so. We shall use, all the power we have." These powers are awarded to the White minority by itself under the notorious Law and Order (Maintenance) Act. It is under this notorious law that Mr. Richard Mapolisa has been sentenced to death. Even while the eighteenth session of the General Assembly was on, on 12 December 1963, Mr. Benoni Sibanda became the second man in the colony of Southern Rhodesia to be sentenced to death under the mandatory "Hanging Clause" of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act. He was sentenced to death by Justice Dendy Young in the Bulawyo High Court for throwing a petrol bomb into a house in an African township last August. In Salisbury three Africans--Alexander Gendhawu, Kassiano Muringwa, and Simon Runyowa--are being tried under the same clause. It is alleged that they attempted to set fire to a house in an African township, with a paraffin bomb. The bomb did not explode, having landed on an unoccupied cot.

This information is available in this Committee's communication No. 468 of 17 December 1963. Even here, the United Kingdom Government, as- far as we know, has not used the prerogative of mercy. And here I should like to quote a letter published in the Spectator, an English weekly, of 28 February 1964, written by R. M. Serpell of Corpus Christi College Oxford :

"I should like to draw to the attention of your readers the information presented by Mr. Palley of the University of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (in a recent letter to The Times) concerning the constitutional position of the British Government in relation to the prerogative of mercy in Southern Rhodesia. The importance of this position attaches at the moment to the case of Richard Mapolisa, who was condemned last year to death for being party to an unsuccessful petrol bomb attack, under section 4 of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Amendment Act, 1963, known as the 'Hanging Bill'.

"Not only was Mapolisa only indirectly involved in the attack, but the total extent of the actual damage caused by the attack runs to one broken window, a burnt hole in a lounge carpet, and a small bum on the hand of the Householder, who threw the burning petrol bomb into his garden. In passing sentence the Judge made the following statement : The Legislature has seen fit to take away from the Court any discretion in a case such as the present. I am therefore obliged to pass sentence of death'. An appeal to the Federal Supreme Court was disnussed on December 16 last year, leaving open only the right of appeal to the Privy Council, the body responsible for introducing the law providing for mandatory hanging.

"It appears that the constitution of the Southern Rhodesian Legislative Assembly prohibits it from amending the constitutional provisions dealing with the prerogative of mercy. These provisions at present state that the Governor may only exercise the prerogative of mercy on the advice of the Governor's Council, i.e. the Southern Rhodesian Cabinet. The British Crown, however, has authority within the Constitution to amend, add to, or alter the provisions. In other words, without breach of convention either an Order in Council or an Act of Parliament in this country could contain provisions governing the exercise of the prerogative of mercy. This means that Britain is really constitutionally responsible, at this stage, for deciding whether the provisions of the 'Hanging Act' are to be implemented in this case or not, since one can hardly expect the Southern Rhodesian Cabinet to rescind the sentence of the first man to be sentenced under an act which they so deliberately introduced.

"So much discussion has centred in recent months around the justifiability of British intervention in the internal politics of Southern Rhodesia that the presence of such a crucial case where intervention is constitutionally unambiguously provided for comes as something of a surprise. Terrorism of any sort is abhorrent to the civilized world, and petrol bomb attacks on white settlers in Southern Rhodesia need be no exception : but that a man should be condemned to hang for his participation in an attack which eventuated in a slightly burnt hand surely smacks of the same sort of this distorted set of values as that behind political terrorism. Isn't this just the kind of anomalous occurrence that discretionary powers are designed to present?"

So, Sir, there is scant respect not only for the wishes and aspirations of the indigenous people, but, as this letter shows, also for their lives.

May we appeal to the United Kingdom Government to exercise its prerogative of mercy and save the lives of these victims of the mandatory 93

"Hanging Clause," of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, or will this also be considered an interference in the internal affairs of the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Southern Rhodesia!

Mr. Clifford Dupont, the Colony's Minister of Law and Order, speaking in Salisbury on 28 February 1964, said that "Law and Order is to be maintained at all costs, and it may be in the course of this that some people may get hurt". I need hardly emphasize that the people who will get hurt are the indigenous inhabitants and not the members of the white minority.

On the same day Mr. Dupont made the following offensive remarks :

"They"--that is, the leaders of the indigenous people in Southern Rhodesia--"have not got the brains. It is a carefully planned campaign of our enemies, and not only of our enemies but the enemies of constitutional government and western civilization, whose only aim is the elimination of the white man from Africa."

All that I can say is that it is doubtful if Mr. Dupont knows what the words "constitutional government" and "western civilization" really mean.

The situation in Southern Rhodesia has continued to grow from bad to worse because the United Kingdom Government has played a passive role and turned a blind eye to the excesses of the white minority Government. If at the very beginning it had acted with firmness and imagination and informed the white minority Government that it could not ride roughshod over the wishes of the vast majority of people, it could have halted the march to disaster in the Colony; but for reasons best known to itself, it elected not to do so.

The Field Government is after all a British creation. All this time the United Kingdom Government has leaned backwards to accommodate Mr. Field and the white minority. All along it has ignored the African ethos. At each stage, the United Kingdom Government, as far as one can see, has given in to the white minority. The latest example is the statement of the Commonwealth Relations and Colonial Secretary. On 11 February 1964, in reply to a question concerning a reported decision that the United Kingdom Government would henceforth refrain officially from referring to Southern Rhodesia as a colony, Mr. Duncan Sandys said:

"We usually try to avoid as far as possible the use of the word 'Colony' when referring to Territories which have reached an adversed stage of internal self-government. There is no constitutional significance. Mr. Field drew my attention to the fact that we had on some occasions departed from this practice in respect of Southern Rhodesia. I assured him that if that was so, it was unintentional."

The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations and Colonies, Mr. Duncan Sandys has in a few words attempted to change the constitutional status of Southern Rhodesia,. The 1923 Constitution, on which the United Kingdom delegation lays so much store, defines the status of Southern Rhodesia in the following words-and I quote from the official publication of Her Majesty's Stationery Office entitled "The Constitutions of All Countries Vol. 1, the British Empire", page 345, paragraph 2 of which reads :

"And whereas by an Order in our Privy Council bearing date the 30th day of July 1923, and known as The Southern Rhodesia (Annexation) Order in Council, 1923', it is provided that the Territories within the limits of The Southern Rhodesia Order in Council, 1898', and known as 'Southern Rhodesia', shall, from and after the coming into operation of the said Order, be annexed to and form part of our dominions, and shall be known as 'the Colony of Southern Rhodesia'." Even the constitution of the now defunct Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland defines Southern Rhodesia as a Colony in its preamble. The dissolution of the Federation does not alter the status of Southern Rhodesia, which continues to remain a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

The responsibility for the present grave situation in Southern Rhodesia must be placed squarely at the door of the United Kingdom. This Committee and various other superior organs of this Organization have repeatedly warned the United Kingdom and indicated the methods by which the situation could be improved in Southern Rhodesia. Not only have our pleas gone unheeded, but we have, on the other hand, been accused of lacking in commonsense and of abusing the functions of these bodies.

The situation at present is that Mr. Field and his colleagues in the white minority Government continue to bring pressure on the United Kingdom Government to grant independence. Mr. Winston Field, speaking in the debate on the Speech from the Throne in the Southern Rhodesian Parliament, is reported to have stated that if Southern Rhodesia's membership in the Commonwealth impeded its progress to independence, then Commonwealth membership must go. Does this mean that the non-self-governing territory of Southern Rhodesia can unilaterally sever its relationship to the Crown, even before it is granted independence? Or is this also part of the special relationship and constitutional convention that is supposed to exist between the United Kingdom and the colony?

#### 94

What we would. like to know is : what does the British Government propose to do in the event of a unilateral declaration of independence by Mr. Field and the white minority Government? That Mr. Field and his Government have this in mind is indicated by the statement made by the Governor of Southern Rhodesia in the Speech from the Throne in the Southern Rhodesian Parliament, when he stated :

"My Prime Minister"--that is, Mr. Field--"had the opportunity last month of having personal and private discussions with the British Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Commonwealth relations on the independence of Southern Rhodesia. It is now plain that the British Government is not prepared to be brought to any conclusion except on the most extravagant terms; not because of misgivings about my government's competence or ability to govern 'in the interests of the country or the logic and rightness of my Ministers' case, but because they wish to placate at all costs those members of the Commonwealth who have declared openly their hostility to my Government and the country.

"My Ministers consider they have done their utmost and there is no obligation upon them to initiate further discussions."

As if this was not enough, Mr. Winston Field went a step further on 26 February 1964 when, speaking in the Southern Rhodesian Parliament, he stated

"My Government affirms that it does not recognize the right of anyone to interfere in the affairs of Southern Rhodesia. Nor will it tolerate any such interference.

"From now onward we shall pursue our course within the framework of the Southern Rhodesia Constitution and will act in all respects as a government owing allegiance to the Crown.

"I want to stress our allegiance to the Crown and not to any particular British Government."

The implications and ramifications of a statement of this kind are certainly ominous, and we have no doubt that constitutional experts in the United Kingdom will find some answer to Mr. Field's novel idea of owing allegiance to the British Crown and not to the British Government. This is not possible so long as Southern Rhodesia is not granted independence by the United Kingdom Government.

What we are here concerned with is the possibility of Mr. Field declaring Southern Rhodesia as independent. This is no longer a hypothetical issue, but it may become a reality any day. This is quite evident from an article that appeared in The Times of London on Friday, 6 Match 1964, in which it was gated that already an effort is being made to introduce an item in the debate saying that no interference In the affairs of Southern Rhodesia will be tolerated and that they were going to declare independence unilaterally. It is a long article, and I will not take the time of the Committee to quote it, but if the members are interested, they can see this particular article which fortifies aft I have been saying that the grave danger of a unilateral declaration of independence by the Field Government is imminent, and this is what is a source of great concern to us all.

How serious the situation is was indicated by Mr. Tom Mboya, Kenya's Minister of Justice, who, according to The Times of London of 27 February stated in Nairobi on 26 February that :

"Kanu must draw attention to the harm that can be done to relations between the African people and the British Commonwealth if Britain failed to uphold lawful authority in Southern Rhodesia."

Mr. Mboya continued:

"Whereas harmony and good relations are being established between Africans and the people of immigrant races in other parts of East and Central Africa, any attempt to impose white settler rule in Southern Rhodesia will undermine a lot of goodwill generated and achievements already made in this field."

Mr. Mboya also warned that any attempt to impose A white Government on Southern Rhodesia will jeopardize the position of white settlers in the African-ruled States of East and Central Africa, and said that Southern Rhodesia might provide the first test case of British willingness to use troops for upholding its authority over white settlers.

That is the crux of the problem. Will or will not the United Kingdom Government use force in the event of a unilateral declaration of independence by Mr. Field ? Such an act on Mr. Field's part must surely constitute, according to British constitutional practice, an act of rebellion against the Crown. Independence can be granted under the Westminster form of democracy only by an act of Parliament. My delegation would like to suggest that the United Kingdom Government should quite categorically and once and for all inform the Field Government that under no circumstances will independence be. granted to Southern Rhodesia under present conditions. The granting of independence must follow and not precede the granting of full and equal rights to all the inhabitants of the territory, irrespective of their colour and creed.

#### 95

Even if for a moment we were to grant that the United Kingdom did not have the constitutional and legal authority, even then the United Kingdom Government has the moral responsibility to see that fair play and justice are not ignored in Southern Rhodesia. But, as I have stated earlier, we do not accept the view that the United Kingdom has no constitutional and legal authority. Moreover, the United Kingdom Government is committed to the concept of majority rule, and this commitment was made by Sir Alexander Douglas-Home in the General Assembly during the eighteenth session when he stated :

"If my Government is to be attacked for taking, scrupulous care to build societies in which majorities rule, but in which, and this is the essence of democracy, minorities are safeguarded then Sir Patrick Dean and I will stand in the dock with our heads high."

The tragedy of British policy in Southern Rhodesia is that this "scrupulous care to build societies in which the majorities rule" is nowhere to be found. The United Kingdom may well ponder this statement of Sir Alexander Douglas-Home by comparing their policy in Southern Rhodesia on the one hand and their policy in British Guiana on the other. In Southern Rhodesia, minorities will rule and majorities will have no protection. In British Guiana, the majority is not to be granted independence, even though a majority Government elected through universal adult suffrage has every expectation to be granted independence. No, as far as the British are concerned they believe, that if they win they win, but if they lose then also they win.

What can this Committee suggest to assist the

United Kingdom Government in its undoubtedly difficult task and also to ensure that the objectives of resolutions 1514 (XV), 1654 (XVI), 1810 (XVII), 1956 (XVIII), 1747 (XVI), 1755 (XVII), 1760 (XVII), 1883 (XVIII) and 1889 (XVIII), and the resolutions adopted by the thirty-two African States in Adis Ababa last May are fulfilled? The United Kingdom Government is forever telling the world that they believe in moderation and in constitutional methods. We suggest that they announce the holding of a constitutional conference on Southern Rhodesia and that they invite not only the representatives of the Field Government but of the African nationalists as well. The threat of a demand for independence by Mr. Field's Government should he sufficient reason for the calling of a fullfledged constitutional conference by the British Government. and my delegation is not convinced by the arguments sometimes heard that the Field Government would refuse to attend such a conference.

At this conference, a new democratic constitution could be hammered out so that the undemocratic constitution of 1961 could be scraped and fresh elections held on the basis of universal adult suffrage. If the intransigence of Mr. Field continues the British Government should make it quite clear that the United Kingdom Government would immediately freeze, in respect of Southern Rhodesia, all foreign reserves, withdraw imperial preferences, withdraw loan guarantees. The United Kingdom Government should also inform Mr. Field that his Government could expect no military, technical, financial or political support from the United Kingdom after a unilateral declaration of independence.

Mr. Field should have no illusions on that score. If the United Kingdom would take decisive steps of this nature and, as I said earlier, they have the responsibility to do so, we have no doubt that the Field Government would not adopt the tone and postures which it is now adopting. Here I would like to quote what Ambassador Yates of the United States said in this Committee on 25 March 1963. He said

"Because of its continued responsibility and relationship in regard to Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom is the natural agent to play such a role. We said so last October. We still say so and we urge the United Kingdom to exert its efforts in this direction. Especially we urge the United Kingdom to apply its special influence regardless of what its legal authority may be....".

This is not the first time that the United Kingdom Government is facing difficult and complicated problems in the colonies. They have sufficient experience of matters of this kind. and we are confident that they will find a solution in Southern Rhodesia which will be in keeping with their age old traditions of democracy. Failure to do so would lead to the most appalling and serious consequences and would be a serious blemish on the record of the United Kingdom in the field of decolonization.

There is yet another aspect of the situation which causes us great concern and distress. This is the unending leashing of repressive measures in the territory. These measures should be immediately withdrawn and all political prisoners must be released unconditionally so that normal political activity can take place in the territory, because in the present restrictive and repressive atmosphere there can be no hope of peaceful settlement.

My delegation shares the sentiments expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom

#### 96

in his concluding remarks at our meeting on Friday last. He concluded his statement by the following words: "Peace and orderly development in Southern Rhodesia are at stake. It is my Government's belief that the problem will be approached by all concerned with prudence, wisdom and restraint." We would go even further. Peace and orderly development are at stake not only in Southern Rhodesia, but in the whole of Southern Africa. The responsibility of the United Kingdom Government is paramount. If they act with foresight and boldness, they can still save the situation and thus earn the goodwill and friendship of millions of people in Africa and the rest of the world. But if they fail to carry out what they profess, that is the rule of the majorities with safeguards for minorities, then they shall have sown the seeds of unrest and discord in Southern Rhodesia for years to come, and by doing so they shall have misjudged the temper of the times and shall have read history in vain.

# INDIA USA NIGER NIGERIA PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA GHANA MOROCCO PHILIPPINES CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM KENYA

**Date** : Mar 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

IRAN

Three-year Trade Agreement Signed

A long-term three-year trade agreement between India and Iran was signed in Tehran on March 11, 1964. Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of International Trade, signed on behalf of India and H.E. Dr. Ali-Naqi Alikhani, Minister of Economy of the Imperial Government of Iran, signed on behalf of his Government. Letters were also exchanged in regard to the arrangement for the first year of the Agreement under which certain commodities like petroleum products, dates, dry fruits, asafoetida from Iran and tea, jute goods, engineering goods, industrial machinery, instrumentation, chemicals and pharmaceuticals etc. from India are to be exchanged.

The overall volume of trade between the two countries is expected to be of the order of about Rs. 600 million annually with an expected increase of about 10 to 15 per cent a year.

Under the agreement, India and Iran will also exchange business delegations on specific commodities of mutual interest so that trade between the two countries It expanded further. The two countries will also collaborate on programmes of technical economic cooperation in setting up industrial ventures in the two countries with joint corporations of entrepreneurs of Governments of the two countries.

The agreement also provides for extending training facilities to the experts and technicians of technical exchange, a number of technicians available in different institutions and industries of the two countries.

It is hoped that as a result of this programme of technical exchange, a number of technicians of the two countries will receive the benefits of training and expertise in different fields of science and technology.

IRAN INDIA USA

**Date** : Mar 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Migration of Christian Refugees from East Pakistan

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in Rajya Sabha on March 2, 1964 regarding the migration of Christian Refugees from East Pakistan into Assam:

The House is aware that an unprecedented influx of Hindu and Christian refugees is taking place into the Garo hills listrict from the Mymensingh district of East Pakistan. It is known that this exodus from East Pakistan into Assam began on January 1-- 1964, and that the total number of refugeemen, women and

#### 97

children who have so far crossed over into Assam is about 52,238. Of this number, an estimated 35,000 are Christian families who belong to the Garo tribe. The reason for this exodus is that these Hindu and Christian members of the minority community in East Pakistan have been compened to leave their ancestral homes due to organised large-scale. looting, arson, kidnapping and forcible occupation of their lands by the members of the majority community with the connivance of the Pakistan Police and the village Defence Corps known as 'Ansars'.

The gravity of this mass movement of the minority population from East Pakistan has been brought out clearly by the recent visit by Indian and Foreign Correspondents to the Garo hills district in Assam where they met refugees and Foreign Missionaries who are looking after them. Father Buccieri, an Italian Missionary, is reported to have told the correspondents that according to the figures he had collected on the basis of identification cards filled up by the refugees themselves, on their arrival in camps, 20,000 of the Garos who had crossed into India were Roman Catholics. Two of the American Baptist Missionaries, Reverend Julius Downs and Reverend James Wood stated that 15,000 of the refugees were Baptists. The correspondents also learnt, at first hand, of East Pakistan Rifles opening fire on a batch of defenceless Garo refugees fleeing into Assam on February 6, 1964. Dr. M. Hussain, Sub-divisional Health and Medical Officer of Tura, showed them the bullets taken from the heads of the two children who were killed. Dr. Hussain informed the correspondents that 7 men, 4 women and 2 children were brought to the hospital from the border outpost of Dalu on the night of February 7, and that 6 of them had bullet injuries and the others had received injuries inflicted by spears and lathi blows. The refugees stated that the total number of persons who were attempting to cross the border was about 3,000 but only 1,500 managed to cross the border near the Indian post of Dalu, 33 miles south-west of Tura. The others who are continuing to cross the border into Assam consist of the Hojong, Banai, Koche, Rajbansi and Dalu tribes. All the refugees who have crowd into the Garo hills district, are from the live Thanas of Nalta Bari, Sribordi, Halvaghat, Durgapur and Kamlakanda in the Mymensingh district of East Pakistan.

The Government of India in their Note dated February 13, 1964, presented to the

Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi, protested to the Government of Pakistan at me shooting of the helpless refugees fleeing from persecution in East Pakistan. Though Pakistan has not acknowledged the occurrence of this barbarous act, the Pakistan Foreign Minister has had to contradict the reported statement of Khan A. Sabur Khan, Pakistan Central Minister of Communications, that "there is no truth in the Indian Press reports that Christians living in East Pakistan had started fleeing", by admitting in Dacca, on February 26, that "some exodus" of Christians from Mymensingh district of East Pakistan into Assam had taken place and regretted on behalf of his Government that this "unfortunate exodus" is due to "acts of highhandedness" by Muslims. The President of Pakistan has also admitted the flight of large numbers of Christians from Mymensingh district to India.

The House will recall that the Government of India in their note dated February 1, 1964, presented to the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi, the text of which was placed on the Table of the House on February 11, 1964, by the Union Home Minister, had pointed out clearly to Pakistan its responsibilities for the restoration of communal peace and harmony in East Pakistan. If the leaders and the Government of Pakistan had taken heed of our advice, these minorities would not now be pouring across the Pakistan border into India and Pakistan would not have to speculate whether they would return to their ancestral homes from which they have been forcibly turned out. In a note dated February 29, 1964 delivered to the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi, the Government of India has reiterated that the Pakistan Government should take immediate steps to restore communal harmony in East Pakistan and rehabilitate the minorities.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN **Date :** Mar 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### REPUBLIC OF IRAQ

#### President Arif's State Visit

His Excellency Field Marshal Abdul Salam Mohammed Arif, President of the Republic of Iraq, paid a State visit to India for a week from March 26 to April 1, 1964. The President of

#### 98

India, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan gave a dinner in honour of the Iraqi President at Rashtrapati Bhavan on March 26, 1964.

Welcoming the distinguished guest, Dr. Radhakrishnan said :

Mr. President, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: May I convey to you, Mr. dent, and the members of your party a cordial welcome on behalf of the people, the Government of India and of myself. I hope you will have an interesting time in the few days you spend here.

Baghdad has been known to us for centuries. All great civilisations took their origin on river banks, the Nile, the Ganges, the Tigris and the Euphrates. In the great days of Baghdad City when there was such an outburst of cultural activities, people from this country went to Baghdad, physicians, scholars, scientists, for advancing their knowledge. That connection which we established in matters of spirit and culture still continues. The city itself means the abode of peace. It was built by Caliph Mansur. Peace is an ideal, is something we aim at. It is not an achievement.

He pointed out to us what conditions we should observe if peace is to become a reality. Wise leadership, honest administration, objective vision, welfare for the common people, tolerance for the views of others-these are the essential conditions for the achievement of peace. Many civilisations in this world have crashed because they did not attend to these conditions which make for peace. We ask for peace but we hesitate to implement the conditions which require peace.

Great civilisations in this world on account of lack of probity, lack of honesty in administration, have come to trouble. It is our duty therefore to see to it that these essential conditions are preserved by us and that the people who are entrusted to our care get real conditions for peaceful living.

You, Mr. President, in the few months of your administration there, have been doing your very best to develop industrial progress, educational reform and social advancement. You have increased your budget allotments for education, health and social services. Your one idea seems to be that the people must become happy. Democracy is a commitment to hope, to the advancement of the human race and to the future development of human beings. That is what democracy really means; and if we are truly democratic, our concern should be to preserve the natural resources, promote them, see to it that they are equitably distributed.

These are the ideals which you are attempting to bring about in Iraq today, The way in which you have dealt with the problem of the Kurds gives us hope that you will be able to consolidate your country soon. You were in Cairo as the Head of the Summit Conference of the Arab States and you made out in the final declaration of that conference that resort to physical force should be avoided if we want to live happily in this world. It is my to say that. If we turn around, look at the different states, the way in which we are scattering horror, violence, bitterness in the name of race, religion or political ideology, these are things which make us ask Are we really behaving like human beings?

I heard a report about a will drawn up by a person in South India who made about Rs. 4 lakhs and the will says : this amount will be devoted to the development of veterinary studies. He said : I have lost faith in human beings; I want to give a chance to the animals. Perhaps they may prove better. It only means that we should not give up hope in human nature, that we should avoid this mood of defeatism, this mood of despair which makes us think that things are bad and they cannot be improved. Democracy means a possibility of changing human nature. It has changed and it will change in years to come. There is no doubt about it. If we look at the way in which the human race has progressed from the beginning of its history to today, we know it has changed considerably, changed a number of times, will Change again. That is the hope of the future, the hope of all of us.

Well, we cannot think that religion, race and other things will continue as they are. In the name of religion from the beginning of history, we have committed so many atrocities repugnant to the conscience of man. If religion asks us to hate, it is not a religion. Unless it asks us to love one another and since God is love, any religion which asks us to hate other human beings cannot be regarded as truly religious.

In the name of race we have committed to many atrocities. National bigotry has also demanded its victims. These are things which have come down to us with which we have grown. These things will have to be modified and human nature can modify them and our hope and your hope is that if peace is to be established in this world, these pernicious practices that have come down to us in the name of hoary traditions will have to be altered.

The world is still in its infancy. It has not become even adult. We are now proceeding through that phase. We should try to see to it that when we become adult when we become truly civilised, we behave towards other human beings as human beings. If we enslave other

#### 99

men we are morally involved in that guilt. Unless we are able to develop that kind of conscience we cannot claim to be truly civilised.

It is a matter of great gratification to us that you Mr. President are doing everything in your power to work for this kind of peace in the world, friendship among nations and you have exhorted all your friends to avoid resort to violence. These are the hopes which we all entertain and I do think that with your cooperation and the goodwill of others people we will be able to bring about a new world. That is what we strive for. May I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to drink to the health of the President of Iraq, Field Marshal Arif.

IRAQ INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT **Date** : Mar 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

**REPUBLIC OF IRAQ** 

Reply by President Arif

In his reply the President of Iraq, Field Marshal Abdul Salam Mohammed Arif, stressed the need for people and countries to come closer to one another.

President Arif said that relations between people did not depend on proximity or good communications. If we come closer to each other now, we are building on surer foundations, for our objects are cultural and commercial and more a desire to promote peace and serve humanity.

He recalled the long established traditions of friendship between India and Iraq. These traditions, he said, included not only commerce but traffic in ideas. The merchants of India and her thinkers were coming in large numbers to Baghdad during the Abbaside period. Traders came carrying silk and incense and thinkers came carrying ideas. President Arif thanked the Government and people of India for the warm welcome accorded to him.

IRAQ INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Mar 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### REPUBLIC OF IRAQ

Iraqi President's Speech at Civic Reception

His Excellency, Field Marshal Abdul Salam Mohammed Arif, President of the Republic of Iraq, made the following speech at the civic reception held in his honour at Red Fort on March 27, 1964:

It gives me great pleasure to talk to you in this lovely city and to thank you for the warm reception and kindness which was so generously extended to me by your President, your Government and your people.

This visit brings back to our minds a long and eventful historical period in which our cultural cooperation and contacts between our two scholars had started. This happy contact started during the Abbassids when we exchanged our learnings in philosophy, mathematics and astronomy.

Our children are still reading avidly the books of Kulaila and Dumna, Sindbad and Descent of Adam.

These historical contacts are only a background to a lively picture today of our present cooperation. We hope that our present visit will not only maintain these ties but promote them. And mutual understanding will be more than ever established.

I have been conscious that in this hospitable country you are going through the same period that we in our country are undergoing. We feel, as you do, that we are still in the beginning of our journey to achieve the same objectives and high hopes.

The objective of our government are to establish social and economic justice. Our

main concern is to prepare the right and healthy atmosphere for our people to enjoy the freedom of expression, belief and religion. From the very first day we assumed responsibility, we embarked upon the achievement of these principles. There is no doubt that so far there is a marked progress in this respect. No effort is spared in order to establish a social structure favourable to Achieve, effectively and properly the hopes of our people.

We have invincible belief in the tolerance of our Islamic culture, a tolerance by which the international peace and security can be fulfilled.

Our people are doing their utmost to propagate friendly spirit among all peace loving nations and we believe that we have made a good progress in this regard. A progress well exhibited during the conference of the Arab Heads of States in Cairo which culminated in

#### 100

adopting a unified plan to establish peace and security in the world.

We hope that this visit to your country will achieve a broader cooperation so that we may render good services to the International Society. The world at present suffers from instability and turmoils. This darkens not only the international atmosphere but our internal affairs as well as the. future of our peoples.

Our two Governments have a common policy based on peaceful co-existence and active contribution towards non-alignment and world peace.

May God bless you all.

IRAQ USA EGYPT **Date** : Mar 01, 1964

### **Volume No**

1995

#### RUMANIA

#### Trade between India and Rumania : Letters Exchanged

Letters relating to the trade between Rumania and India during 1964 were signed in New Delhi on March 12, 1964 by Mr. Gheorghe Leonte, General Director in the Ministry of Foreign Trade, and Leader of the Rumanian Delegation, on behalf of his country, and by Shri S. Ramachandran, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of International Trade, for the Government of India.

The two Governments have agreed to extend the validity of the list of commodities enclosed with the Long-term Trade and Payments Agreement signed in Bucharest on November 30, 1962. It is estimated that the total volume of trade each way during 1964 will be of the order of Rs. 70 million as against the actual trade of Rs. 48 million both ways during 1963.

Rumania will import from India during 1964 cotton textiles, jute manufactures, chemical products and pharmaceuticals, rolled steel products, various engineering goods including tools, rubber products, tinned fish and salted fish,' paints. pigments, varnishes, enamel-ware etc. apart from traditional goods like coffee, pepper, vegetable oil, shellac and iron ore.

Rumania will continue to supply to India during 1964, oils prospecting and drilling equipment, capital goods, energetical equipment, earth moving and construction equipment, petroleum products, etc.

INDIA ROMANIA RUSSIA USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1964

# Volume No

#### Indo-Soviet Collaboration for Expansion of Neyveli Thermal Plant

A contract was signed in New Delhi on March 9, 1964 between the Neyveli Lignite Corporation and Technopromexport of U.S.S.R. for the supply of equipment, machinery and materials, worth Rs. 7.75 crores, for the expansion of the capacity of the Neweli Thermal Station from 250 MW to 400 MW. The contract also provides for Soviet technical assistance for erecting and putting into operation the equipment delivered. It will be financed out of the rouble credit extended by U.S.S.R. to India under the Indo-Soviet Agreement of February, 1960.

The contract was signed by Shri Chhedi Lal, Joint Secretary, Department of Mines & Metals and Director of the Neyveli Lignite Corporation, and Mr. N. M. Silouianov, Counsellor for

#### 101

Economic Affairs to the U.S.S.R. Embassy: The signing ceremony was attended by Shri N. C. Shrivastava, Secretary, Department of Mines and Metals, and H.E. Mr. I. A. Benediktov, U.S.S.R. Ambassador to India.

The Neyveli Lignite Corporation, a Government of India undertaking, is at present putting up, with Soviet assistance, a 250 MW Thermal Power Station comprising five units of 50 MW each. Of the five units, four are already, in operation and the fifth 50 MW unit will be commissioned within a month or two.

The Corporation had entered into a contract with Techno-promexport in February, 1963 for the preparation of a detailed project report and working drawings for the expansion of the installed thermal capacity from 250 MW to 400 MW. This project report was received in August, 1963 and accepted by the Corporation.

Under today's contract the delivery of equipment for the sixth 50 MW unit, which will raise the capacity to 300 MW, will begin-during the second quarter and be completed in the third quarter of 1964. The delivery of the seventh 100 MW units, which will take the total capacity to 400 MW, will begin in the first quarter and be completed in the last quarter of 1965. This delivery schedule will enable the sixth unit to be commissioned by March 1965 and the seventh unit by about the end of the Third Plan period. The erection will be done by Indian personnel under the technical supervision and guidance of Soviet specialists. The contract also provides for the training of Indian personnel at U.S.S.R. power enterprises.

The total cost of the expansion of the Neyveli Thermal Station, including rupee expenditure to he incurred on civil works etc. is likely to be of the order of Rs. 18 crores.

With this expansion, the second stage of the Neyveli Power plant will be completed. It is expected that ultimately, this power station will be expanded to a capacity of 600 MW.

INDIA ITALY USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Agreement for Shipping Service Signed

A bilateral Agreement for the establishment of a shipping service between India and the United Arab Republic was signed in New Delhi on March 20, 1964 in the presence of Shri Raj Bahadur, Union Minister of Transport, and His Excellency Ahmed Hassan El-Feki, Ambassador of the United Arab Republic in India.

The U. A. R. delegation consisted of Mr. M. Mohamed Nadim, Chairman of the Egyptian General Organisation for Maritime Transport as the Head of the delegation and General Hassan Mourad, General Hassan Hamdy and Mr. Aly Bakr, as members. The Indian delegation consisted of Dr. Nagendra Singh, Additional Secretary and Director General of Shipping, Ministry of Transport, as the Leader and Shri C. P. Srivastava, Managing Director, Shipping Corporation of India and Shri J. D. Mehta, Deputy Manager of the Shipping Corporation of India. as, members.

The Agreement was signed by Mr. M. Mohamed Nadim on behalf of the U.A.R. and by Dr. Nagendra Singh on behalf of the Government of India.

The agreement follows the lines of other bilateral shipping agreements and provides for transportation of cargoes between India and the U.A.R. by the vessels of these two countries on the basis of parity. The new Indo-UAR Shipping Service is expected to be inaugurated as soon as the necessary preliminary arrangements have been completed.

102

### INDIA EGYPT CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Mar 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

#### UNITED KINGDOM

British Loan Assistance to India

Agreements for loans totalling œ 12 1/2 million (Rs. 16.7 crores) to the Government of India from the British Government were signed in New Delhi on March 17, 1964, by Shri P. Govindan Nair, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Sir Paul Gore-Booth, the British High Commissioner. These loans complete the offer of further aid amounting to œ30 million made by Britain at the last meeting of the Consortium in July 1963, as her contribution for the financial year 1963/64 towards the foreign exchange costs of economic developments under India's Third Five-Year Plan.

Three agreements were signed. Under the first, a loan of  $\infty$ -5 million was made available for purchase from Britain of capital goods and components for projects and industries selected by the Indian Government from an agreed list. (In most cases negotiations with potential suppliers are in an advanced stage). The list includes :

Components for British oriented industries (up to a ceiling of œ 750,000) (Rs. 1 crore); capital goods for private sector industries (up to a ceiling of œ 1 million) (Rs. 1.33 crores); a coastal ship, a bucket dredger and two hoppers; equipment for the Nahorkatiya fertiliser plant, equipment for the Singareni collieries. equipment for the Hoshangabad paper mill, heat treatment furnace for alloy steel plant at Durgapur; requirements of the Indian Copper Corporation's expansion programme, equipment for Oil India Limited.

The second agreement covers a general purposes loan, also of  $\infty$  5 million (Rs. 6.7 crores), which is to be used to pay for current British exports to India. It will provide immediate benefit to the Indian balance of payments.

The third agreement is for a loan of œ 2 1/2 million to be used for the purchase of capital equipment and components for the factory at Bhopal managed by Heavy Electricals (India) Ltd., a public sector corporation engaged on the manufacture of heavy electrical equipment. The plant is one of the major products in India's industrialisation programme and Britain has always been closely associated with its development.

#### Background Note

Signature of these Agreements is one of the last official functions being performed by Sir Paul Gore-Booth before leaving Delhi on midtour leave and it coincides with the opening hi Paris of the first meeting in. 1964 of the Aid India Consortium.

These loans have been made under Section 3 of the Export Guarantees Act, 1949. They are for a period of twenty-five years and provide a grace period of seven years before repayments of principal begin. In addition, the interest that would otherwise have been due during the first seven years of the loan is being waived.

The signature of these loans brings the sum which the British Government has made available so far towards India's Third Five-Year Plan to a total of œ 125 million (Rs. 167 crores) and over œ60 million (Rs. 80 crores) of this has already been disbursed.

The plant at Bhopal was designed by Associated Electrical Industries Limited of London who are also the technical consultants advising on construction and management. Most of the equipment is British and many of the Indian engineers were trained in Britain. A consortium of British banks lent œ 2,700,000 (Rs. 3.6 crores) to the Indian Government to buy some of the equipment in the factory and over œ 12 million (Rs. 16 crores) has been allocated for expenditure on equipment and components for this project from British Government loans India made in 1961 and 1962.

103

# INDIA USA RUSSIA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Mar 01, 1964

# April

## Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs RecordApr 01, 1964Vol. XAPRILNo. 4
CONTENTS
CANADA PAGE Indo-Canadian Loan Agreement Signed 105
INDO-PAKISTAN HOME MINISTERS' CONFERENCEShri Gulzari Lal Nanda's Welcome Address105Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda's Statement in Lok Sabha107Joint Communique108
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha 112
KUWAIT Joint Statement on Visit of Foreign Minister of Kuwait 116
LAOS Prime Minister's Message to Prince Souvana Phouma 117
REPUBLIC OF IRAQ117Joint Communique117Farewell Messages by President Arif118
REPUBLIC OF KOREA Trade Arrangement Signed 119
REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM Three-Year Trade Arrangement Signed 119
SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE Sardar Swaran Singh's Opening Speech at Preparatory Meeting 120 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Soviet Participation in Afro-Asian Conference 123 Final Communique 124 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Preparatory Meeting 126
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CANADA PAKISTAN KUWAIT LAOS IRAQ KOREA VIETNAM INDIA

**Date** : Apr 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

CANADA

Indo-Canadian Loan Agreement Signed

An agreement between the Government of India and Export Credits Insurance Corporation of Canada for a loan to India of \$ 37-million to cover foreign exchange portion of \$ 74-million Atomic Power Plant at Ranapratap Sagar Project in Rajasthan was signed in Ottawa on April 28, 1964.

Expected to commence operations in 1970, Ranapratap Sagar Atomic Power Plant comes under India's Third Five Year Plan for development and will help India meet power requirements of rapidly developing areas in Rajasthan.

Foreign exchange portion of the project is being financed under special credits allocated by Canadian Government to India under World Bank Aid India Consortium. Repayment terms are on overall credit period of 20 years including five years grace. The rate of interest is six per cent.

Power costs from Ranapratap Sagar Nuclear Power Plant are expected to be competitive with those from alternative sources of power.

The Department of Atomic Energy will act as prime contractors and will be responsible for erection of the station. Engineering and consulting services will be provided by atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

The Montreal Engineering Company Limited has been appointed by the Indian Department of Atomic Energy as Canadian Engineers for the project and they will also act as procurement agents for purchases made in Canada. Capital equipment to be supplied by Canadian manufacturers includes major nuclear components, turbo generators, switch gear and substation equipment. Half of initial uranium fuel charge will also be supplied from Canada.

CANADA INDIA RUSSIA **Date** : Apr 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

#### INDO-PAKISTAN HOME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda's Welcome Address

Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda, Union Home Minister and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Indo-Pakistan Home Ministers' Conference held in New Delhi from April 7 to 11, 1964, made the following statement on April 7, while welcoming the members of the Pakistan Delegation

Your Excellency,

On behalf of the Government of India, and on my own behalf, I extend to you and to the members of your delegation a most cordial welcome. I wish you and your colleagues a pleasant stay and I wish both our delegations success in the task that our Governments have entrusted to us. This task is of paramount importance. The problems before us are onerous and difficult, and it would be no exaggeration to say that on their solution depend, to a great extent, future relations between India and Pakistan and the happiness of our people.

Our meeting is taking place at a time when relations between our countries have come under considerable strain and we face a tragic human problem. There have been communal disturbances in Pakistan and in India. There has been a mass exodus of minorities from East Pakistan into India. Between 3,000 and 4,000 refugees are coming into India every day from East Pakistan and over 200,000 refugees belonging to the minority communities have come into India. Most of these refugees arrive as destitutes and in a state of great distress. We fear that many more thousands may arrive in the coming weeks. The resources of the Government of India are already taxed to the utmost. Apart from the enormous burden of relief and

#### 105

rehabilitation of these vast numbers which the Government of India have to shoulder, the influx must inevitably have repercussions. The problem is not merely one of numbers; it is something very much deeper. It is a problem in human misery with all the frustration, and bitterness resulting from the deprivation of life, property, home and honour of large numbers of people.

I am not competent to speak with confidence about the precise problems facing your Government. Perhaps these are problems causing, concern to the Government of East Pakistan and to your Government, though I could say with assurance that the dimensions of the problems faced by Pakistan are not comparable to those faced by us. I am not making these observations in any spirit of controversy. We could spend a great deal of time on mutual accusations and recriminations. I do not think, however, that it will serve any useful purpose to spend time on mutual accusations and recriminations. We have to look to the future rather than the past and we have to strive to resolve the difficulties that confront us, taking into account the well-being of our peoples and the imperative need for building up friendly cooperation and good neighbourly relations between our two countries on the basis of equality, sovereignty, mutual respect and mutual benefit. Above all, we should strive to deal with these problems bearing in mind the fact that the lives, honour and happiness of millions of people are involved.

If India and Pakistan were distant countries, the problem of what happens to any section of the people in either country would concern that particular government alone and would not have any consequences or repercussions in the other country. The facts of history and geography are, however, such that the situation in regard to minorities in one country has serious consequences for the other. In this sense, there is mutuality of interest between the two countries, which must be recognised. It is essential that we talk among ourselves as to what should be done in our respective spheres to create conditions of security and confidence which will beneficially react on the relations between different communities in each country and prevent migrations across our borders with all their serious consequences.

In our view it is the duty of both our Governments to strive ceaselessly for communal harmony. To devise ways and means for bringing this about and for eradicating the virus of communal hatred and violence should be our principal task. To this end I promise you, Your Excellency, on behalf of the Government of India, our earnest endeavour and full cooperation.

Recognising the mutuality of interests between India and Pakistan in a similar situation, the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan concluded the Nehru-Liaquat Agreement on 8th April, 1950. In that Agreement the two Governments committed themselves to admirable principles in regard to the treatment of minorities in their respective countries. It was stated in the preamble to that Agreement :

"The Governments of India and Pakistan solemnly agree that each shall ensure to the minorities throughout its territory, complete equality of citizenship, irrespective of religion, a full sense of security in respect of life, culture, property and personal honour, freedom of movement within each country and freedom of occupation, speech and worship, subject to law and morality. Members of the minorities shall have equal opportunity with members of the majority community to participate in the public life of their country, to hold political and other office, and to serve in their country's civil and armed forces. Both Governments declare these rights to be fundamental and undertake to enforce them effectively".

Then followed an agreement on a number of points relating to the treatment of minorities and facilities to be provided to the migrants going from one country to the other. The Agreement was subsequently ratified by both Governments. This Agreement served a useful purpose and although today it is not in active operation, the reasons for which I do not wish to go into, I feel that we could profitably revive the spirit of the Nehru-Liaquat Agreement. In the spirit of that Agreement we could devise measures which would help in the amelioration of the human problems with which we are faced today.

The Government of India have offered that every aspect of the problem of minorities and movement of refugees both ways can be discussed with a view to reaching mutually satisfactory arrangements. So far as we are concerned, it will be open to either of us to bring in any aspect of these problems. I am aware of your points of view which, I must confess, are in certain cases different from ours. I believe, however, that we can discuss these frankly and in a spirit of understanding. We pledge you our sincerity of approach and our determination to succeed. We ask the same of you.

For us equal treatment and the fullest guarantee and protection of the rights of the minorities is a fundamental article of faith which has been enshrined in our constitution. This principle is one which has governed and will

#### 106

continue to govern the policies and actions of the Government of India. Ms Excellency the President of Pakistan also in the course of his radio broadcast on March 1, 1964, stated that the minority communities in Pakistan are a sacred trust entitled to equal rights and privileges.

We have thus a large measure of common ground of intentions and objectives and there is no reason why we cannot reach agreed conclusions which will not only transform the present unhappy atmosphere between India and Pakistan but bring security and happiness to millions of people in our countries.

Once again, Your Excellency, I welcome you and your delegation.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date** : Apr 01, 1964

### Volume No

#### 1995

#### INDO-PAKISTAN HOME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda's Statement in Lok Sabha

Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda, Union Home Minister and Leader of the Indian Delegation, made the following statement in Lok Sabha on April 13, 1964 regarding the Indo-Pakistan Home Ministers' Conference :

In the middle of January 1964 the Government of India felt gravely concerned at the wave of communal disturbances which swept across East Pakistan and parts of West Bengal. On the 16th of January 1964 the President of India communicated a message to the President of Pakistan through our High Commissioner in which he said "It is my sincere belief that the time has come when our Governments should put their heads together and devise ways and means of bringing to an end the recurring cycle of such incidents and disturbances in both countries ..... As a first step I propose that you and I join in an immediate appeal to the people of our two countries for communal peace and harmony. If you are agreeable, my High Commissioner will submit to you a draft of such a joint appeal for Your Excellency's consideration." The High Commissioner of India in Pakistan was also instructed while handing over the President's message to say that he had been instructed by the Government of India to make a further suggestion for the consideration of the President of Pakistan that the Home Ministers of India and Pakistan accompanied by the Chief Ministers of West Bengal and East Pakistan meet urgently to impress upon the people of both countries the earnest desire of the Governments of India and Pakistan to establish harmony and peace amongst all communities in their respective territories and to take all measures necessary to that end. He was further instructed to say that such a high level meeting following an appeal by the two Presidents would be most

effective in securing communal harmony and peace amongst all communities in both countries. The Home Minister of India and the Chief Minister of West Bengal would be prepared to participate in this high level meeting at Dacca or Calcutta, at short notice. On the 24th of January the Pakistan Foreign Office communicated their reply verbally to the Indian High Commissioner rejecting the proposal for a joint appeal by the Presidents of the two countries, but stating "Once law and order have been fully restored, Ministers of two Governments may meet initially in Rawalpindi/Delhi to discuss measures necessary to ensure that the refugees of recent disturbances as also those evicted from Assam, Tripura, and West Bengal during some two years prior to these disturbances, return to their homes."

On the 19th of March the Prime Minister of India wrote to the President of Pakistan reviving the proposal for a Minister-level meeting between the two countries. The President of Pakistan replied to the Prime Minister of India on March 23 agreeing to a meeting of the Ministers of the two countries and suggesting that the meeting might be held in Delhi.

A Conference between a Delegation from Pakistan led by the Home Minister Khan Habibullah Khan and including Mr. Hafiz-ur-Rahman, Finance Minister of East Pakistan, and an Indian Delegation led by me including the Chief Ministers of Assam and West Bengal met in Delhi from the 7th April to the 11th April, 1964. At an early stage of the Conference it became clear that the problems confronting the two countries which called for discussion fell under three heads :

(i) Restoration of communal harmony and the establishment of conditions of security and confidence for the minorities of the two countries;

(ii) The problems of migration and the movement of refugees from one country to another;

(iii) Eviction of persons from Assam and Tripura, described by Pakistan as Indian Muslims and regarded by India as illegal infiltrators from Pakistan. A preliminary discussion of the problems as viewed by India and as viewed by Pakistan took place on the opening day at a plenary session. Later the three issues were remitted for examination to two committees of officials. Finally discussions were carried on in a more informal atmosphere between the Home Minister of

#### 107

Pakistan and the Finance Minister of East Bengal on the one side and myself and the Chief Ministers of Assam and West Bengal on the other. A number of proposals for the promotion of communal harmony and the establishment of conditions of security and confidence for the minorities in the two countries including the problem of rehabilitation of persons affected by disturbances in each country were considered. A measure of agreement was reached on a number of these points. There were also discussions on the question of the facilities to be afforded to the refugees migrating from one country to another. On this subject, too, a fair measure of agreement was reached on a few points. A considerable part of the discussions was devoted to the problem of evictions. The Pakistan Delegation proposed that the Government of India should immediately suspend all further evictions and that they should set up a Tribunal consisting of an Indian Judge and a Pakistani Judge and a Judge from a neutral country to go into the general question of the propriety of the action taken by the Government of India so far. They further proposed that similar Tribunals, should be established later to deal with cases of individual persons already evicted or those who may have to be evicted in the future. The proposal of the Pakistan Delegation for the establishment of these Tribunals was found totally unacceptable. The Indian Delegation, however, offered to consider any suggestions which Pakistan may have to make with regard to modifications and improvements in the procedures preceding the issue of quit notices. In order to enable such a review of the procedures to be made and further if the Pakistan Government would be prepared to agree to the grant of certain facilities to refugees coming from East Pakistan to India and if they would further agree to certain other measures proposed for the establishment of communal peace and harmony, the Indian Delegation indicated that the Government of India would

be prepared not to issue quit notices on any persons for a period of two months. During this period of two months however, the other legal processes would continue. The Pakistan Delegation, however, laid great insistence on their proposal for the establishment of joint Tribunals for examining the whole question of evictions. As this proposal was not acceptable to the Indian Delegation and as the discussions of the many other outstanding matters raised at the Conference would require still further time, it was agreed that discussions between the two Home Ministers would be resumed either at Karachi or at Rawalpindi in the near future.

I lay on the table of the House brief heads of the proposals made by us to the Pakistan Delegation relating to the three issues which were the subject matter of discussion. I also place on the table of the House the proposals of Government of Pakistan on the two issues of the facilities to be granted to refugees from one country to another and on the question of evictions.

## PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Apr 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

## INDO-PAKISTAN HOME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

joint Communique

The following is the text of the Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on April 11, 1964 by the Home Ministers of India and Pakistan :

The Home Ministers of India and Pakistan, assisted by their advisers met in New Delhi from April 7 to April 11, 1964, and discussed the problems of minorities and communal harmony in India and Pakistan.

During the course of his visit the Home Minis-

ter of Pakistan laid a wreath on the Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi. He also took the opportunity of calling on the President of India, the Vice-President of India, the Prime Minister of India and the Minister without Portfolio, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

The discussions between the two delegations were held in a frank and cordial atmosphere and a free exchange of views took place.

The Home Minister of Pakistan impressed upon the Home Minister of India the view that eviction of a large number of persons from Assam and Tripura and other Indian States had led to tensions and consequences thereof. The Home Minister of India, on the other hand, explained his Government's position regarding the problems relating to the migration of minority communities from Pakistan into India and the consequences arising therefrom.

Efforts were made by the two delegations to arrive at a mutually satisfactory solution of these questions.

The two delegations were in full agreement over the necessity of promoting urgently communal harmony between various communities in each country and the need to establish a sense of security and confidence in the minds of the minorities.

The two delegations were agreed that the responsibility for the protection and well-being of the minority communities and the redress of their grievances lay with their respective Governments. They felt that there was imperative need to ensure that the minorities throughout their territories

#### 108

enjoyed complete, equality of citizenship, irrespective of religion, a full sense, of security in respect of life, culture, property and personal honour and an other rights which have been guaranteed to the citizens of each country under its Constitution.

A number of proposals for the promotion of communal harmony, restoration of law and order in affected areas and for taking prompt and effective action against those responsible for crimes against the minority communities and the rehabilitation of the persons affected by the disturbances were considered. The two delegations reaffirmed their respective Government's determination to adopt all measures for the early attainment of these objectives.

In view of the great importance of the issues involved and the complex nature of the problems, it was agreed that discussions between the two Home Ministers will be resumed at Karachi/ Rawalpindi in the near future.

The Home Ministers expressed their firm determination to take all measures to maintain communal peace in their respective countries and appealed for cooperation in preserving communal harmony.

## INDIAN PROPOSAL

### Part I

(i) Ways and means of promoting communal harmony should be considered keeping in view that the minorities must look to their own Government for their protection and the preservation of their fundamental rights. Each Government should take all necessary steps to instil a sense of confidence in the minority community and to make them feel that they are in an integral part of the entire community of the State.

(ii) All factors which cause distrust and suspicion between different communities should be eliminated from the social fabric.

(iii) The good offices of local leaders and local bodies should be fully utilised for promotion of communal harmony.

(iv) Vigilance and timely intelligence are of great importance. All agencies of Government should, therefore, be used for collection of intelligence regarding apprehension of any trouble.

(v) Citizens' Committees, should be set up utilising, as far as possible, the existing institutions such as union councils, municipal committees and grain panchayats, and where the minorities are not adequately represented on such bodies, members of minority communities should be associated with them. (vi) The industrial areas pose a special problem. Adequate security arrangements should be made in these areas, and in addition committees consisting of trade union leaders and the representatives of managements and Government set up.

(vii) The administrative machinery should be used to put down promptly and sternly all disturbances. Any failure on the part of officers to take prompt and effective action should be treated as grave dereliction of duty and should be punished as such.

(viii) Anti-social elements and those who instigate or finance them should be put under preventive detention.

(ix) There should be quick investigation, speedy trial and deterrent sentence in cases arising out of communal disturbances. Special procedure should be provided for by legislation, if necessary, if the existing machinery and procedure are found inadequate.

(x) Wherever necessary, quartering of punitive police, imposition of collective fines and enrolment of special constables should be resorted to.

(xi) It is imperative expeditiously to rehabilitate affected persons. Rehabilitation should in every case include restoration of immovable properties; and the legal provisions and procedures should be simple and expeditious. Grants, loans and other assistance for rehabilitation should be adequate. These should check migration to the other country.

(xii) The Radio should be used to promote communal harmony through special programmes. Care should be exercised in presentation of news and views.

(xiii) The cooperation of the Press should be secured in the cause of communal peace and harmony. A common code of conduct for the guidance of the Press should be evolved, and a Committee set tip in each country to ensure its observance.

(xiv) There should be freer circulation of newspapers between the two countries.

(xv) Text books in use in schools should be examined from the point of view of promotion of communal harmony, and, any distortion of history or any material which might lead to communal discord excluded. There should also be positive elements in the curricula designed to promote communal harmony.

(xvi) There should be exchange of cultural delegations, scholars, sports teams, etc. These are likely to help improve the relations between the two countries and promote communal harmony. Even there are difficulties in joint

#### 109

observance of festivals, endeavour should be made by each country to promote social and cultural contacts between members of various communities by every possible means.

(xvii) The observance of a common Comunal Harmony Week/Day in the two countries would be beneficial.

(xviii) Minority Commissions on the lines provided for in the Nehru-Liaquat Agreement should be revived, as this is likely to have a particularly reassuring effect on the minority community.

(xix) The restrictions imposed by Pakistan in 1960 on the category 'B' visas should be removed. This is likely to check tendency to migrate.

(xx) Meetings of Chief Secretaries should take place as often as necessary and whenever required by either side, and to start with, there should at least be one meeting in every three months, and later once in six months.

(xxi) There should be meetings between the two Central Home Secretaries whenever necessary.

(xxii) Occasional meetings of the two Home Ministers would be desirable.

(xxiii) Ministers should undertake joint tours of an area in either country where communal harmony and peace are disturbed. The objective of these tours would be not the encouragement of the growth of extra-territorial loyalties but to enable the visiting Minister to reassure his own people by giving them a correct picture and thus check the dissemination of wrong or exaggerated facts which inflame communal passions.

(xxiv) Quick, effective and deterrent action in cases of crimes against the persons or honour of women is imperative. Use should be made of the relevant provisions of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact and the annexure thereto. In addition, a highpowered committee, including the members of the minority community, should be appointed in each country to examine the magnitude of the problem, and consider whether any further legislation, etc. is necessary.

(xxv) The protection and welfare of the minority communities in each country should be the special responsibility of the Home Minister.

## part II

1. There shall be freedom of movement for intending migrants from East Pakistan to India.

2. Adequate protection shall be provided for such intending migrants during transit.

3. Intending migrants shall not be required to produce income-tax clearance certificate and other similar certificates before migration.

4. There shall be no harassment of intending migrants. They shall not be subjected to check by customs or other authorities. They shall not be deprived of their belongings in transit or at customs posts or otherwise subjected to vexatious procedures.

5. There shall be liaison officers of the other Government posted at the customs posts to ensure that there is no harassment of migrants.

6. The Indian Government should be permitted as a temporary measure to establish more visa offices in East Pakistan to deal with the increased number of applicants for migration.

7. Every intending migrant shall be permitted to remove as much of his movable properties and personal household effects as he may wish to take with him. This shall include personal jewellery. The maximum cash allowance to each adult migrant shall be Rs. 150 and to each migrant child Rs. 75.

8. A migrant may deposit such of his personal jewellers or cash as he does not wish to take with him with a bank. A proper receipt shall be furnished to him by the bank for cash or jewellery thus deposited and facilities shall be provided as and when required for their transfer to him subject as regards cash to the exchange regulations of the Government concerned.

9. Rights of ownership in or occupancy of the immovable property of a migrant shall not be disturbed. If during his absence such property is occupied by anohter person it shall be returned to him provided that he comes back by 1st May 1965. Where the migrant was a cultivating owner or tenant, the land shall be restored to him provided that he returns not later than 1st May 1965.

10. In the case of a migrant who decides not to return, ownership of all his immovable property shall continue to vest in him and he shall have unrestricted right to dispose of it by sale, by exchange with an evacuee in the other country or otherwise.

11. A Committee consisting of three representatives of the minority and presided over by a representative of Government shall act as trustees of the owner. The Committee shall be empowered to recover rent for such immovable property according to law. Necessary legislation shall be enacted to set up these Committees.

12. The East Pakistan Disturbed Persons (Rehabilitation) Ordinance. 1964 and its amendments issued on 4th April 1964 restricting the

#### 110

right of members of the minority community of transferring their immovable properties by sale, exchange, mortgage, etc. should be abrogated.

13. Employees of Government, local bodies, private firms, etc., who may be intending migrants shall be permitted to draw their provident fund and their pension according to their conditions of service or employment and to remit moneys out of their provident fund and pension to the other country subject to the foreign exchange regulations in force.

Part III

1. The Indian Delegation explained to the Pakistan Delegation in detail the procedures adopted to scrutinise individual cases for ensuring that quit notices are served only on foreigners. They also explained the legal remedies open to any person aggrieved by service of such quit notices.

2. The Government of India, however, are prepared to review the existing procedures in Assam and Tripura preceding the service of quit notice, with Pakistan. They will be glad to consider any modifications or improvements of the procedures which may be necessary.

3. In consideration of the Government of India's earnest desire to help in the restoration of communal harmony and establishment of conditions of security and confidence for the minorities in both countries, the Government of India will be prepared to agree not to serve quit notices for a period of two months. This is without prejudice to their legal rights and without suspension of the normal legal processes. Notwithstanding the above, persons physically detected crossing the frontier illegally from Pakistan to India will be deported. The same will apply to persons who have come with passports and visas from Pakistan into India and the period of the validity of whose visas has expired. 4. The Government of India will be prepared to review and re-examine the cases of any persons who have gone away to Pakistan under guit notices, but who claim to be Indian citizens, on application made by the individual concerned to the Indian Deputy High Commissioner at Dacca.

## PAKISTAN PROPOSAL

In consideration of the earnest desire on the part of both the Governments to help in the restoration of communal harmony and establishment of conditions of security and confidence for the minorities in both countries, the two Governments agree to the establishment of an impartial tribunal consisting of one Pakistani Judge of the rank of Supreme Court Judge, one Indian Judge of the same status and a mutually agreed impartial Judge from another country. The tribunal will examine the general claim of the Indian authorities that all evictees deported from Assam and Tripura and other parts of India were Pakistani infiltrators.

If the aforementioned tribunal finds that the Mew of the Government of India that the evictees are Pakistani nationals is not valid then the two Governments will set up a joint machinery in the form of a number of subsidiary tribunals each consisting of a Pakistani Judge of the rank of a High Court Judge and an Indian Judge of the similar status with a chairman from a third country to examine the cases of all the persons who have been evicted on the ground that they are Pakistani infiltrators. These tribunals will also devise means of repatriation of such of the above persons as are not Pakistani infiltrators to their homes in India. The tribunal proposed in the sub-para above should also handle the cases of any persons who have been or may be declared by Indian authorities as Pakistani infiltrators and thus face a threat of eviction.

Till the result of the enquiries made by the first tribunal are made available and subsidiary tribunals have started functioning the eviction of any persons on the ground that he is a Pakistani infiltrator should remain suspended.

The Indian authorities in Assam, Tripura and elsewhere would also take adequate steps to ensure that no private person or organisation, by physical violence, threat or intimidation, is permitted to evict Muslims from their homes.

#### Migration

The two Governments agree

(i) that there shall be freedom of movement and protection in transit, through authorised routes, subject to possession of valid travel documents.

(ii) Rights of ownership in or occupancy of the immoveable property of a migrant shall not be disturbed. If during his absence, such property is occupied by another person, it shall be returned to him, provided that he comes back by 31st July 1964. Where the migrant was cultivating owner or tenant, the land shall be restored to him, provided that he returns not later than the 31st July 1964. The two Governments further agree that they shall-

(i) Continue their efforts to restore normal conditions and shall take whatever measures are necessary to prevent recurrence of disorder.

#### 111

(ii) Take prompt and effective steps to prevent the dissemination of news and mischievous opinion calculated to rouse communal passion by Press or Radio or by an individual or organisation. Those guilty of such activity shall be rigorously dealt with.

(iii) Not permit propaganda in either country directed against the territorial integrity of the other or purporting to incite war between them and shall take prompt and effective action. against any individual or organisation guilty of such propaganda.

## PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Apr 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following observations on Foreign Affairs in the Lok Sabha on April 13, 1964, while replying to the debate on budget grants for the Ministry of External Affairs :

....We have to face today difficult questions. Many new problems have arisen in the international sphere. The more difficult the problems we face, the more it is necessary that we should view them calmly and dispassionately and arrive at specific conclusions.

It does not help much merely to get excited about them, and to deal with them in an agitated way.

An hon. Member's speech showed that he is still tied up with the old happenings about Chinese attack on Tibet and our attitude to it. These matters have been repeatedly discussed here, and I do not wish to go back to them at this stage. The position in the world has changed considerably in recent months, and we have to face the situation as it is.

#### NON-ALIGNMENT

The hon. Member's chief proposal appears to have been aimed at our giving up non-alignment. Non-alignment is not a basic policy of ours or of any country. It is our reaction to events, and more particularly, our desire to maintain our independence of thought and action. It arose chiefly because of the two Power blocs headed by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and our desire not to get entangled with them. To some extent that continues, but many changes have taken place in these alignments.

The USA and the Soviet Union are not so bitterly opposed to each other as they were, and they are growing closer to one another. Among the two Power blocs, internal differences have arisen, and in some cases they amount almost to a split. Thus, the Soviet Union and China, the two Communist Powers, have practically separated from each other, and are bitterly opposed to each other. In the Western bloc, some differences have also arisen. Meanwhile, a large number. of newly independent countries have come into existence, and most of them adhere to the policy of non-alignment.

From any point of view, it would appear that non-alignment has not only succeeded in the past, but is even more desirable today. It surprises me, therefore, that the hon. Member should at this stage oppose it.

Non-alignment is not merely not joining a military bloc, but it affects economic and other policies. It is specially psychological. We are

on friendly terms with the leaders of these blocs, and are receiving substantial aid from them. To align ourselves would be to tie ourselves with many of their policies, with which we may not agree. It would mean also some kind of a break within our relations with the other group. That would be utterly wrong.

In addition, we have to remember that a large number of new countries as well as old ones are tied to this policy of non-alignment. It would mean our cutting ourselves adrift from the main trends of world opinion.

As the House knows, it has been decided to hold a conference of non-aligned countries later this year. This is a desirable development, and we are wholly associated with it.

Recently, the rift between the Soviet Union and China has grown greatly, and the Soviets have criticised the Chinese invasion of India and China's policies.

An hon. Member has spoken vehemently against our foreign policy, but vehemence has been directed more to our administration and other matters. He has spoken like a prima donna. I

### 112

might add that he has criticised the Annual Report of our Ministry. I must confess that this Report leaves much to be desired. He has laid great stress on the Report referring to the visit of our hockey team to Kabul. I may inform him that the visit of the hockey team at the Jashan time in Afghanistan was greatly appreciated by the Afghans, and has, therefore, considerable importance.

## CHINA AND PAKISTAN

We are always concerned with the progress or otherwise of the conference on disarmament, as this is of vital consequence to the world. For the present, however, our chief concern is about our two neighbours China and Pakistan. Some Members of the Opposition have accused us frequently of surrender and appeasement both to China and Pakistan. I am most surprised to hear these charges. Strength does not lie in strong language and shouting, but in other matters. It is perfectly true that we want a peaceful settlement of our troubles with China and Pakistan, and we shall endeavour to realise them, however, difficult they may seem today. Taking a long distance view it is essential that we should exist peacefully with these two neighbours of ours, more particularly with Pakistan. We cannot live in conflict for a long time to come. I hope a time may come when India and Pakistan might draw closer to each other; there is no other way. To talk of exchange of population is, I think, utterly wrong. Not only would it be an extraordinarily difficult undertaking but it will not solve our problems. The two countries would face each other as bitter enemies, threatening each other's existence. I do not know what the leaders of Pakistan have in view apart from their present aims. I have a feeling that both Pakistan and China have larger objectives in view in regard to India. I do not think that either of them will be able to achieve these objectives. But we shall have to be prepared for all attempts on their part and gain them. It is clear that peaceful settlements of these conflicts would be desirable but such settlements must be in keeping with the honour and integrity of India. That is an essential aspect to be borne in mind always. Keeping that in mind we should always strive for peaceful settlements.

In regard to China we have made it clear-and Parliament has approved of it-that if the Colombo proposals are accepted by China, we shall be prepared to discuss with them our conflict and disputes. In this matter I should like to make clear one development which took place some time ago. This was referred to by Mrs. Bandaranaike in one of her recent letters to us; we were asked that if the Chinese vacated all their posts in the demilitarised area in Lad would we consider this as fulfilment of the Colombo proposals? This was first mentioned to me by two representatives of Lord Russell who came to me last summer. To them I answered that we might be prepared to consider this proposal if China made it. Since then no such proposal has been made by China. In the Colombo proposals it was stated that in this demilitarised area of Ladakh both parties should have by agreement an equal number of posts. It was possible to consider that this was satisfied if both parties by agreement decided to have no posts at all in this area. I had clearly stated to Lord Russell's representatives and later to

Mrs. Bandaranaike that this could be considered by us if a proper approach was made to us by China. No such approach has been made and, therefore, the position remains the same as before.

#### DJAKARTA CONFERENCE

In regard to Djakarta Conference which is now being held, an Hon. Member has taken strong objection to our participation in this Conference because China would also be there. I am wholly unable to accept this argument. It would mean cutting ourselves away from important international conferences because China may happen to be there. It would mean some kind of discourtesy to the many other nations that went there and took part in it. An Hon. Member has, I think, said that we had decided not to go to it and at the last moment sent one of our Ministers to it. That is quite untrue. I do not think that at any time I had said that we would not attend the conference. What I had probably said was that I personally would not go there. It was our intention to send our team under the leadership of Deputy Minister of External Affairs. A few days before the Conference, we decided to send the Minister of Food and Agriculture, Sardar Swaran Singh, as the leader of our team, and I am glad that he agreed to go. There was thus no question of our not going there, but only as to who should go. The Djakarta Conference is being attended by a large number of representatives of countries, and Sardar Swaran Singh is taking a leading part in it. (Interruptions).

An Hon. Member: The Prime Minister has often said that he prefers a Belgrade type of conference to a Bandung type of conference. He has never favoured a Bandung type of conference.

Prime Minister : It is one thing not to favour it; but it is another thing to boycott it.

There was no question, thus, of our not going there. We should go there and Sardar Swaran Singh is taking a leading part in it. Not to go there is to miss an important opportunity to put forth our view and to some extent influence the conference.

113

PAKISTAN

In regard to Pakistan, it has been a big grief to me that ill-will and conflict should continue between India and Pakistan, in spite of our efforts. We had hoped that this background will gradually disappear and we would be able to live in peace with each other. Unfortunately, it has continued all these years and I do not know when we shall be able to live normal and peaceful lives. Kashmir has been one of the causes. But I am convinced the cause must lie deeper, and probably this conflict will continue unless we can succeed in somehow removing the hatred and fear complex.

With the coming in of China as more or less as any ally of Pakistan, Pakistan has become even more aggressive. I do not know what secret understanding they have come to with each other, but such understanding cannot be of advantage to India. It is extraordinary that even in these circumstances, some of the western powers are inclined towards Pakistan and help it in regard to Kashmir. The Kashmir issue would have been solved long ago but for western help to Pakistan.

So far as we are concerned, our position in regard to Kashmir has been repeatedly and carefully stated recently in the Security Council by my colleague, the Minister of Education. We stand by that position.

Sheikh Abdullah, who has recently been released, has made some statements, which I consider are unfortunate. I am told that some of the Press reports of these statements are not correct. However, I will not deal with these Press reports, as I hope to see him soon and discuss this matter.

I think an Hon. Member was very angry at the fact that President Arif of Iraq came here in a Pakistani plane. I might tell him that this made us unhappy too, but we could not help it. That is to say, we offered him our plane to come here. A reply came from him that he has already accepted Pakistan's offer to bring-him here in their plane and he could not get behind it. We still pressed him to come in our plane, which we offered to send, but he said he could not go behind his promise to Pakistan. (Interruptions).

### COLOMBO PROPOSALS

An Hon. Member said the other day that the Colombo proposals are absolutely dishonourable to India. How they are so is more than I can understand. He seems to think that we cannot deal with China by ourselves and, therefore, we must allow other countries to deal with it: in other words, we must give up our independence of action. I do not wish to discuss our capacity to deal with China, but I think he is under-estimating it very much when he thinks that we must hand over the defence of India to somebody else and, certainly, handing over means giving up our independence, in so far as that is concerned. It is apparently more honourable to him than any other method of settling the matter ourselves. If the Hon. Member has read some of the comments on our Sino-Indian conflict in America and England he would probably think differently.

## SEVENTH FLEET

There is one thing I would like to mention. There has been an account in the Press about the Seventh Fleet of the United States coming into the Indian Ocean. This was referred to in this House in answer to questions previously and we had said that we have not been told or it has not been referred to us. Anyhow, they are not coming to any of our territorial waters or ports. This time it appears that they are coming nowhere near India, not to any of our ports or territorial waters but probably going to Africa. I can only express my regret that a cruiser which is equipped with nuclear weapons went about the Indian Ocean .... We do not like nuclear weapons coming anywhere near India. We have said so.

## EXODUS FROM EAST PAKISTAN

Now, we have to face a terrible problem of the exodus from East Bengal. We must receive all those who come here and try to rehabilitate them. I hope that soon we shall put up a special Ministry to deal with this problem. May 1, in this matter, repeat that terribly bad as this problem is, all kinds of stories are sometimes given publicity in the press, which have little basis in fact, and they do much harm? The other day there was some story of some girls from East Bengal being carried to Arab countries for sale

there. On the face of it, it was an absurd and fantastic story. Yet, I suppose some people believed it because it appeared in print. We have received information from our representatives that they can find no trace of any truth in it, it is foreign to them and it is utterly baseless.

But I should like to point out the effect of these things. Somehow this story reached some of the Arab countries and there has been great indignation in the Arab countries that any one in India should presume or should say that abducted girls are being sent there for sale. So. the House will notice bow these stories spread and create impressions which are not good for us. (Interruptions).

We have every Tight to feel angered about what is happening in East Pakistan and do what

#### 114

we can to help the unfortunate refugees who are coming from there. But we must not forget that something very horrible has happened in India too, of which we should be thoroughly ashamed in Orissa and Bihar and partly in Calcutta. By these things we are playing into the hands of Pakistan which wants such troubles to happen.

I think in this matter it is more important that we should stop all such occurrences in India than anything else. This is vital because otherwise we fall into this trap, we play into the hands of Pakistan which wants us to do all these things, which wants us to give up our secular policy, our other policies and thereby justify their policies and their position.

I have often thought these days of Gandhiji, how he would have dealt with our existing problems, specially those with Pakistan. It is difficult to say what he would have advised; possibly, in the course of the last 15 or 16 years he might have devised some method or other to deal with them. But I am sure of one thing, namely, that having regard to our ultimate aim of peace and friendship with Pakistan, he would not have advised any action on our part which should come in the way of this.

We must keep this ultimate aim in view and not be led away by momentary passions. It is true that at the present moment the fate of the minorities in East Pakistan bears down upon us terribly and we must do all we can to help them; but if we do something which adds to their troubles and misfortune, that will be neither good for the present nor for the future.

I would beg the House to distinguish between two things. One is that we have to Lake certain steps, however undesirable they may be and however they may burden us. That we have to do. But in taking them we must not do anything to create an atmosphere which comes in the way of any future arrangement between India and Pakistan. I would have hoped that India and Pakistan would be able to come together much closer, even constitutionally closer. I do not say so because this annoys Pakistan that we are trying to upset them. I do not wish to upset them; I wish them well, but there is no other way for India and Pakistan to live except to live at peace. It may take years to achieve that; that is a different matter. But I believe a new generation is rising up in Pakistan which looks differently at this problem than the older generation. I believe, in East Pakistan specially there are all kinds of movements which do not like these old methods. It is, therefore, particularly unfortunate that East Pakistan has a particularly weak spot in the Pakistan chain and possibly this is one of the reasons why the Pakistan authorities have made East Pakistan the special place where these atrocities have occurred so as to get Fast Pakistan tied up with these atrocities and to move, their thinking away from the other trends of thought in East Pakistan.

### HOME MINISTERS CONFERENCE

I hope that this Home Ministers' Conference which has occurred, papers of which have been placed before this House by our Home Minister, will resume its meeting soon and will ultimately arrive at some conclusion which will remove or lessen this great tension that exists. I am sure that our Home Minister will agree with me that the Home Minister of Pakistan who came here struck me as being very earnest about it and trying his utmost to put an end to these troubles. Of course, he was tied up by various factors and he had to go back by a certain date. But I do hope, at the next meeting they will get over these difficulties and come to some arrangement and agreement. I hope the House will realise that however angry. we may get-and we have enough reason to get angry-anger does not solve the problem of Pakistan and India. It will never solve it, whether it is today or a year hence or 10 or 20 years hence. It has to be solved on a basis of friends who have fallen out coming together of not agreeing with each other, of disapproving of each other occasionally but nevertheless remaining friends and co-operating. That is the only way to solve this problem.

I know the people of Pakistan fairly well. I have known them in the past, not now. I have great respect for them. They are very decent folk. Of course, when you excite them with religious slogans, nobody remains decent; they become brutal. Everybody becomes brutal, whether it is the Hindu or the Muslim. We have seen what has happened in Rourkela and Jamshedpur. It is scandalous in the extreme that anybody should do what our people have done there. This kind of a thing does more disservice to India than anything that might happen across our borders and elsewhere because that is put in the balance as if this is happening on both sides and they are both pretty bad. I hope that the worst of this has passed and that we shall gradually-it will take a little time-get back to more normal behaviour.

As for China, that is a very difficult thing we have to face. We have to face it by strengthening ourselves, which we are doing and which we have done to a large extent, and by relying on ourselves more and more--certainly getting help from other people but relying ultimately on ourselves. The moment we give up that reliance we are lost. I do not know how the hon. Member imagines that somebody else, however great

#### 115

the power may, be may defend us on our borders. Nobody can defend us; not the greatest power in the world can defend our borders except ourselves. It is well to remember this always and to keep our people to remember this so that they may not become weak and think of, what is called, the Maginot Line or some such thing and that others will help them.

If I may say so with all respect and humility,

we must not become too self-righteous. We think that every evil is being done by Pakistan and China and that we are completely free from any wrong-doing. We are not free from wrongdoing. In the Question Hour many questions were asked about intrusion of air space.... As a matter of fact, the statement that there have been more on Pakistan side is completely correct. From the point of view of the United Nations, the United Nations have received complaints of our intrusions from Pakistan and from us about intrusions by Pakistan. They have got both and they are receiving them constantly about these intrusions. The big difference is that our intrusions into Pakistan do not give rise to question in Parliament; the others do. The U.N. Observers judgment, although as far as I remember certainly the majority are in our favour, a minority is against us too, namely, that we intruded in their territory. These questions do not come here. Nobody is interested in them. I am afraid, we are growing very self-righted and we imagine that we are completely in the right and others are in the wrong. That is not a good thing. We should always think of our wrong actions that we do. That is more important than the wrong actions that are committed against us. Wrong actions that, we do betray our mentality, how we think, how we act, etc. They delude us. They do not delude the world. The world gets to know all these facts.

USA CHINA INDIA AFGHANISTAN PAKISTAN SRI LANKA INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC IRAQ

**Date** : Apr 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

KUWAIT

Joint Statement on Visit of Foreign Minister of Kuwait

The following is the text of a joint statement issued on April 14, 1964 by the Government of

India and the Foreign Minister of Kuwait, on the conclusion of the latter's visit to India :

The Government of India have welcomed the visit of His. Excellency Sheikh Sabah Al Ahmad Al Jaber, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Kuwait from the 11th to the 14th April, 1964, who came as the representative of the Council of the Kings and Heads of States of the Arab League which met at Cairo in January 1964. His Excellency the Foreign Minister called on the President, the Vice-President and the Prime Minister of India and he also had discussions with the Minister without Portfolio and the Minister of Petroleum & Chemicals.

The Foreign Minister of Kuwait explained the decisions taken at the Cairo Conference in relation to the problem of Palestine. The Government of India have welcomed the results of the Cairo Conference which have strengthened the unity and solidarity of the Arab people. They have also expressed their sympathy and continuous support for the just claims of the Arab countries in regard to the Palestine question. The Government of India agreed with the view, expressed by the Foreign Minister on behalf of the Arab peoples, that religion should not be exploited for political ends.

The Foreign Minister of Kuwait and the Government of India noted with satisfaction the present extremely friendly relations which exist between the two countries and expressed their mutual desire for their further strengthening in all fields to their common benefit.

116

KUWAIT INDIA USA EGYPT **Date** : Apr 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

LAOS

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru sent the following message to the Prime Minister of Laos, Prince Souvana Phouma on April 22, 1964 :

The Government of India have learnt with deep concern of the happenings in Laos during the last few days. Normally the internal happenings in Laos would not concern us very much. As you know, however, we are profoundly interested in the maintenance of peace and stability in Laos and in the wellbeing of the people of Laos towards whom the people of India have always had fraternal feelings. We have also assumed responsibility as Chairman of the International Commission for Supervision and Control to supervise the implementation of the Geneva Agreement of 1962. We feel that the maintenance of peace and stability in Laos is of paramount importance in the context of peace in Indo-China and indeed in the whole of South East Asia. We are convinced that the Declaration of the neutrality of Laos, which was the product of the Geneva Conference, and the agreements reached at that time, offer the best guarantee for peace and preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of Laos. We have admired the way you, as Prime Minister of the Government of National Union, have tried to carry out your difficult task of reconciliation and maintaining the unity of Laos. I hope that the present difficulties will disappear and that you will continue to lead the Laotian Government and people to a full realisation of the objectives embodied in the Geneva Declaration, with the assistance of the International Commission as envisaged in the Geneva Agreement. In this you will continue to have our full support.

LAOS INDIA USA SWITZERLAND CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Apr 01, 1964

## Volume No

## **REPUBLIC OF IRAQ**

#### Joint Communique

The following is the text of a joint communique issued in New Delhi on April 1, 1964 at the conclusion of the State visit to India of His Excellency Field Marshal Abdul Salam Mohammad Arif, President of the Republic of Iraq:

On the invitation of the President of India, His Excellency Field Marshal Abdul Salam Mohammad Arif, President of the Republic of Iraq, paid a State visit to India from the 26th March to the 1st April 1964. He was accompanied by Sayed Subhi Abdul Hamid, Minister of Foreign Affairs, General Mahmoud Sheet Khattab, Minister of Municipal Affairs, Sayed Muslih-Al-Nakshbandi, Minister of State for Awakaf. The President and his party received a warm and cordial welcome from the Government and people of India.

During his stay in India, President Arif visited the cities of Agra, Hyderabad, Bangalore, Poona and Bombay, which provided him with an opportunity to see some of India's historic monuments and seats of Indo-Islamic culture as well as her modern development projects. President Arif showed interest in India's progress in the industrial, social and scientific fields and he recognised her efforts to foster and develop her ancient cultural heritage and to integrate her variegated traditions into the lives of the people. His visit helped greatly to cement the historical and cultural ties which bind India to Iraq and to the Arab countries generally.

During his stay in Delhi, President Arif had informal and friendly exchanges of views with the President, the Prime Minister and other members of the Government of India on the current international situation and on matters of mutual interest. The discussions, which took place in a cordial atmosphere, revealed a general similarity of views on the current international situation and contributed greatly to bringing about closer mutual understanding. The Prime Minister welcomed the results of the deliberations of the Council of the kings and Heads of States of the Arab League which met at Cairo in January 1964, under the distinguished chairmanship of President Arif. The Prime Minister expressed his deep satisfaction at the success achieved in strengthening the unity and solidarity of the Arab people and the measures devised for effective mutual coopera-

#### 117

tion between the Arab countries. He noted with appreciation that after the Arab Summit Conference, inter-Arab relations have been normalised, thus strengthening the forces striving for international peace and security. He welcomed their contribution to the promotion of world peace by their accession to the partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and the support given by them to the achievement of the goal of total and complete disarmament.

The President and the Prime Minister acknowledged the identity of views between India and Iraq, on world issues such as nuclear disarmament, colonialism, racial discrimination, arising from the policy of non-alignment followed by both countries and their common devotion to the objective of ensuring an early end of imperialism and colonialism in all their form and manifestations.

They welcomed the efforts being made by the developing countries to raise their standards of living and to improve the economic wellbeing of their people to which they pledged their fullest support. They agreed that concerted efforts must be made to remove the economic and trade disparities between the developed and the developing countries of the world.

The President and the Prime Minister agreed that existing Indo-Iraqi cooperation in the field of trade and technical development should be further strengthened and enlarged. The President expressed his appreciation for the assistance already rendered by India to Iraq in the form of the services of technicians and teachers, etc. The President and the Prime Minister agreed that the non-aligned States should make every effort to exercise their combined influence to reduce international tensions and to consolidate and extend the area of peace. They upheld the principle that all disputes between States, including boundary disputes, should be settled by peaceful means and not by resort to force, and that if aggression is committed in pursuit of territorial aims, its fruits must be denied to the aggressor.

The President and the Prime Minister reviewed the grave developments relating to the India-China border question. The Prime Minister reiterated India's desire to settle the border problem through peaceful negotiations and stated that it was with a view to facilitating such negotiations that India had accepted, without reservations, the proposals made by the six Asian-African countries at the Colombo Conference. The President expressed appreciation of the Colombo Proposals and the hope that the People's Republic of China would also do everything necessary to facilitate direct negotiations between the two countries in order to resolve the problem, re-establish peace and confidence and contribute to the solidarity of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

The President and the Foreign Minister of Iraq explained the resolutions adopted at the Arab Summit Conference. In keeping With the India's traditional friendly relations with the Arab countries, the Prime Minister expressed his support for the just claims of the Arab countries to the waters of the river Jordan and for the rights of the Palestinian refugees wishing to return to their homes.

The President expressed the hope that the unfortunate differences between India and Pakistan would be resolved by reducing the current tensions between the two countries and creating the necessary atmosphere for direct discussions between India and Pakistan.

The President expressed gratification at the fact that India was the homeland of 50 million Muslims and millions of persons belonging to other faiths, who enjoyed the fullest freedom of religious faith and worship on a basis of complete equality under the law.

The President of Iraq extended an invitation to the President of India and to the Prime Minister of India to visit Iraq at a time convenient to them. The President of India and the Prime Minister were happy to accept the invitation.

IRAQ INDIA USA EGYPT CHINA SRI LANKA JORDAN PAKISTAN

**Date** : Apr 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

**REPUBLIC OF IRAQ** 

Farewell Messages by President Arif

On leaving India at the conclusion of his State visit Field Marshal Abdul Salam Mohammad Arif President of the Republic of Iraq, sent the following messages to the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan and the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on April 1, 1964 :

## MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT

I have the honour to convey to Your Excellency on behalf of myself and party our thanks for inviting us to visit your beautiful country and for the opportunity to meet Your Excellency and the esteemed members of your Government. We feel our visit has achieved benefits for mutual interest between our countries, the result of which, may I proudly say, shall be for the betterment of our people and all the people of the world, whom we wish all progress and prosperity.

## MESSAGE TO PRIME MINISTER

While leaving your great country I thank you on behalf of myself and party for giving the op-

#### 118

portunity to meet you and acquaint ourselves with the progress achieved by your country under your wise leadership. I wish you good health and wish the people of India progress and wealth for more fruitful cooperation between our two countries, for the happiness of humanity and peace of the world.

# Volume No

1995

## REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Trade Arrangement Signed

A Trade Arrangement between the Republic of Korea and India was signed in New Delhi on April 29, 1964. Mr. Kibong Han, Consul General of the Republic of Korea, signed on behalf of his country and Shri D. K. Srinivasachar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of International Trade, signed for the Government of India.

This Arrangement, which is the first between the two countries, contemplates expansion of trade, provides for exchange of commodities consisting mainly of non-ferrous metals like zinc and lead and tungsten ores and concentrates from the Republic of Korea and engineering goods, machinery, ferro-manganese, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, etc. from India.

Detailed discussions about trade between the representatives of both the countries were held in New Delhi in January this year.

KOREA INDIA USA **Date** : Apr 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Discussions were held in New Delhi over the last two weeks between a Trade Delegation from the Republic of Vietnam, led by Mr. Buu Hoan, Director of the Industrial Development Centre, and a Delegation of the Ministry of International Trade, led by Shri D. K. Srinivasachar, Joint Secretary, on the question of expansion of trade and economic and industrial cooperation between the two countries. The Delegation from South Vietnam also visited important industrial and commercial centres in India like Bombay, Madras and Calcutta.

As a result of the discussions, documents leading to a three-year Trade Arrangement were signed in New Delhi on April 25, 1964, by the leaders of two Delegations. This Arrangement will be the first to be entered into with the Republic of Vietnam and contemplates not only increasing volume of trade but also industrial and technical collaboration. Under this Arrangement, the Republic of Vietnam will export commodities like rubber, timber, etc., while exports from India will consist of engineering goods, capital machinery (including paper, sugar and oil mills and tea-processing machinery in particular), chemicals and pharmaceuticals and jute products.

119

VIETNAM INDIA USA **Date :** Apr 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

#### SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE

Sardar Swaran Singh's Opening Speech at Preparatory Meeting

The Indian delegation to the Preparatory Meeting for the Second Afro-Asian Conference held in Djakarta from April 10 to 15, 1964, was led by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister for Food and Agriculture, Government of India.

The following is the text of his opening speech:

### Mr. Chairman,

I would like to join the distinguished representatives, who have spoken before me, in congratulating you on your election as our Chairman, and to pay a tribute to you for the tireless efforts you have made to make possible the holding of this preparatory meeting. I would also like to take this opportunity to facilitate the distinguished representatives of the Cameroons and Cambodia as Vice-Chairmen and the distinguished representative of Iraq as our Rapporteur.

It is, indeed, a matter of great pleasure for me to represent my country at this meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Afro-Asian conference. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank you, Sir, and the Government and the people of Indonesia for the warm reception and generous hospitality that they have extended to my delegation.

On this occasion, Mr. Chairman, our thoughts naturally turn. to the historic conference held in April 1955, in the city of Bandung, which Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India then described as the focal centre and the capital of Asia and Africa during those momentous days. He said, "we come here consciously or unconsciously as agents of historic destiny and we have made some history here." The Bandung conference will be long remembered for having set out the ten principles as a foundation of Afro-Asian relations. We can do no better today than to rededicate ourselves to those principles. Yesterday, His Excellency the President of the Republic of Indonesia, gave an inspiring address to the delegates of this conference. My delegation and I were deeply moved by the President's call for the revival of the Bandung spirit. Nearly a decade after the Bandung conference, Indonesia has, once again, taken the initiative to prepare for the holding of another Afro-Asian

conference. I wish to express my government's appreciation and gratitude to the Government of Indonesia for this initiative. I bring to this Preparatory Meeting the good wishes of the President, the Prime Minister and the Government and the people of India, for its complete success.

It is a matter of gratification for all of us that there are nearly as many delegations attending this Preparatory Meeting as took part in the Bandung conference itself, and the conference for which we are now preparing promises to be a much larger one. That this is so is due, indeed, to the great and historic days of Bandung and the forces released by that conference.

It is befitting at this stage to review briefly the memorable developments that have taken place since April 1955. In Asia, we witnessed the final reunion of West Irian with the motherland. Parts of my own country, which were under Portugal's colonial domination, have also been reunited with Independent India.

The Bandung Declaration, Honourable Delegates will recall, had endorsed, and given support to Indonesia's determination to rid its territory of the remnants of colonialism. I recall with gratification and pride the conference we held in New Delhi in 1949 for the independence of Indonesia.

Since the achievement of its independence, after a prolonged and heroic struggle and engaged as it is in the onerous tasks of its economic development, Indonesia has consistently and purposefully played a very significant role in the struggle of African and Asian peoples to eradicate the scourge of colonialism and racialism. The contribution of Indonesia and her leaders, as, indeed, of other countries of the continents of Africa and Asia, are a matter of historical record in which we may all take pride.

In Africa, the Bandung Conference called for the freedom of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia. Those countries are now happily independent and we share the privilege and pleasure of their presence with us in the various forums of the world. I should like to extend my delegation's warm welcome and cordial greetings to the distinguished representatives of Algeria and Morocco, who are here with us at this meeting.

It is equally a matter of deep satisfaction to us that a large number of other African countries have gained their independence : we welcome among us today the distinguished delegates of the Cameroons, Tanganyika and Guinea. The establishment of the Organisation of African Unity is another welcome development of outstanding importance in recent months. We wish

#### 120

the O.A.U. every success in Its objetives to expand the area of freedom and independence, to rid the human race of the curse of racialism, to preserve human dignity and to achieve economic progress and cultural cooperation. To these objectives, and to the endeavours of our African brethren to ensure their achievement, my Government and people lend their wholehearted support and sympathy.

So also in the Arab world, the winds of freedom and progress, of hope and unity blow across the region. These reached a climax in the Cairo Arab Summit Declaration of January 1964. The Government of India have lent their full support to this Declaration.

But the evil of colonialism still continues to blemish parts of our two continents : Asia and Africa. Salazar's medieval and inhuman tyranny still maintains outposts of oppression even in this part of the world and dominates large areas of the great Continent of Africa. Patriots in Angola and elsewhere continue to pay the supreme sacrifice of their lives to gain the birthright of freedom. We propose, therefore, that at the second Afro-Asian conference, the representatives of the Provisional Government of Angola, which is engaged in a heroic struggle against a barbaric and tyrannical regime, should be associated as full member.

Also, not all of the Arab world is yet free from colonial and imperialist domination. We should associate with ourselves, in a suitable manner, the representatives of the national liberation movements from these non-self governing territories. We are committed to the sacred cause of their liberation and their destined independence which cannot be denied to them any long.

The work of the Decolonization Committee of the United Nations and the Liberation Committee of the Organisation of African Unity in this supreme cause merit the commendation and support of all of us here. We are happy that Malawi and Northern Rhodesia will soon join the comity of free nations.

The continued serfdom of many of our brethren in Africa is immensely painful to us. This heart-rending agony of large sections of the human race must be ended in their emancipation. Indeed, it can continue only at peril to the peace of Africa and the rest of the world and at peril to the perpetrators of this tragic state of affairs. Southern Rhodesia remains under the oppressive heel of a racist minority. There is also the pernicious and inhuman policy of apartheid of a racist minority regime in South Africa. The nations of Africa and Asia have told the world in unmistakable terms that they will not tolerate the existence of this indignity in their midst. They have demanded positive action against the Government of South Africa-severance of diplomatic relations and discontinuance of all economic intercourse with that Government

Mr. Chairman, my own country's struggle against South Africa's racial discrimination is halfa-century old. This struggle was started by the Father of our Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, who began the movement of non-cooperation and nonsubmission to evil in South Africa itself. Even before India became free, it severed all trade and economic relations with South Africa. Many years before the adoption of a resolution by the United Nations to that effect in 1961, we had discontinued diplomatic, commercial, air and trade relations with the Government of South Africa.

We, in Asia and Africa, have to demonstrate to the world that we shall have nothing to do with the uncivilized and inhuman regime in South Africa. My delegation is convinced that those of us, who still maintain trade and other relations with that country, will immediately fall in line with the proclaimed desire and determination of the people of our two countries. Slogans will not do; it is action that is needed. Even though South Africa lies in the African continent, there is no association of any kind possible between its government and the independent Afro-Asian countries so long as it continues to enforce its inhuman policy of Apartheid and so long as the legitimate rights of the African people of that country are denied to them.

In the field of economic development, the progress has been comparatively slow. The disparity between the rich and the poor, between the developed and the developing nations, between the privileged and the under-privileged is widening rather than narrowing. The nations of Asia and Africa are no longer content to be the mere suppliers of raw materials for the industries of the economically advanced countries. They wish to diversify their economies, to industrialise and to secure for their people the benefits of technology so that the fruits of their natural resources and their labour will reach them in adequate measure. We trust that the current conference in Geneva will devise adequate measures to ensure sufficiently rapid economic development of developing nations. The rich nations of the world can no longer continue to build their prosperity on the exploitation of the labour, the poverty and hunger, and, indeed, the resources of the under-developed countries. It goes without saying that we too must pool our resources and engage in it cooperative endeavour for the economic advancement and social uplift of our people.

Peace and international security are the objectives towards which the whole of mankind is

#### 121

directing its efforts. Disarmament-General and Complete Disarmament-under effective international control and supervision is an indispensable means to that end. The Bandung conference laid great stress on this most urgent and vital issue facing mankind.

The Bandung conference declared that universal disarmament was an absolute-necessity for the preservation of peace and requested the United Nations to continue its efforts in that direction. It laid special emphasis on the prohibition of the production, experimentation, proliferation and the use of arms and weapons of mass destruction and to establish effective international control to achieve that purpose.

The international community has not only accepted the Bandung thesis on disarmament, but

has also made some progress in the desired direction. We have now gone beyond the sterile discussions of small groups representing the two power blocs; and the U.N. has entrusted the work of negotiating a treaty on General and Complete Disarmament to a committee of 18 members of which 8 are from outside the Power blocs. A partial test ban treaty has been signed by more than 100 countries thus ridding the present and future generations of fatal contamination. The U.N. has approved the agreement between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. not to station or orbit nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in outer space.

By and large, thus, the progress on the issues which we discussed at Bandung in 1955 has been noteworthy. And yet it is only the beginning of a process. There is much to be done and it remains the duty of African and Asian countries to continue to urge the international community to complete the process, and to complete it quickly.

Our first conference, Mr. Chairman, was held nearly a decade ago, and it is appropriate to recall those early days. The Bandung Conference was sponsored by five countries, namely, Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan, and we worked with faith in our cause and hope in our hearts at Bogor and elsewhere. That was a small group as compared to the number of countries which have assembled here today for preparatory work for another conference. This notable increase is, as I said, a tribute to the success of the first Bandung conference and the great forces released as a result of the important decisions taken by that conference. Over half the membership of the United Nations now belongs to Asia and Africa.

At this preparatory meeting, we have the good fortune to have present among us more than half the participants of the conference at Bandung and some others, who have achieved their independence since. We would have been happier to have with us on this occasion also others who participated in the Bandung Conference, and to receive the benefit of their wise counsel in our deliberations here. They would, no doubt, be with us at the next conference, but we also hope that they will be co-sponsors of the main conference to which they would be invited along with the vast number of countries which have since then gained independence as well as some others.

We would like to welcome as a full participant among us at the main conference the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a great part of which country lies in the continent of Asia. Soviet Union is already a member of various Afro-Asian organisations at the peoples level, such as the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation, the Afro-Asian Films Festival, the Afro-Asian Workers' Conference, the Afro-Asian Games and so on. We are confident that the Soviet Union will make a worthy contribution to all that we are striving for. The proposed expansion of our membership would make the second Afro-Asian conference the largest and the most unique regional gathering in history.

I mentioned earlier that the Bandung conference was held nearly a decade ago in April, 1955. The anniversary of that historic conference will fall on April 18, 1965. What can be more appropriate and befitting, what can be more inspiring to the people in Asia and Africa that the second Afro-Asian conference should be held on the auspicious occasion of that Anniversary ! Apart from giving adequate time for preparation to ensure the greatest possible success for the conference-and, indeed, we envisage that the second conference will be even more productive, fruitful and successful than the first-and apart from avoiding a period overcrowded with Summit and other conferences, the 18th of April, 1965, will have a unique significance of its own for assessing the successes and achievements of a decade and for setting new goals and objectives for the future.

My colleagues here will, perhaps, recall that at the Bandung Conference there was a general feeling that since the first conference was held in Asia, the second should be held in Africa. This was, indeed, a far-sighted thought on the part of the organisers of the Bandung Conference as the welcome upsurge of African independence witnessed in recent years was yet distant on the horizon. There were no more than six African countries present at Bandung; there are six times that number independent now and there will be more by April, 1965. In this last decade Africa has made great and admirable strides; and the emancipation of the whole of that continent from the last remaining vestiges of colonialism cannot be too far. The holding of our next conference at a suitable place in that continent will not only be a fitting tribute to the achievements of new Africa, free, independent and dynamic; it will also demonstrate the urgency of liberating the areas still under colonial domination and eradicating the last traces of racialism from that great continent.

#### INDIA INDONESIA CAMEROON IRAQ USA PORTUGAL ALGERIA MOROCCO TUNISIA GUINEA PERU EGYPT ANGOLA MALAWI SOUTH AFRICA SWITZERLAND BURMA PAKISTAN

**Date** : Apr 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Soviet Participation in Afro-Asian Conference

Sardar Swaran Singh made the following speech on the question of participation of the U.S.S.R. in the next Afro-Asian Conference

Mr. Chairman,

As I mentioned in my general statement, the Indian Delegation is of the view that the Soviet Union should be invited as a full participant to the second Afro-Asian Conference. This view is motivated by various important considerations.

Principally, we must ensure that the views of a large and important part of Asia do not go unrepresented in our deliberations. Many, of our countries have an affinity and kinship with the large neighbouring Asian parts of the Soviet Union, which we must continue to foster. In this regard we must bear in mind the fact that many aspects of the culture and civilization of Central Asia, situated within the confines of the Soviet Union, have influenced the culture and civilization of many countries in South and Weft Asia.

The central fact, Mr. Chairman, is that geographically the Soviet Union is also a part of Asia. This fact has been recognized over the years in the Soviet Union's participation in many Afro-Asian conferences at people's levels. I would like to recall that when the first Asian Relations Conference met in New Delhi in March 1947, representatives from practically all countries of Asia, including the Soviet Republics of Central Asia came to that conference to consider the common problems which all Asian countries had to face, such as, national movement for freedom, racial problems, colonial problems, industrial development, intra-Asia migration, the status of women and cultural cooperation.

Later, in pursuance of the Bandung Conference, steps were taken to establish an organisation at the people's level in 1957-58 called the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation with headquarters at Cairo. The Soviet Union is an important member of that Organisation and a major contributor towards its organisational and financial set-up. Presently the Soviet Union is participating in the Afro-Asian Film Festival which is due to be held in Djakarta this week. The Soviet Union is also participating in the Afro-Asian Workers' Conference and is the Deputy Chairman of the Preparatory Committee. The Soviet Union has participated in the Afro-Asian games. It will be seen, therefore, that the Soviet Union's participation at people's level in Afro-Asian affairs and conferences has extended over practically the last two decades.

It is significant that the participation of the Soviet Union in Asian and Afro-Asian affairs has not merely been a formal one. It is well known that the Soviet Union has throughout fully demonstrated its keen interest and concern in the problems and tribulations of Afro-Asian countries. It has played a notable role in assisting the freedom movements in Asia and Africa.

One has only to recall the determined stand taken by the USSR against the tripartite aggression against the United Arab Republic in 1956 and during the Suez Crisis, and its resolute support for Algerian independence, to appreciate the magnitude of the debt of gratitude which we owe to this great country. It is, therefore, fitting and important that the Soviet Union should take its place among us and continue as one of us, to assist in the preservation and promotion of the vital interests of the Afro-Asian world.

Then there are the facts of geography to be considered. In the first Bandung Conference, we had the privilege of welcoming Turkey, which is geographically a part of both Europe and Asia. The positive and decisive contribution made by Turkey in our deliberations in the Bandung Conference as well as its continuous adherence to the principles then enunciated should leave no doubt in our mind about Turkey's interest in the affairs of countries of Asia and Africa. The Soviet Union is not dissimilarly placed in regard to facts of geography; and, in fact, the larger part of the country lies in Asia.

Yesterday, Sir, a distinguished delegate asked why the Soviet Union was not invited to the first Bandung Conference. One may call this an unfortunate omission; and, indeed, there were other unfortunate omissions too. This meeting, we hope, will rectify these omissions. For example, Mongolia as well as North Korea and South Korea were not invited to the Bandung Conference : they

#### 123

should be invited now. In the latter case the omission was particularly noticeable considering that North Vietnam and South Vietnam, divided as they were like North and South Korea, were invited and, indeed, attended the first Bandung Conference. They will, no doubt, be among the Sponsors of the Second Afro-Asian Conference. There were other omissions as well, such as the Union of South Africa and Israel. There were valid reasons for these, which are still applicable and India is opposed to inviting these two countries although geographically they lie within Asia and Africa.

Apart from these omissions, Mr. Chairman, there was, in 1955, what we may call an act of commission which we consider objectionable today, namely, the invitation to the Central African Federation established in 1953. The Central African Federation, as is well known, though an African country, was dominated by a white minority Government, not un-similar to the racist and oppressive regime in the Union of South Africa. While we propose that Nayasaland and Northern Rhodesia should be invited, on the attainment of their independence to the next conference, we are confident that no one here would today suggest inviting the present Government of Southern Rhodesia.

I mention these examples, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that what happened in this regard in 1955 is no infallible guide to what we should do at the present time after our experience and observations over a decade of crucial significance to the Afro-Asian world.

Mr. Chairman, despite the omission to which I referred a while ago, in the days following the meeting at Bogor, while the concept of Bandung which our leaders bad formulated was being ridiculed in parts of the world, the Soviet Union was in the forefront of those who welcomed the initiative of the five sponsoring countries in convening an Afro-Asian Conference at that time. We gave full endorsement to the decisions reached at the Conference and the principles enunciated by it. In the United Nations and elsewhere the Soviet Union has unhesitatingly identified itself with the causes, which we of Africa and Asia have espoused.

My delegation is convinced that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has a rightful place among the gatherings of Afro-Asian countries. We are convinced that the next Conference will profit greatly from the participation of the U.S.S.R. and that such participation will strengthen our growing movement. We, therefore, propose that an invitation should be extended to the U.S.S.R. to the next Conference of Afro-Asian States; and we hope that this proposal will receive the support of the distinguished delegates assembled here.

## USA INDIA INDONESIA EGYPT ALGERIA TURKEY KOREA NORTH KOREA VIETNAM ISRAEL SOUTH AFRICA

**Date** : Apr 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### Final Communique

Following is the text on the Final Communique issued in Djakarta on April 15, 1964, at the conclusion of the Preparatory Meeting :

At the invitation of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia and in pursuance of the recommendation adopted by the Asian-African Conference held in Bandung in April 1955, that the five sponsoring countries consider, in consultation with the participating countries, the convening of the next Conference, the representatives of the following African and Asian countries met in Djakarta from the 10th to the 15th of April 1964 to make preparations for the Second Conference :

Afghanistan; Algeria; Cambodia; Cameroon; Ceylon; People's Republic of China; Ethiopia; Ghana; Guinea; India; Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Liberia; Morocco; Nepal; Pakistan; Philippines; Syria; Tanganyika; Turkey and United Arab Republic.

Imbued with the Bandung spirit of African-Asian solidarity and guided by the Ten Principles laid down by the First Asian-African Conference the meetings took place in a most cordial atmosphere.

It was unanimously re-affirmed that at this juncture in international developments the convening of a Second African-Asian Conference was of paramount importance.

The First Conference having been held in Asis, it was decided that the Second African Asian Conference be held in Africa on March 10th, 1965, at the level of Heads of States/Heads of Governments, and that the selection of the Government which would serve as host to the Conference be left to the Organisation of African Unity.

It was decided that a meeting of Foreign Ministers be held immediately before and in conjunction with the Second African-Asian Conference and that this meeting pays special attention to the questions of economic development and cooperation.

It was also decided to recommend that the governments of the countries invited to the Second African-Asian Conference who are re-

#### 124

presented in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development instruct their Heads of Delegation in Geneva to meet at the end of that United Nations Conference to review and evaluate its results in the light of the provisional agenda of the second African-Asian Conference with a view to formulating recommendations on economic problems. African-Asian countries not represented in that United Nations Conference should be invited to participate in such a meeting.

The meeting decided that the objectives of the Second African-Asian Conference would be, as follows :

In consonance with the spirit of the First Asian-African Conference held in Bandung in 1955, and taking note of the substantial increase in the number of independent nations and peoples in Africa and Asia since that Conference, and their enhanced role in international affairs :

1. to promote and strengthen mutual understanding and friendship among the nations and peoples of Africa and Asia and further to exchange experiences and information for their common benefit;

2. to attain common understanding of the basic problems arising out of the revolutionary changes which have been taking place in all fields in the lives of the peoples in Africa and Asia in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism for the achievement of full and complete national independence;

3. to search for appropriate methods to ensure continuous and full cooperation among African-Asian nations for the development of African-Asian solidarity on the basis of equality, mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
4. to make policies for the peaceful settlement of disputes and for the renunciation of threat or use of force in international relations;

5. to revive the spiritual heritage of the African and Asian peoples and to exploit fully their natural resources so as to utilise them for their moral and material advancement and the development of their national identities on the basis of political sovereignty, economic selfreliance and cultural self-assertion;

6. to formulate guiding principles and to devise practical measures which would;

(a) further inspire the peoples of Africa and Asia in their continuing struggle against all forms of colonialism, racial discrimination, and foreign economic exploitation;

(b) secure the restoration of their lawful rights of domicile to populations evicted from their ancestral homes as a result of imperialist and colonialist designs, and also in violation of human rights;

(c) ensure complete emancipation of countries which are still under foreign domination;

thereby permitting the countries of Africa and Asia to play their legitimate role in this changing world in a constructive and progressive way towards justice, prosperity and peace among nations, based on respect for fundamental human rights and the rule of international law;

7. to strengthen economic, social and cultural cooperation among the countries of Africa and Asia as a means of consolidating and safeguarding their independence and raising the standards of living of their peoples. In accordance with the objectives set out in the preceding paragraph the following provisional agenda for the Second African-Asian Conference was agreed upon:

1. General Review of the international situation in the light of the First Asian-African Conference and an appraisal of the Ten Principles of Bandung.

2. Decolonization and the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonalism.

3. Human Rights:

(a) Racial discrimination and apartheid.(b) Genocide.

4. World Peace and disarmament:

(a) Strict international control.

(b) Prohibition of all types of nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

(c) Non-dissemination of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.

(d) Creation of nuclear free zones.

(e) Complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons.

5. The peaceful settlement of international disputes and the renunciation of the threat or use of force in international relations :

(a) Basic principles for the settlement of African-Asian disputes.

#### 125

6. The strengthening of the United Nations :

(a) Review of the United Nations Charter.

(b) Observance of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

(c) Implementation of United Nations resolutions by its members.

7. Economic development and cooperation:

(a) Review of the results of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in particular the position of African-Asian countries visa-vis the industrialized countries.

(b) Basic principles for the cooperation amongst African and Asian countries towards economic emancipation.

8. Cultural cooperation.

9. Peaceful co-existence:

(a) Basic principles of peaceful co-existence.

10. The desirability of the establishment of a permanent Secretariat to facilitate effective cooperation amongst African-Asian nations.

A. It was decided that the following countries be invited to Second African-Asian Conference:

(a) All the 29 countries in Africa and Asia which participated in the Bandung Conference.(b) Countries in Africa, members of the O.A.U.

(c) Countries in Africa and Asia which will become independent between now and the convening of the Second Afro-Asian Conference.

(d) The following: Mongolia
North Korea
South Korea
Cyprus
Kuwait
West Samoa
The Provisional Government of Angola.

B. Representatives of all National Movements from non-self-governing territories recognised by the O.A.U. in Africa and from Asia, which have not yet attained independence, may come to the Conference with the right to be heard and the host country is requested to provide facilities for their attendance. This provision should also apply to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Oman Aden and Palestine.

C. With regard to the composition of the Second African-Asian Conference,

(a) it was proposed that an invitation be extended to the U.S.S.R. Some delegations supported and others opposed the proposal to extend an invitation to the U.S.S.R. A number of delegations stated that they needed consultation with their governments. After discussion no consensus could be reached. Some delegations were of the view that the matter may be placed before the Heads of States/Governments at the Second African-Asian Conference for their consideration. Some other delegations were against submitting this matter to the Heads of States/Governments at the Second African-Asian Conference for their consideration. Therefore, no agreement was reached.

(b) It was also proposed that an invitation be extended to Malaysia. In this case, it was hoped that the obstacles which prevented reaching a consensus on the invitation would be eliminated. In this case an invitation should be extended as soon as possible. Some countries that recognised Malaysia stated their position that Malaysia was fully entitled to an invitation and should be invited.

The meeting unanimously expressed the hope that the Second African-Asian Conference, like the First Conference held in Bandung, would make a significant contribution to the solidarity and complete emancipation of the African-Asian countries as well as the growth of friendly cooperation among nations, the promotion of universal respect for human rights, and the attainment of lasting peace.

The participants expressed their deep appreciation on the initiative taken by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia in convening the Preparatory Meeting, of the excellent arrangements made, and of the gracious hospitality extended to them by the host Government.

INDONESIA USA AFGHANISTAN ALGERIA CAMBODIA CAMEROON CHINA ETHIOPIA GHANA GUINEA INDIA IRAN IRAQ LIBERIA MOROCCO NEPAL PAKISTAN PHILIPPINES SYRIA TURKEY SWITZERLAND MONGOLIA KOREA NORTH KOREA CYPRUS KUWAIT ANGOLA OMAN SOUTH AFRICA MALAYSIA

**Date** : Apr 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Preparatory Meeting

Sardar Swaran Singh, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Preparatory Meeting for the Second Afro-Asian Conference, made the following speech in the Lok Sabha on April 17, 1964 :

As the House is aware, India participated in the meetings of Ministers recently held in Djakarta in preparation for the Second Afro-Asian Conference. I had the honour of being the leader

#### 126

of the Indian Delegation which consisted of the Indian Ambassador to the U.A.R., officials of the External Affairs Ministry and our Charge d' Affaires in Djakarta. The meeting was held from April 10 to April 15. Twenty-two countries participated; of these 17 were from the First Afro-Asian Conference held in Bandung in 1955. The five other countries were new participants.

The meeting of Ministers discussed the question of the venue, the timing, the agenda and the composition of the Second Afro-Asian Conference. On all these matters, except for some difference of opinion about the composition of the Conference, agreement was reached in consonance with the views of the Indian Delegation.

With regard to the timing, for an important

Conference of this kind we felt that sufficient time should be allowed for necessary adequate preparations. We proposed that for this reason and because of the pre-occupation with other important conference this year, the Second-Afro-Asian Conference should be held in April 1965, on the 10th anniversary of the Bandung Conference, That would be a fitting tribute to the historic Afro-Asian Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia, in April, 1955. Our view was that the impact of this particularly on the new countries which would be participating would be of considerable importance. However, since some of the countries did not find the month of April convenient, it was agreed to have the Conference on March 10, 1965.

The second proposal of the Indian Delegation with regard to the venue of the Conference was also unanimously accepted by the meeting. In my opening speech I had stated that as the First Afro-Asian Conference was held in Asia, the Second should be held in Africa. There was complete agreement on this, and it was left to the African countries, who would consider this question in the Organisation of African Unity, in which particular country it would be held. We expect to have this decision in the course of next two or three weeks.

With regard to the Agenda, the views of the Indian delegation with some minor modifications were accepted by the Conference. The agenda has reflected, by and large, our own thinking on matters of current international interest.

With regard to the composition of the Conference, apart from the countries about which there was no disagreement, the Indian Delegation specifically proposed that Malaysia and the U.S.S.R. be invited. With regard to Malaysia the Indian Delegation felt that because of geographical and other considerations Malaysia should be invited to the Conference. However, because of objections from certain delegations, this issue was deferred for later consideration. The meetmg expressed the hope that the obstacle which prevented reaching a consensus on the invitation to Malaysia would be eliminated, and that an invitation would be extended as soon as possible. The Indian Delegation took a firm and unequivocal stand on the question of the invitation to Malaysia and asked for their views to be recorded on this issue. On the Indian proposal to invite

the U.S.S.R., the meeting was not in a position to take a final decision. Our view that the matter should be decided by the Heads of States and Governments when the Summit Conference takes place has been incorporated in the final communique of the meeting.

127

#### INDIA USA INDONESIA MALAYSIA

Date : Apr 01, 1964

### May

### Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record

Vol. X No. 5 May 01, 1964 MAY

CONTENTS

#### PAGES

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Message to Nation on Death of Prime Minister Nehru 129

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speeches in Security Council on Kashmir 130

#### PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on his talks with Sheikh Abdul lah 145

REPUBLIC OF SUDAN Dr. Radhakrishnan's Speech at Banquet welcoming Sudanese President 146 Reply by President Abboud 147 President Abboud's Banquet for Dr. Radhakrishnan 148 Reply by Dr. Radhakrishnan 149 Joint Communique 150

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Defence Minister's Address to National Press Club 151

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA PAKISTAN SUDAN USA

Date : May 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Message to Nation on Death of Prime Minister Nehru

President Radhakrishnan broadcast the following message to the nation on May 27, 1964 an the death of Prime Minister Nehru :

In a moment so charged with emotion, I do not wish to say much; nor is there any need for it. It is an occasion when every one of us, man, woman and child, wish to keep our thoughts to ourselves and render in a mood of reverence grateful homage to a life of great service and dedication.

Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the greatest figures of our generation, an outstanding statesman whose services to the cause of human freedom are unforgettable. As a fighter for freedom he was illustrious, as a maker of modern India his services were unparalleled. His life and work have had a profound influence on our mental make-up, social structure and intellectual development. It will be difficult to reconcile ourselves to the image of India without Nehru's active and all-pervasive leadership. An epoch in our country's history has come to a close.

As a man, Nehru combined a fine sensitivity of mind, a rare delicacy of feeling, with large and generous impulses. To the weak and the frustrated his heart went out in profound sympathy. He was an author of distinction. His Autobiography which tells the story of his life and struggle without a touch of self-pity or moral superiority, is one of the most remarkable books of our time.

Nehru held the office of the Prime Minister of our country ever since the dawn of independence: and in the long years of his premiership tried to put our country on a progressive, scientific, dynamic and non-communal basis. His steadfast loyalty to certain fundamental principles of liberalism gave direction to our thought and life. We can understand the endless surprises of his attitudes and actions; all these fall into their place if we remember his faith in democracy and freedom. He used the existing social and political institutions and breathed into them a new spirit, a new vitality.

Nehru by his series of public utterances educated our people to an appreciation of the values he had cherished. He fought for a high level of human life and burnt his ideals into the understanding of the common people. By his own powerful and vibrant voice, which we will not hear any more, he created, moulded, inspired and kindled a whole generation of Indians, to a loyalty to the first principles which he held so dear. It is not enough to have great ideals. We have to work for their achievement. Time is the essence of the situation and Nehru had a great regard for the sanctity of time. The pitiless exactions of time take no denial and so the great leader has fallen.

Though nurtured in a life of sheltered ease and comfort, he drew himself into the national struggle and became a great leader second only to Gandhi. The part that he played in the national struggle and in the final settlement of the Indian question in 1947 are a part of recent Indian history.

Nehru realized even before the advent of freedom, that our economic regeneration, our progressive modern lives cannot be achieved, unless there is concerted planning. After the transfer of power, as the Chairman of the Planning Commission it was he that gave dynamism and power to the various plans which are now being implemented.

The path of Nehru as a nation builder in the early years of India's freedom was beset with fantastic difficulties and formidable challenges. The partition of the country resulting in the exodus of millions of people from one part of the sub-continent to the other amidst scenes of appalling riots, loot and arson brought in its wake problems-political and economic, which defied easy solution. We have outbreaks of communal violence here and there in our country even now. This must have seemed to Nehru a terrific disillusionment of his great work, inherited from Gandhi and developed by himself.

Nehru always had a conviction that India cannot be viewed in isolation from other States of the world. Even before the advent of freedom, he was pleading that the Indian question was a part of the large movement of the oppressed people. fighting against colonialism. He had a love of liberty, not merely for his own people, but for all people of the world. He, therefore, expressed sympathy and support for all liberation

#### 129

movements in Africa, Asia and South America. He believed in the liberty of all without distinction of class, creed or country.

Nehru was a great believer in world peace and the concept of one world community. No one had shown greater faith and allegiance to the Charter of the United Nations than Nehru. He realised that in a thermonuclear age, war would mean the extinction of all civilised values. That is why he was convinced that the true role of a statesman in this distracted world lay in the way of lessening tensions and conflicts and bringing about a climate of understanding and mutual accommodation, with a view to settlement of international differences without resort to the horrors of war. On several international questions such as Korea, Laos, Congo and Vietnam, his was the voice of peace and friendship and his voice was always heard with respect.

His courage, wisdom and personality has held this country together. It is these qualities which should be cherished, if we are to hold on. Our thoughts today go out to him as a great emancipator of the human race, one who has given all his life and energy to the freeing of men's minds from political bondage, economic slavery, social oppression and cultural stagnation.

Those of us who are left behind to mourn his loss could do no better than work for the ideals he cherished. That is the best tribute we can pay to our departed leader.

# USA OMAN INDIA PERU CONGO KOREA LAOS VIETNAM **Date** : May 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speeches in Security Council on Kashmir

Shri M. C. Chagla, Education Minister and Leader of the Indian Delegation, made three speeches in the Security Council on May 7, 12 and 18, 1964, during its resumed debate on Kashmir.

The following is the text of Shri Chagla's speech on May 7 :

It was said of the Bourbons that they learnt nothing and forgot nothing. The representative of Pakistan is different from the Bourbons in the sense that he has forgotten everything and learnt nothing. The most vital fact he has forgotten, which has changed the whole situation in Kashmir, is the Chinese attack on India. China today is in possession of about 15,000 square miles of Kashmir territory, which is Indian territory. By a signal act of generosity at other people's expense, Pakistan has recently handed over 2,000 more square miles to China.

#### PAKISTAN'S TIGHTROPE ACT

We have been witnessing with amusement, and also with a certain amount of disgust, the greatest tightrope act ever seen in international affairs. Pakistan has achieved this act with extraordinary skill by keeping one foot in SEATO and CENTO and the other in the Chinese camp. She is getting closer and closer into the Chinese embrace, and the latest incident of this touching affection between these two countries is what happened in Djakarta, when Pakistan, China and a few other countries--I am sorry to use the phrase, which is the only way to express what has happened-ganged up to deny to the USSR a place in the Asian world and refused Malaysia admittance to the Asian-African Conference as an Asian country, to which they have an undoubted right.

Pakistan tells the United States that she is her ally and she wants arms in order to fight Communism. She tells China that if she attacks India, Pakistan will stab India in the back. She preaches democracy to us and asks us to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir, but she does not permit even a vestige of democracy in her own territory. She has suppressed the democratic movement in East Pakistan. She has refused the principle, which she professes to be so sacred to her, of selfdetermination to Pakhtoonistan and Baluchistan. I must emphasize a fact, which the representative of Pakistan has conveniently overlooked that in the context of what has recently happened in Kashmir, it is vital to India not only for recovering the territory which China has unlawfully occupied, but also for resisting future aggression by China. The defence of Ladakh, which is north-east Kashmir, against the continuing menace of China is impossible except through Kashmir.

#### **RELIGIOUS APARTHEID**

When I said that the representative of Pakistan has learnt nothing, I meant that he still

#### 130

believes that we are living in the medieval age.

and not in modern times. One of the most serious problems that is facing us and which the Security Council will be discussing very soon is racial apartheid. But there is an equally serious problem, equally vicious and evil, and that is religious apartheid. In principle there is no difference between the two. Both discriminate between man and man and do not respect human dignity. Pakistan was founded on the principle of religious apartheid, and that principle is continuing till today and the most eloquent testimony is the fact that not less than 300,000 members of the minority communities from East Pakistan have sought refuge in India since the beginning of this year. They have fled from persecution and insecurity of the worst type involving their lives and property and even the honour of their women.

They are not merely Hindus; they are also Buddhists and Christians. It is an indisputable fact, of which, notice has been taken by the whole world Press, that no less than 40,000 Christians left East Pakistan because of the religious oppression practised by Pakistan and the fear for their security which these people felt. I should like to refer here to the Easter message of 29 March 1964 issued by Archbishop Lawrence of Dacca (East Pakistan). He is not prejudiced against Pakistan, he is not pro-Indian; he is an archbishop who, I take it, is impartial in his judgement. This is what he says :

"Perhaps never has there been so much real physical and mental suffering in this Archdiocese as during the past month or two." His Archdiocese is in Pakistan. "As you know, Catholics and other Christian communities in the district of Mymensingh have suffered very much." Mymensingh, again, is in East Pakistan. "They have been victims of harassment, of mental affliction, of physical mistreatment. Their homes have been violated, their security of body and peace of mind lost. Conditions were so bad that Christians, almost 30,000 of them, fled from their homes to India, leaving behind all their earthly possessions. Some lost their lives; others were wounded; some are still under treatment in hospitals and camps. Almost all your Catholic brethren of Parishes of Mariannagar, Baramari, Biroi-Dakuni and Bhalukapara fled." These are all places in East Pakistan. "Parishes of Ranikhong, Baluchora and Jallhatra have lost a smaller number. It has been a sad experience for these refugees-a time of real sorrow. Likewise, it has been difficult for those who have remained within. Sorrow of priests, brothers, sisters and of myself is hard to put into words.

"Not all of you are aware of happenings. But I was aware of this danger long ago and I warned the Government"--that is, the Pakistan Government--"of what was likely to happen if strict measures were not taken to stop this injustice. Unfortunately, my warnings were not heeded."

This establishes what I said last time, that the Government of Pakistan was privy to the riots that took place in East Pakistan. Here is the Archbishop who says :

"...I warned the Pakistan Government to take steps to stop these communal riots and the Government took no action."

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE IN OUTLOOK The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has said that if the Kashmir problem was solved, relations between India and Pakistan would become friendly and the two countries would live in peace and amity ever afterwards. I beg to differ. In MY opinion, Kashmir is not the disease; it is only the symptom of the disease and the disease is much more deep-rooted. The disease is the fundamental difference in the outlook of India and Pakistan. India is modern, secular, believing in a multi-communal, multi-linguistic society; Pakistan believing in a religious State in which people would only practise one religion and in which members of other religions should have no place whatsoever. For, so long as Pakistan continues to remain what it is, it must keep up religious frenzy and religious fanaticism. This is the only explanation for the large and continuing exodus of minorities from East Pakistan. Pakistan has already denuded West Pakistan of minority communities. And now it has launched upon a cold, calculated policy of doing the same with regard to East Pakistan. It is significant to note that hardly any Muslim of the 50 million Muslims in India wishes to leave the country. Far from Muslims wishing to leave India, Muslims from East Pakistan have been coming to our country because they find greater prosperity and security there, And when we evict these infiltrators because they are not Indian nationals Pakistan makes a grievance of it and insists on our keeping these infiltrators within our borders.

#### PAKISTAN'S AGGRESSION REAL ISSUE

I think it necessary to re-emphasize what really is the issue before the Security Council. The issue is not, as suggested by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, the status of Kashmir or the question of the accession of Kashmir to India. The issue is Pakistan's aggression on Indian territory. This is the item on the agenda of the Security Council. This was the item brought before it when we came here complaining of Pakistan's aggression. It is important to note that

#### 131

this aggression, namely, the unlawful presence of its armed forces in Jammu and Kashmir, was admitted by Pakistan after considerable prevarications. It also follows from the fact of Pakistan's aggression on India that Kashmir is an integral part of India. India could not be the complainant and Pakistan could not be the accused unless Pakistan's aggression was on Indian territory. The aggression which was committed in 1947 continues till today. If the Security Council wishes to discuss Kashmir at all, it should discuss the question of Pakistan's aggression and find ways and means of Pakistan's vacating the aggression. A burglar who breaks into a house and takes possession of the anteroom cannot ask the owner of the house to prove his title to the remaining portion of his property while he coolly squats in that part which he has unlawfully occupied. Let first things come first. It will be time enough to talk of the status of Kashmir and the legality of accession after Pakistan has conformed to elementary international ethics by withdrawing herself from part of a country which does not belong to her.

Mr. President, you will permit me to say, in all frankness, that our Government and people have a grievance that during the years the Kashmir question has been before the Security Council, most members of the Council have turned a blind eye to the patent fact of Pakistan's aggression. It is that attitude, coupled with the indulgence that the allies of Pakistan have shown to it in the Council, that has been the greatest obstacle to the solution of this question which has bedevilled relations between ourselves and our neighbour. There have been numberless meetings on the subject of Kashmir, and millions of words have been spoken in the Security Council and I am sorry I am adding to those millions a few more.

#### FOUR QUESTIONS

Members have made this suggestion and that, but the vital question brought to the Security Council has remained unanswered. Our people expect an answer from the Security Council. So long as it is not answered, the Security Council will be unable to grapple with the basic elements of the Kashmir situation. My delegation hopes that even at this late hour, the members of the Council will give careful thought to the matter and give an answer to these questions which I now pose : (1) How is it that Pakistan occupies two-fifths of Kashmir ? By what right? (2) Has it any legal right to be in possession and control of any part of Kashmir territory ? (3) Has it any right to negotiate and give away any part of Kashmir to China, as it has admittedly done, as I have said, having given away 2,000 square miles ? (4) What steps should the Council take to make Pakistan vacate its aggression ?

After committing aggression, as an afterthought Pakistan trotted out the plea that her troops had entered Kashmir to help the Muslims who were engaged in a freedom movement. This was also patently false. Let the true nature of Pakistan's actions be exposed by the statements of someone whom Foreign Minister of Pakistan has quoted extensively in his speech. In 1948 Sheikh Abdullah, as the head of the Emergency Administration of Kashmir, was a member of the Indian delegation to the Security Council, and this is what be had to say-this is what he had to say here before the Security Council :

"I was explaining how the dispute arosehow Pakistan wanted to force this position of slavery upon us. Pakistan had no interest in our liberation"-let me repeat-"Pakistan had no interest in our liberation or it would not also have opposed our freedom movement. Pakistan would have supported us when thousands of my countrymen were behind bars and hundreds were shot to death." (241st meeting, page 21)

He is referring to what happened before 1947. Whereas India supported the Kashmir liberation movement, this is what Sheikh Abdullah says about the action of Pakistan when the people of Kashmir were fighting for their freedom against the Maharaja's rule.

#### Sheikh Abdullah further stated

The Pakistani leaders and Pakistani papers were heaping abuse upon the people of Kashmir who were suffering these tortures.

"Then, suddenly, Pakistan comes before the bar of the world as the champion of the liberty of the people of Jammu and Kashmir." (Ibid.)

" I had thought all along that the world had got rid of the Hitters and Goebbels, but from what has happened and what is happening in my poor country, I am convinced that they have only transmigrated their souls into Pakistan." (Ibid., page 22)

According to Sheikh Abdullah, the reign of the Hitters and Goebbels has not passed; the reign still continues in other parts of the world.

#### ABDULLAH'S RELEASE: TRIBUTE To DEMOCRACY

As I was listening to the Pakistan representative's speech, I was wondering whether I was participating in a debate on Kashmir or in a debate about Sheikh Abdullah's opinions on Kashmir and its status. You had a long string of quotations

#### 132

from the representative of Pakistan which his advisers must have taken a long time to cull from newspapers published in India. Let me first say this about the release of Sheikh Abdullah. I think it is a tribute to democracy and freedom in India that not only has he been released, but he enjoys full freedom to express his opinions. What is more, our free Press has given full publicity to what he has been saying, even though his opinions might be unpalatable to the Government. If we, could have ordered the Press to black out all that Sheikh Abdullah said, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan would have been deprived of material for threequarters of his speech. But unlike Pakistan, we have no censorship of the Press in India. Sheikh Abdullah is free to go anywhere he likes in India and to meet anyone he likes. He has just met Mr. Rajagopalachari, whom was once our Governor-General and who today is one of the most vocal opponents of our Government in India. The release of Sheikh Abdullah also proves another important fact : that we are perfectly confident that the situation is normal in Kashmir and that his release would create no disturbances or untoward incidents. It completely disproves the Foreign Minister of Pakistan's thesis that Kashmir is in revolt. No government in its senses would release Sheikh Abdullah if there was already trouble in Kashmir.

Let me say one further thing about what Sheikh Abdullah has been saying. The opinions of any person, however distinguished or eminent, cannot alter or affect the question of the status of a territory. It is not a matter of opinion; it is a matter of law. If two people get married and the marriage is valid in law, the status of these two people cannot be altered by a thousand opinions suggesting that they are living in sin. But if Sheikh Abdullah's opinions are to be relied upon, it is more to the point to ascertain what his opinions were from 1947 to 1949 when the question of the accession of Kashmir arose. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan is a lawyer and I am sure be knows his Evidence Act which is in force both in his country and in mine. As he knows, it is only statements made at or about the time, that are admissible evidence. Statements made long after the event have not only no evidenciary value but are not evidence at all.

#### INVASION By RAIDERS

Sheikh Abdullah gives a graphic description of Pakistani aggression and the invasion by the raiders supported and backed by the Pakistani Government. We heard a great deal the other day from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan about treating Kashmir as a human problem. But let us see how Pakistan treated the people of Kashmir in 1947-1948. I quote from the official records of the Security Council :

"When the raiders came to our land, massacred thousands of people --- mostly Hindus and Sikhs, but Muslims too-abducted thousands of girls, Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims alike, looted our property and almost reached the gates of our summer capital, Srinagar, the result was that the civil, military and police administration failed." (241st meeting, page 21)

To the same effect but a little more emphatically, he stated in a Press statement issued on 16 November 1947 at Srinagar, as reported in The Hindustan Times of 18 November 1947 :

"These raiders abducted women, massacred children, they looted everything and everyone, they even dishonoured the Holy Koran and converted mosques into brothels, and today every Kashmiri loathes the invading tribesmen and their arch-inspirators who have been responsible for such horrors in a land which is peopled with an overwhelming majority of Muslims."

Again in a Press statement issued on 19 November 1947 at Srinagar and reported in The Hindustan Times of 20 November 1947, he said :

"....The invaders who came in the name of Pakistan to make us believe that they were true servants of Islam"-

and I hope the Muslim countries in the world will note this, as to what these true servants of Islam did to Muslims in Kashmir; I repeat :

"...The invaders who came in the name of Pakistan to make us believe that they were true servants of Islam scorched our land, ruined our homes, despoiled the honour of women and devastated hundreds of our villages. These lovers of Pakistan dishonoured even the Koran and desecrated our mosques which they turned into brothels to satisfy their animal lust with abducted women."

This is Sheikh Abdullah telling us what the Pakistan raiders, backed and supported by the Pakistan army and the Pakistan Government, did to the people of Kashmir, and this is the human Problem which, as I have said, the Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto, says we have to discuss before the Security Council. This is the human interest that Pakistan took in the people of Kashmir when they invaded it in 1947. To go back to the record of the Security Council, Sheikh Abdullah said :

"Under these circumstances, both the Maharaja and the people of Kashmir requested the Government of India to accept our accession." (241st meeting, page 22)

Note, not only the Maharaja but also the people of Kashmir, when the land was invaded. when

#### 133

mosques were being desecrated and turned into brothels, turned to us and said, "Accept our accession".

And from page 25 of the same meeting I quote :

"We should prove before the Security Council that Kashmir and the people of Kashmir have lawfully and constitutionally acceded to the Dominion of India, and Pakistan has no right to question that accession."

That was Sheikh Abdullah speaking in 1948.

Can anything be clearer or more authentic than this ? Then he went on to say :

"I refuse to accept Pakistan as a party in the affairs of the Jammu and Kashmir State; I refuse this point blank. Pakistan has no right to say that we must do this and we Must do that." (241st meeting, page 26)

On 18 June 1948, at a Press interview in Delhi, Sheikh Abdullah said :

"We, the people of Jammu and Kashmir, have thrown our lot with the Indian people not in the heat of passion or a moment of despair, but by deliberate choice."-This is self-determination. "The union of our people has been fused by the community of ideals and common sufferings in the cause of freedom. India is pledged to the principle of secular democracy in her policy and we are in pursuit of the same objective."

In a broadcast from Radio Kashmir on 1 July 1952, he said : "Kashmir's accession to India is final."

The Kashmir Government Bureau of Information, New Delhi, issued an authorized version of Sheikh Abdullah's speech made in Jammu on 12 April 1952 :

"The relationship existing between India and Kashmir which has been sanctified by the blood of countless martyrs was irrevocable and no power on earth could 'render us asunder'. We have chosen to remain with India at our own will and for the ideals for which Gandhiji laid down his life."

In his most authoritative pronouncement made in the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir on 11 August 1952, Sheikh Abdullah said as follows :

"It was also made clear that the accession of the Jammu and Kashmir State with India was complete in fact and in law to the extent of the subjects enumerated in this Instrument,"-That is, the Instrument of Accession.

In another pronouncement made in the Constituent Assembly on 19th August 1952, he said:

"We have no intention to secede from India. Everybody knows the conditions through which India and Pakistan were passing at the time of our accession to India. Our accession to India, as I have stated in my last speech, is complete."

I do not wish to depart in the slightest degree from what I stated before the Security Council on the last occasion that the Indian Independence Act did not contemplate a provisional accession nor a conditional one and that the accession did not require any ratification or consent of the people. The accession was complete and irrevocable as soon as the Ruler had executed the Instrument of Accession and it had been accepted by the Governor-General of India.

But after the accession, a Constituent Assembly was elected when Sheikh Abdullah was Prime Minister. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has relied on a statement made by Sheikh Abdullah that the three elections in Jammu and Kashmir were rigged. It is not necessary for my purpose to go into the question of the two latter elections. But as far as the first election was concerned, which elected the Constituent Assembly, the election was held under the auspices, of Sheikh Abdullah himself who was the Prime Minister. Even while the Constituent Assembly was in session, an agreement was arrived at between the State Government of Jammu and Kashmir, of which Sheikh Abdullah was the Premier, and the Central Government known as the "Delhi Agreement" which provided for more power being given to the Central Government than the original Instrument of Accession provided, which was restricted to the three subjects of defence, external affairs and communications, and this, the Delhi Agreement, was ratified by the Constituent Assembly.

#### ACCESSION IRREVOCABLE

So, the legal and constitutional position is perfectly clear : an accession which is absolute and irrevocable, accompanied, what was not necessary in law, by the consent of the people expressed through Sheikh Abdullah, who was the leader of the largest party in Kashmir, and followed by a ratification, again not necessary in law, through the Constituent Assembly.

Therefore, we have all the three facts here first, the legal accession, which is complete and irrevocable; the consent given by Sheikh Abdullah as the leader of the party, which is not necessary in law but still was given; and finally, the Constituent Assembly, elected when Sheikh Abdullah was Prime Minister through adult suffrage which ratified the Constitution.

#### 134

It has been argued that the elections to the Constituent Assembly were not held on the specific issue of accession. This is an erroneous argument. The very purpose of, the Constituent Assembly is to make a constitution, and the elections to the Constituent Assembly in Kashmir were definitely and clearly held for that purpose. This is a normal practice in many countries in which Constituent Assemblies have been specifically elected and charged with the making of the Constitution of the States. This Constituent Assembly formulated a Constitution for the State of Jammu and Kashmir and duly ratified it. Section 3 of this Constitution states : "Kashmir is and shall be an integral part of the Union of India." But even recently Sheikh Abdullah has made statements which are quite different from those cited by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Naturally, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has selected only those which suit his purpose and omitted those which support the case which India has placed before the Security Council. Speaking at Batote on 15 April 1964, as reported by The Hindustan Times on 17 April 1964-as recently as that-Sheikh Abdullah said :

"It is unfair to condemn me for positions I have not taken. Mr. Krishna Menon has, for instance, quoted a statement made by me fifteen years ago against an independent Kashmir and has suggested that I have retracted from that. I still stand by every word of the statement and in fact by all my commitments."

So even today, according to this, Sheikh Abdullah stands by all his commitments, and what his commitments are I have read to the Council from extracts of statements made by him as far back as 1948 and later. Sheikh Abdullah went on to say :

"It is the Government of India which I feel has gone back from its commitments."--That is another matter.--'I have no intention to disown my responsibility in leading Kashmir's accession to India in 1947. Nor do I repudiate my subsequent agreements with the Government of India which were intended to shape the State's relations with the Centre in accordance with the wishes of the people."

The Hindustan Times of 10 April 1964 reported that Sheikh Abdullah made it clear at his news conference earlier that a plebiscite was not the only method for ascertaining the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. He said that if the Government of India felt that a plebiscite would lead to trouble for the sub-continent, other methods must be explored to solve the problem amicably and democratically so that everybody is satisfied.

Now this related obviously to the relations between the Government of India and one of its constituents parts. What Sheikh Abdullah is saying is this : Let us try to find ways and means whereby the wishes of the State of Kashmir are satisfied and that our relations are such that they are agreeable both to the Central Government and to the Constituent State of the Federation of India.

#### PAKISTAN'S TREATMENT OF GHAFFAR KHAN

Let us see what Pakistan has done to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, a great fighter in the freedom struggle of India and Pakistan and popularly known as the "Frontier Gandhi". Pakistan released him after a long period of detention. I think the release was just a few days before the Security Council met last February. I see it as a dramatic gesture. But having released him, big movements were restricted to his village. He has not been permitted to address public meetings, to give interviews to the Press, to issue statements, and hardly any word about him is permitted by the "basic democratic" Government of Pakistan to appear in the Press or to be broadcast in its radio.

He was so badly treated by Pakistan while he was in detention that today this great man is a physical wreck. Compare this with the manner in which we treated Sheikh Abdullah while he was under trial. I met him less than a week back and he is, I can assure members if the. Council, in the best of health.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has again referred to the point which I thought had been shown to be entirely baseless when I addressed the Security Council on the last occasion, namely, that Kashmir is in open revolt. I pointed out then that there was complete inter-communal unity in Kashmir and not a single incident had taken place to mar the prevailing friendship and amity between the different communities living in Kashmir. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has referred to demonstrations taking place in Kashmir. Since when have demonstrations become an evidence of a revolt in a country ? Because Pakistan does not permit demonstrations, it does not understand the meaning of demonstrations. In a free and democratic country, of course there are demonstrations both in favour of and against Government. There is no doubt that when Sheikh Abdullah was released there were demonstrations, but they were demonstrations in which members of all the communities participated, and until today, as far as we know. there has not been a single untoward incident.

#### NO VIOLENCE IN KASHMIR

I wish to contradict a statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan on the last occasion that there was a curfew in Kashmir, that there was a lathi charge--which means a baton chargeagainst the students. That statement is absolutely

#### 135

false. I have a telegram from India saying that all that happened was that the students demonstrated; there was no curfew, there was no violence, there was no baton charge against the students. I am really surprised and shocked that a responsible representative of a responsible Government should come before this body and make a statement that is false and baseless to prejudice India's case.

As I said last time-and I repeat it-throughout this time there has not been a single incident in Kashmir where communal amity has been jeopardized. When the sacred relic was lost, Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs mourned the loss. When the sacred relic was recovered they rejoiced over it. When Sheikh Abdullah was released all communities, garlanded him and demonstrated in his favour. Students may hold a particular view about the future of Kashmir. They have every right to demonstrate. It is a democratic country. But to come to the Security Council and make a statement that there was violence in Kashmir and that there was a baton charge is the height of irresponsibility.

#### PAKISTAN'S VEILED THREAT

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has advanced a rather curious argument that if we took up the attitude that the resolutions adopted by the Security Council have become obsolete, then the cease-fire agreement has also become obsolete. It is clear, from a perusal of the records of the Security Council, that the cease-fire line is a complement of the suspension of hostilities and can be considered separately from part II and, therefore, from part III of the resolution of 13 August 1948. But there is a sinister significance in these suggestions of the Pakistan Foreign Minister. It is not merely a legal argument; it is a threat to disturb the peace of the sub-continent, because, in another part of his speech, be has made no secret of his Government's intention to excite and inflame the people to go to the rescue of the people of Kashmir-to excite and inflame the people to go to what he calls the rescue of the

people of Kashmir. In other words, Pakistan is working up a situation which might lead to a further aggression either by so-called raiders or openly by the Pakistan Army. And now, of course, Pakistan is in a strong position because it is counting upon help and assistance from a newlyfound friend and ally, China. In my opinion, the Security Council should take serious notice of what the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has said on this point. We are all here in the cause of international peace. In flagrant negation of all that the United Nations stands for, a Member State solemnly informs this body, the Security Council, that Pakistan is preparing to commit a breach of the peace.

On the last Occasion when we met, every member of the Security Council was anxious that India and Pakistan should come together, have talks and discuss ways and means of restoring communal harmony in both India and Pakistan, and take steps to prevent a recurrence of the terrible incidents that took place in both countries.

One hopeful and significant event that took place after the last meeting of the Security Council in February was that our Home Minister and the Home Minister of Pakistan, at the initiative of our Prime Minister, met in Delhi to have talks on this question. I do not know what the relations between Mr. Bhutto and Khan Habibullah Khan are, but I am rather surprised to find that there was not even a passing reference to these talks in the long statement by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. After returning to Pakistan, Mr. Habibullah, the Home Minister of Pakistan, issued a statement on these talks. I quote from The Pakistan Times of 25 April 1964 :

"The Pakistan Home Minister said that in spite of serious obstacles the meeting of Home Ministers was quite a success, as the two Governments succeeded in settling about 90 per cent of the points necessary to restore communal harmony and peaceful atmosphere. The Government of Pakistan is determined to iron out the remaining points of difference, including evictions of Muslims from India and migrations of Hindus from East Pakistan, during the second round of meetings to be held in Rawalpindi and Karachi next month."

That means that the second round is going to be held this month, very soon.

Therefore, the talks between the two Home Ministers have been fairly successful. They have not been concluded and they are to be resumed later this month. I should have thought that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan would have shown some restraint in the statement which he made on Tuesday, 5 May, and not indulged in diatribes against India and Prime Minister Nehru. But I realise that restraint is a quality that is not easily acquired.

#### PAKISTAN'S PRETENSIONS

I was very happy to see that Pakistan is now trying to emerge as a great protagonist of Afro-Asian solidarity and as a great champion of anticolonialism. I do not think that it is necessary for India to remind our Afro-Asian friends of the stand that we have always taken in our common fight against colonialism, in support of their independence, and in our opposition to apartheid. I am sure that the Afro-Asian countries will look askance at this championship of the Afro-Asian cause by a country which is a member of SEATO and CENTO, which believes in military alliances, and which has always questioned the principle of nonalignment. I do not think that it is necessary for

#### 136

India to remind our Afro-Asian friends of India's stand on colonialism ever since its independence and of its struggle against British colonialism for many decades prior to 1947. Nor do I think that Afro-Asian countries have such short memories as to forget Pakistan's continuing warm friendship and maintenance of diplomatic, commercial and other relations with the Government of Portugal; nor the trade relations that Pakistan maintained with South Africa in the face of the united stand of Asians and Africans against commercial and other intercourse with South Africa; nor the Pakistan Government's pro-imperialist role in the Suez crisis.

I might also remind members of the Council that it was India in 1946 that persuaded the Assembly to pass the first resolution against racial discrimination in South Africa and we were also among the first to raise the question of South West Africa in the United Nations and we have continued to carry on a ceaseless fight against apartheid in all its forms. It is somewhat strange that Pakistan should talk so glibly of Indian neocolonialism when Pakistan itself is a creation of imperialism, the interests of which it has continued to subserve directly or otherwise ever since its inception through membership in CENTO, particularly to stem the rise of Arab nationalism. I should not like to elaborate further on this point but all that I would say is that we have nothing to learn from Pakistan in respect of anti-colonialism or championship of the cause of freedom of colonial and dependent peoples.

The Pakistan Foreign Minister has referred to many Afro-Asian countries supporting Pakistan on the Kashmir issue. We know that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has been all around the world trying to get certificates of good character from different countries. We do not know how Pakistan's case was presented to these countries. But there is hardly any value attached to ex parte judgements which Mr. Bhutto, as a lawyer, should clearly realize. In one case at least we can say that the support which Pakistan has received is purely a marriage of convenience. I am referring to the joint communique with China to which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan referred with such emotion. For sixteen years the Chinese Government has maintained a non-partisan and a neutral stand on the Kashmir issue. But now after its invasion of India in pursuance of its own global policy motivated by the chauvinistic desire to establish China's domination in Asia and Africa with the assistance of some other countries including mainly Pakistan. China has chosen to take sides. Pakistan and China are both aggressors in Kashmir. Both have acquired their gains by the use of force and aggression. The affinity between them is all too obvious. It is no wonder that the Pakistan representative soon after the Chinese aggression on India went around the world trying to persuade various countries that it was not China that was the aggressor but India.

#### REPRESSION IN BALUCHISTAN

In an eloquent peroration the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has appealed for good relations between our two countries. But even in this appeal the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has not resisted the temptation of indulging in vituperation against India. Vituperation comes so easily to him. He has said that India has stalled and prevaricated for sixteen. years. I wonder whether it is a typographical mistake and whether he meant Pakistan rather than India. Because prevarication has all been on the side of Pakistansince 1947 when it denied aggression and was ultimately compelled to admit it. Stalling has also been on its side-the refusal to vacate its continuing aggression. I am glad that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan realizes that this is an age of freedom and self-determination and of removing shackles which bind people. Most wonderful and laudable sentiments. May I offer him a little friendly advice ? Why not start translating these noble sentiments in Pakistan itself? Why not give adult suffrage to his people who are clamouring for it? Why not confer democratic rights and fundamental freedoms upon them who have been groaning under the oppression of an autocratic and tyrannical regime ? How autocratic and tyrannical the regime can be, may be gathered from what is happening in Baluchistan. Mr. Abdul Haq, a member of the National Assembly of Pakistan, disclosed the other day that the Id gathering in Baluchistan had been bombarded. Other Opposition members have also drawn attention to the repression that is going on in Baluchistan and the country-wide arrests, the lathi charges-perhaps the Foreign Minister confused Kashmir with Baluchistanthe firings and bombings, and they have expressed the opinion that this might be crossing the limits even of a police State.

The Guardian, which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan is so fond of quoting, stated in its issue of 24 April 1962, referring to the Baluchistan Administration :

"The Administration is typical of good colonial rule and there is a wide gulf between it"-that is, the Administration-"and the people".

Let us see what Pakistanis themselves had to say about their own Government. Here is Mr. Qureshi, speaking in the National Assembly at Dacca--this is from the official Pakistan records:

"We talk of the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir although we deny the basic rights to the people of Pakistan."

#### 137

On 2 April 1964, an interesting incident hap-

pened in the course of the debate in the National Assembly in Rawalpindi which throws a flood of light on restrictions placed upon public debate in the legislature on the issue of self-determination for the people of Pakistan. Mr. Qamar-uz-Zaman, a member, stated that Pakistan failed to get sympathy on Kashmir because of failures within the country. The Government demanded self-determination for Kashmir but refused franchise for Pakistani people and the world knew that the Government had no popular support. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan intervened saving that it was not relevant whether India was a democracy and Pakistan was not and evidently upset by Mr. Zaman's argument, called these highly injurious to national interests.

Mr. Hussain Mansoor, another member, said that the Foreign Minister could not refute charges against Pakistan by Minister Chagla in the Security Council--I am very grateful to, Mr. Hussain Mansoor, whoever he is, I do not know him-and the Speaker intervened saying, "Kindly stop there; it is not a matter for playing about." The ultimate end of the debate was that the House went into secret session. with the support of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. This is self-determination. This is the right of people in Pakistan.

I also find from the debate in the National Assembly of Pakistan-the debate on the Constitution First Amendment Bill, which was held on 20 March 1963-that under an ordinance which is on the statute book of Pakistan today, a police officer can interrogate a person and he can forture him into making a confession. When I read this, I asked myself -: "Am I living in 1964 or am I living in the medieval era?" I cannot conceive of a country putting on the statute book a measure which permits the police to torture people into making confession. And this is a statement made, again, in the National Assembly of Pakistan. This was stated in the Pakistan National Assembly by Mr. Yousaf Khattak, leader of the Opposition.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has relied on opinions expressed by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and some other Indians in support of his case. The trouble with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan is that be does Dot or cannot realize that we are a democratic country and one of the fundamental principles of democracy is the right to dissent and the right to express that dissent. In a large country like India, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan will always find some people with misconceived, ideas who accept the thesis propounded by him. But has he taken the trouble to inquire what is the following of these people and whether there is the remotest possibility of their view being accepted either by Parliament or even by the tiniest section of our people.

## FANTASTIC SUGGESTION

Towards the end of his speech, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan made a fantastic suggestion that Sheikh Abdulalh should be called before the Security Council to give information which will be of assistance in examining the question before the Council. Sheikh Abdullah is a citizen of India, who, I will assume, has a large following in Kashmir. He has the greatest affection and regard for our Prime Minister and is at present in Delhi staving with the Prime Minister as his guest. Like any other citizen, he has the right to approach his Prime Minister and represent to him what changes should be made in the political and administrative set-up in Kashmir. But with all that he is no more than a private citizen. The parties before the Council are India and Pakistan, and they alone have the right to appear through their official delegations. It is solely for India to decide who should be a member of its delegation. The suggestion made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan is, therefore, totally unacceptable to my Government.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has paid me a compliment by referring to me as a judge and quoting what I said in Patna that law must take its course with regard to Sheikh Abdullah. Perhaps the Foreign Minister of Pakistan does not appreciate the fact that in my country we have equality before the law and, as far as the law is concerned, it makes no difference whether the person concerned is high and mighty or is the humblest citizen. As a judge, and I was a judge for many years, I administered the law and I did not distinguish between one citizen and another. I applied the law equally. And that is all I meant when I said what the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has quoted. It was not intended as a threat against Sheikh Abdullah; it was only a reminder that law cannot make any exception in favour of anybody.

My final appeal to the Security Council is to

realize that India-Pakistan differences can only be solved by those two countries, and there is more chance of a settlement if there is no intervention by third parties. No superimposed solution will do any good. The Security Council should take note of the discussions that have already started between the two Home Ministers and hope that these discussions will end successfully and bring about an atmosphere of communal harmony. It is only when such an atmosphere is established that it will be possible to discuss with Pakistan our other outstanding differences.

## Following is Shri Chagla's speech on May 12

When I joined the Bar and. started practising more than forty years ago, I was given one important piece of advice. That if I had a bad case I should abuse my opponent as virulently as possible. I do not know what other qualifications of an advocate the Foreign Minister of Pakistan possess-

#### 138

es, but he has certainly taken this particular advice to heart and has perfected it by practice. Half the speech of the representative of Pakistan was devoted to invective and abuse. I shall ignore it. More than a quarter of the speech was devoted to asking rhetorical questions, which the Pakistan Foreign Minister answered himself to his own complete satisfaction. Therefore, there is very little of substance in the speech which I have to Answer. I shall try to avoid repeating what I have said in my earlier statements before this Council. I reiterate and stand by every statement I have made on behalf of my Government. in my earlier statements in the course of this debate.

#### EXERCISES IN FUTILITY

I feel more and more that these debates on Kashmir are only exercises in futility. They lead nowhere and come to no conclusions. We have taken up the stand from the very start that this meeting was both unnecessary and extremely untimely. When the two Home Ministers of India and Pakistan are, busy carrying on talks for the restoration of communal harmony, I have no doubt that the debate here, far from helping them, will only make their task more difficult and aggravate the situation prevailing in the two countries. Let me repeat that the Kashmir question, as indeed all the other outstanding differences between the two countries, can only be solved by bilateral talks between us and by the creation of an atmosphere conducive to such a settlement. The representative of Pakistan has made a charge that it is we who have made it impossible to create such - an atmosphere. Facts speak differently. Our President made an appeal to the President of Pakistan and our Prime Minister from his sick bed made a similar appeal. Both the appeals were turned down with scant courtesy and even the talks now going on between the two Home Ministers were at the initiative of our Prime Minister.

The representative of Pakistan insisted on coming to this Council on flimsy charges to reopen the Kashmir question and even after full and complete statements made by both sides, insisted on resuming the debate which is now going on. Lest memories be short, let me remind the members of the Council that it was our Prime Minister who appealed to President Ayub to enter into a no-war declaration, which would emphasize the peaceful intentions of both the countries. The offer was rejected.

The Pakistan representative has made an appeal to my people to transform the climate of our two countries. I have no doubt in my own mind that the peoples of Pakistan and India have no guarrels and they want to live in peace and amity. After all only seventeen years ago the people of Pakistan were also the people of India. Ethnically and culturally they are the same. Millions in my country speak the languages which are the official languages of Pakistan. The history of Pakistan does not commence from 1947. It goes back thousands of years as does the history of India. The people of Pakistan have as much right as the people of India to take pride in the great civilization that India has developed. The Taj Mahal, Kutab Minar, Fatehpur Sikri, Ellora and Ajanta are the great monuments of India's greatness to which people of Pakistan can equally lay claim. When Mr. Habibullah, Home Minister of Pakistan, came to India, he often talked of the old days when he had fought under Mahatma Gandhi and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, another great fighter for independence in the old days. The trouble with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan is that he is too young either to have participated in the freedom struggle or even to remember it.

## CONTINUING PAKISTANI AGGRESSION

It will be noticed that in the long statement that the representative of Pakistan made he has perfunctorily and summarily dealt with the central issue which I had raised in my statement, namely, the aggression of Pakistan which continues till today. Am I right in assuming that Pakistan has no answer to the charge ? It is futile for the Pakistan representative to talk of the principles of the Charter and of a scrupulous discharge of international commitments when his country has flagrantly violated the Charter and has perpetrated aggression upon another country in which she persists till today.

It is equally obvious that Pakistan has failed to discharge her international commitments by not complying with the directives given by this Council to Pakistan to withdraw her troops from twofifths of Kashmir which she even today illegally occupies. Pakistan has failed to realize that the significance of her treaty with China by which she gave 2,000 square miles of Kashmir is not its territorial aspect nor the arithmetical calculation by which we are told that Pakistan made a net gain, but the fact that Pakistan has no common frontier with China and in negotiating with her she was negotiating with regard to a territory to which internationally she has no claim and which is part of India. In claiming an accretion of 750 square miles to Pakistan territory, Pakistan stands selfcondemned of aggression, because in no view of the case is this territory part of Pakistan. I would like to know how Kashmir can express her selfdetermination when part of it has been given away to China. It is not correct to say that the treaty is provisional. As far as Pakistan is concerned, she is bound because it provides that if Kashmir comes to Pakistan, Pakistan is committed to the agreement which she has made with China.

The argument I advanced with regard to China's aggression against India is not irrelevant

### 139

to the kashmir issue as suggested by the representative of Pakistan. On the contrary, it is its most important aspect. It is no use saying that a look at the map a India discloses that there are other routes through which China can march into India. The patent tact remains that China attacked India through Ladakh, that she can do so again if she was so minded and that China today is in unlawful possession of a large part of Indian territory which can only be recovered if Kashmir remains a part of India and provides facilities for resistance to Chinese aggression.

It is ridiculous to suggest that this is a colonial or imperial argument and that we are subordinating the rights of the Kashmiri people to the needs of our defence. Through the centuries Kashmir has always been a part of India. The United Kingdom ruled both British India and the princely States although with varying degrees of authority. Therefore, when India speaks of Kashmir being vital to her defence, she is not referring to a foreign country or trying to subject people of a different race or nationality in order to subserve her own requirements. In 1947 the only question that arose was whether Kashmir should accede to India or Pakistan. There was no question of either India or Pakistan acquiring a colony. It is an insult to the people of Kashmir even to suggest that her relationship to India is that of a colonial people to. an imperial Power. Kashmir decided legally and constitutionally to accede to India rather than to Pakistan. That was the end of the controversy. The controversy now is whether a part of India could be permitted to secede from her. It is in this connexion that the argument I advanced about the importance of Kashmir to India assumes significance. Let me point out that President Ayub khan himself has spoken of Kashmir being vital to Pakistan's defence. In saying this is President Avub looking upon Kashmir as a colony or her people as belonging to a different race?

### PAKISTAN'S POLICY UN-ISLAMIC

The Pakistan representative has insinuated that I have made an attack on Islam and the principles of Islam and that we in India resent the fact that the people of Pakistan practise that religion. This insinuation is totally baseless. In my own country, fifty million practise Islam freely and without any opposition, I am conscious of the great principles for which that religion stands : social equality, human dignity, tolerance and the value that every individual soul has in the eye of God. Our objection is not to the fact that the people of Pakistan are Muslims. Our objection is that the policy of the Government of Pakistan is entirely un-Islamic. There are many Muslim countries in the world which have non-Muslims living in them. The nonMuslims look upon themselves as citizens with loyalty to that country just as much as the Muslims do. There it complete communal harmony in those countries and the non-Muslim religions are respected and receive complete toleration. Pakistan of late has been sending many delegations to different countries in the world. It would be worthwhile to send a delegation to these Muslim countries to find out how the principles of Islam are applied in the governance of these countries. Hatred of India, persecution of her minorities, the perpetual cry of a holy war against my country, are not precepts which Islam proclaims. It is not I, but Sheikh Abdullah, who stated as I pointed out on the last occasion, that the Pakistanis claiming to be the protectors of Islam had killed and looted people, desecrated the Koran and converted mosques into brothels.

### INDIA'S FAITH IN NON-ALIGNMENT

The representative of Pakistan has charged India with pursuing a Machiavellian policy in adhering to the principles of non-alignment. India was perhaps the first important country which declared its faith in non-alignment. Non-alignment means refusal to enter into military pacts or alliances or to belong to any power bloc. It also means maintaining friendly relations with all countries. You will remember that Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States, once called nonalignment an immoral policy. In our adherence to that principle, we withstood without flinching many violent attacks from the Western Powers, and today these very Powers realize that nonalignment is the only correct policy for the newly emerging countries to adopt. The United States played an important part in making Laos nonaligned. France, with a sense of Gallic logic and realism, has now come to the conclusion that the only way to have peace in South East Asia is to remove it from the ambit of the cold war.

What has happened in that China, with which we were on friendly terms, suddenly and treacherously attacked us. Did we give up our policy of nonalignment ? We certainly did not. It is to the credit of the Western Powers that they gave us military assistance because they realized that our cause was just and we were victims of a naked aggression. In obtaining this assistance from them, we entered into no military pact with them. But we did not receive assistance merely from the Western Powers. The USSR, making it clear that the border dispute between India and China should have been settled by peaceful means and not by war-which China had unjustifiably waged against Indiaalso gave us assistance. It was only Pakistan, our dear neighbour, which not only did not come to our assistance but did its utmost to prevent the Western Powers from coming to our rescue. It did more. It carried on a violent propaganda in the chancelleries of the world against India and justified the Chinese attack on our country.

#### 140

The representative of Pakistan has made a slanderous attack on the Colombo Powers. He has suggested that, while we are maintaining a warlike attitude against China, we are simultaneously carrying on negotiations for a peaceful settlement by proxy--I am using his expression through the Colombo Powers. This suggests that the Colombo Powers are our agents and our tools. The Colombo Powers-the United Arab Republic, Ceylon, Burma, Cambodia, Ghana and Indonesia-are important, respected and independent countries. They, on their own initiative, intervened and wanted to bring about a peaceful settlement between India and China. For that purpose they put forward certain proposals. India accepted them without qualification or reservation. China refused to do so, and it is because of this that China and India have not been able to come to the negotiating table in order to settle their dispute.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has charged India with a policy which is intended to annihilate or expel the 50 million Muslims living in India, and for this purpose he has quoted extensively from a speech of Mr. Frank Anthony and a statement of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. We do not deny the disgraceful incidents which took place in India, in which atrocities were committed on the Muslim minorities, but let me set the record straight on this point.

In the first place, these atrocities were localized and were largely the result of the fact that the feelings of the majority community were inflamed by the refugees coming over from East Pakistan with harrowing tales of what they and their families had suffered. In the second place, communal disturbances in these parts were put down with a heavy hand both by the State authorities and by the firm intervention of the Government of India.

## PAKISTAN'S POLICY : HOSTILITY To MINORITIES

In the third place, we have emphatically denounced these atrocities and expressed our shame that such things should happen in a secular country like India. The religious apartheid of which Pakistan is guilty consists of treating Muslims as a separate-and privileged---class from others. Pakistan's origin is indeed traceable to religious apartheid, the manifestation of which is a two-nation theory-that is, that Muslims and others are separate nations, a theory we entirely reject and repudiate. The same concept governs Pakistan's internal policy today.

The 50 million Muslims of India have not appointed the Pakistan Foreign Minister as their representative or advocate to plead their cause here. On the, contrary, they have denounced Pakistan's stand here, have expressed complete confidence in the Government of India, have, emphasized the importance of Kashmir's remaining an integral part of India to secularism and in their complete faith in the Government's safeguarding their religion and their rights as citizens. The Pakistan representative will perhaps be interested to learn that even the Muslim League, which was the most communal organization in India and which was really responsible for partition, has supported India's stand on Kashmir.

In the fourth place, I should like to emphasize one important aspect of the communal policy in my country and Pakistan. The position would be made clear if I drew an analogy between the United States of America and South Africa. We all know that there is racial discrimination in the United States, but we also know that the official policy of the Government of the United States is against such a policy and the American administration is doing its best to remove this blot from the record it has established through its Constitution and the principles of its revolution of equality before the law and respect for human dignity. On the other hand, the official policy of South Africa is to support and strengthen racial apartheid. We have communal troubles

and disturbances in our country, but our official policy, which we pursue with unflinching tenacity, is secularism and communal harmony. Pakistan's official policy, on the other hand, as witnessed by statements made by its responsible leaders and its Press, to which I made reference in my previous statements, is open hostility to the minorities residing within its territories.

With regard to the Anglo-Indian community and what Mr. Anthony said, I have before me a large number of statements made by Anglo-Indians and Anglo-Indian associations totally repudiating the stand taken by him.

## REFUGEES FROM EAST PAKISTAN

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has stated that we are responsible for the large migration of minorities from East Pakistan into India. In a despatch that appeared in The New York Times on 10 May of this year from Calcutta, the figure given of the refugees that have crossed over into India so far is 312,000 and about 10,000 had got through on 6 May in the largest wave so far. It is ridiculous to suggest that we are luring these refugees to our country. Does this Council realize what these figures mean in terms, of human suffering and misery? These peoples are leaving their homes and hearths and leaving a country in which their forefathers lived for centuries in order to go out to a foreign land, to an uncertain future. We do not want these refugees. We

#### 141

realize that their proper place is in Pakistan. We also realize that their advent will disrupt our economy. But what are we to do? Compassion demands that we should not refuse shelter to people who are fleeing from-persecution and a sense of insecurity:

I am not going into the figures of the Indian Muslims who might have left India. I dare say when communal trouble took place in India some Muslims must have left because of fear and a sense of insecurity. But the unchallenged fact remains that after communal harmony was restored in India and the troubles put down, there has been no movement of Muslims from India into Pakistan. The movement is all the other way and this is borne out not merely by Indian but by impartial foreign testimony. With regard to the figures given by the representative of Pakistan of Muslims who left India in the course of two, years, these are not Indian nationals. After due legal process they have been found to be not the nationals of India but the nationals of Pakistan who have infiltrated into our country. They have been evicted and in doing so we have exercised the right of sovereignty that every country possesses of sending out of its country infiltrators who do not acquire citizenship of the country, and even here the numbers cited by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan are grossly exaggerated.

#### NO TRADE BETWEEN INDIA AND S. AFRICA

The representative of Pakistan has given a lame explanation about its attitude towards the Afro-Asian countries and colonialism. It is completely false to say that we have done any business with South Africa. In document A/ AC.115/L.55 dated 5 March 1964, referred to by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, there are figures given of exports by India to South Africa. The fact of the matter is that products of Indian origin might have gone to South Africa from third countries. I repeat that there is and has been no trade between India and South Africa. We were the first to cut off diplomatic and commercial relations with that country. Suez was a turning point in the history of colonialism. Pakistan's representative did not say a word about the role played by his country on that question, nor has he said. anything about Pakistan's continuing relations with Portugal. I sympathize with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. It is so difficult to be at the same time anti-colonial and a distinguished member of SEATO and CENTO.

The representative of Pakistan has expressed indignation at my comparing Pakistan to a burglar who has entered the property of another person, squats in the anteroom and challenges the rightful owner to prove his title and with a great show of injured innocence has attempted to make the point that we art not dealing with the law of real property and that Kashmir is not a piece of property which has got to be disposed of in that way. But what about the two-fifths of Kashmir that Pakistan is in possession of ? Is is part of Pakistan property ? Or does Pakistan just hold on to it as the imperial Powers of old did with territories they seized by war as a part of their

#### booty?

Let me refer to two points in brief. One is about Nagaland. The representative of Pakistan should have told the members of the Security Council that we have conferred upon Nagaland the status of a Constituent State of the Indian Union, and the people of Nagaland have accepted this status and have held free elections recently to establish a State Legislature in that part of the country. The other point is with regard to what happened at Diakarta. Pakistan opposed the invitation to the USSR to the Afro-Asian Conference on the ground that it was not an Asian Power and compared it to Albania. It forgot that two-thirds of the USSR is in Asia and that 40 per cent of the people of the USSR live on the Asian Continent.

### PAKISTAN'S CONTENTION UNTENABLE

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has raised the question of Sheikh Abdullah being called before the Security Council. I have already pointed out in my last statement how untenable his contention is. Sheikh Abdullah occupies no official position in Kashmir, and it would be a most dangerous precedent for this Council to lay down that any citizen in a country who holds dissident opinion or belongs to an opposition party should have the right of audience here. In Kashmir itself there are various parties. If Sheikh Abdullah is to be called, then representatives of all these parties should also be called. And why not the representatives of 50 million Muslims in India who have a vital stake in the future of Kashmir? The representative of Pakistan says that the whole of Kashmir is behind Sheikh Abdullah. Where does he get this fact? Is this his inference from the demonstrations held in favour of Sheikh Abdullah ? Has he obtained the figures of the number of people who took part in these demonstrations ? Is he satisfied that the only demonstrations that take place in Kashmir are in favour of Sheikh Abdullah ? I have just received a telegram from Delhi which is very pertinent :

"High tributes were paid to the leader of the Indian delegation, Mr. Chagla, for his able handling of the Kashmir case in the Security Council at public rallies held in all the three districts of Kashmir on 10 May."

#### 142

reports PTI from Srinagar. I am grateful for this tribute to me. I am sorry I have to read it out. I should be a little more modest, but I am reading out the telegram as I have received it.

Addressing a rally at Dyalgam in Anantnag district-this is again in the Valley of Kashmir-Syed Hussain MLC-he is a member of the Legislative Council of Kashmir-and Mufti Mohammed Syeed, also another member of the Assembly, said Chagla had very ably advocated "our case against Pakistan's aggression. Chagla has voiced the feelings of the people of the entire country, especially the Kashmiris."

Ghulam Mohammed Lasjan, a former MLA and Abdul Rehman Rahat, Vice-President, District National Conference, Srinagar, addressing another public rally at Mharmar South of Srinagar said that the people of the State were determined to march forward on the path of progress as an integral part of India. Any attempt to disturb the peace and stability in the State would be resisted.

Another rally was held at Vagura in the Baramula District; this is very near Srinagar. Speakers at the rally supported new Government policies -that is, the Government of Mr. Sadiq-and pledged support to the Government of India and the State Government.

Patriot's correspondent adds from Srinagar

"Rallies, mostly peasant gatherings, confirmed the fact that the health of Kashmir was sound despite the secessionists' cry to reopen the Kashmir issue and undo the settled condition in Kashmir.

"Inspiring to watch was a 10,000 strong rally held at Manmar forty miles away from Srinagar in the Kangan Valley where nomadic Gujjars travelling from far off distances assembled to reiterate their resolve to defend the integrity and to extend their support to the policies of the new Government."

So the demonstrations that are held in Kashmir, may I inform the Foreign Minister, are not all in support of Sheikh Abdullah; there are equally important demonstrations which are being held in support of the Present Government of Kashmir headed by Mr. Sadiq, and also the party which wants Kashmir to remain an integral part of India.

Now, if I may continue with this quotation

"Speakers at the rally included Bashir Ahmed, a popular Gujjar leader, Ghulam Mohammed Lasjan, a former MLA, and Abdul Rehman Rahat, veteran peasant leader from Badgan and Vice-President of the District National Conference, Srinagar.

"Thunderous cheers greeted Bashir Ahmed when he said that it was only because of India's generous help that Gujjars, ignored for centuries in the State, were advancing on a par with other sections of the society.

"If anything threatened this advance it was the continuing Pakistani aggression on. the State's territory, and Chagla, by exposing Pakistani perfidy, had ably voiced the Kashmiris' sentiments.

"Both Lasjan and Abdul Rehman Rahat pinpointed the role of Western countries in keeping the so-called Kashmir issue alive. Rahat said that ever since Kashmir's freedom struggle started imperialists had been particularly active to defeat its objectives. They had failed in the past and they would be defeated this time too because the entire country stood behind Kashmir, he said."

My Government, therefore, is emphatically opposed to an invitation being extended to Sheikh Abdullah to appear before this Council.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has referred to the gallant deeds of Muslims in East Pakistan in giving protection to members of the minority community. These gallant deeds are not confined to East Pakistan. Similar gallant deeds were performed by Hindus in West Bengal. All honour to those who risk their lives in protecting those belonging to other faiths. This emphasizes, what I said earlier, in my statement, that the peoples of the two countries have no quarrel, that they may be swayed by passions but at heart they want to be friendly and are not oblivious to the bonds that still bind them.

## NO SOLUTION IF AGGRESSION IS CONDONED

Let me, therefore, end on this note : that we treat the Kashmir problem as a human problem as much as a legal or political one. The question that we should address ourselves to is : what solution will lead to the peace and happiness of the people of Kashmir and maintain inter-communal unity not only in that part of India but in the Test of the country ? I wish to state with all the confidence and emphasis I possess that any disturbance of the status of Kashmir which has already been settled will result-in serious troubles not only in Kashmir itself but in the whole subcontinent of India. If this Council is interested in the maintenance of peace and international relations, it should avoid any superimposed solution upon the two countries or any intervention in any talks or discussions we might have with each other. The Kashmir question will not be solved by interminable discussions and debates in this Council. It will be solved only when Pakistan realizes that Kashmir is not a political shuttlecock in the game of anti-Indian policies

#### 143

which she has for the time being adopted. The Kashmir question will be solved when Pakistan realizes that India wishes her well and has no designs on her independence, and that in the prosperity of the two countries lies the prosperity of the whole subcontinent. In this prosperity the people of Kashmir must have a share as an integral part of India.

India has always stood, and stands, for a just solution, a peaceful solution, an early solution to the Kashmir question. It is Pakistan which has, blocked the way to such a solution. There cannot be a just solution in international affairs if aggression is either condoned or rewarded. There can be no just solution of the Kashmir question if Pakistan does not vacate her aggression and while the Pakistan army still keeps two-fifths of the State of Jammu and Kashmir in her unlawful possession.

Shri Chagla made the following closing remarks on May, 18 :

May I join the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in expressing my deep appreciation of the help given to us by the members of the Council in terminating this long debate, and especially to you, Mr. President.

You have been very gracious and very patient. You have tried to overcome many difficulties, and it is because of your kindness that I will be able to catch my plane at 9.30 p.m. tonight. I do not want to enter into controversy, but in view of the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, I must say a few words. The summation that has been made by you, Mr. President, was very ably done, and I can quite understand all the obstacles you had to overcome in order to arrive at that summation. But a summation does not bind either party. It is the view of the President as to what was stated in the debate that has taken place. What was actually stated is on the records of the Council, and if ever a question arises as to what any particular representative stated in this debate, we will have to turn to the official records, which will speak for themselves. Therefore, there also I am in agreement with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that the summation is not a consensus, is not a resolution, and it has no binding effect. It only expressed the opinion of the President as to what, in his view, was the trend of the debate in February and March.

The representative of Pakistan said that certain important aspects emerged from this debate. Let me state what, according to me, emerged from this debate. First and foremost, it emerged that Kashmir was not in open revolt. Far from Kashmir being in open revolt, there was complete peace and normalcy in that State, and I think it is a tribute to Kashmir and those who live in Kashmir that there was complete communal harmony in that part of India.

#### BILATERAL TALKS ONLY SOLUTION

The second thing that emerged was that this matter can only be solved by Pakistan and India. It can only be solved by bilateral negotiations, and any intervention on the part of third parties will binder rather than help these negotiations. What also emerged was that it is time we discarded all shibboleths, forgot all resolutions which were passed many years ago, and face the realities of today. I think it was you, Mr. Presdent, and some other members who said that the time has come to have a new look at the Kashmir situation, and the Kashmir situation can only be solved provided you take into consideration what effect it will have on the people of India and the peace and communal harmony prevailing in India.

## KASHMIR INTEGRAL PART OF INDIA

With regard to negotiations, negotiations can always succeed if there is goodwill between both parties. I assure my friend opposite that we want to settle with Pakistan, but let us go to the negotiating table on the basis of goodwill. Also, I want Pakistan to accept certain basic positions which India takes up and which it will always take up. One is that Kashmir is an integral part of India, that is the basic position. The second is that no country can be a party to giving up part of itself, that no country can agree to the self-determination of a part of the country. It would break up India, and if this dangerous principle were to be applied to other parts of the world, it would break up Africa, it would break up many parts of Asia, and it would break up many parts of the Middle East.

India is an example, and I hope it will always be an example, of how an intercommunal society can exist. Fifty million Muslims and others, Hindus, Christians and Buddhists, have been living in peace in India and my appeal to Pakistan is : Do not interfere with this experiment. Let this experiment go on because the future of the world depends upon inter-communal societies succeeding. There are inter-communal societies living in Africa and in the Middle East, where there are Muslims and Christians living happily together, and we are carrying out the same experiment in India.

#### SECRETARY-GENERAL

One last word about the Secretary-General. My country has the greatest respect and the greatest regard for the Secretary-General. Only recently, we invited him to come to India to deliver lectures, but unfortunately he could

## 144

not accept. I extend an invitation to him to come to India as a guest of my country, to go wherever he likes, to talk to whomsoever he likes, find to visit Kashmir and any part of India. We have no Iron Curtain in our country. But I do not want him to come in the context of the Kashmir debate unless we both agree that he should so come. I am sure that the Secretary-General himself will never put himself in the embarrassing position of coming to India if he is not wanted on this Kashmir question. But he will always be our friend and always welcome to come to our country, but as our guest and not in an official position in this connexion. I assure the Secretary-General and I assure the Council that any intervention on the part of the Secretary-General, which is uninvited and without the consent of both parties, will hinder and hamper the negotiations which we propose to carry on in the very near future.

## INDIA PAKISTAN CHINA USA INDONESIA MALAYSIA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA LAOS SRI LANKA BURMA CAMBODIA GHANA ALBANIA ANGUILLA

## **Date** : May 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on his talks with Sheikh Abdullah

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on May 8, 1964 about his talks with Sheikh Abdullah :

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I can quite understand the desire of the Members of this House to know what is happening in regard to these talks with Sheikh Abdullah-naturally they are anxious to find out. I can assure them that nothing will be done, will be settled with Sheikh Abdullah or anyone else in regard to Kashmir without reference to Parliament. It is a little difficult for me to discuss this matter in detail before this House while these talks are in progress, because. the talks consist also of matters not directly dealing with Kashmir-many of them-but other matters indirectly connected with it. with, as an hon Member has just said, the relations of India and Pakistan and other like matters. So it is difficult anyhow to say much about them except this if I may say so, that Sheikh Abdullah has repeatedly said that he attaches the greatest importance to secularism and that he is opposed to the two-nation theory, which he has always been, and he continues to be opposed to it, and he wants to strengthen the ideal of secularism in India and, if possible, elsewhere too. (interruption).

That is all that I wish to say here, Sir, because, at the present moment, it will be extremely awkward for me to go into details. It would probably be confusing to the House, might be confusing to me even, to narrate all the talks that have taken place and may take place. I would only assure the House that nothing in the shape of a decision of any kind will he made without reference to Parliament.

About the two questions that an hon. Member, asked one was about Sheikh Saheb going to the Security Council. Now that has been answered by our representative there, and so far as I know, there is no question of his going there.

The other is the invitation that President Ayub Khan has issued to him to visit him and discuss this matter with him. I cannot say at the present moment what Sheikh Saheb thinks about this matter, but it may be that, in future, conditions may arise, which may lead him to think that he might go there. If so, I think he should be allowed to go there. The question has not arisen as yet before me; it has not come in any shape or form. But to prevent him from going there, well, I think, would not be justified or proper.

145

PAKISTAN USA INDIA **Date** : May 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## REPUBLIC OF SUDAN

#### Dr. Radhakrishnan's Speech at Banquet welcoming Sudanese President

Speaking at a dinner given on May 20, 1964 at Rashtrapati Bhavan in honour of His Excellency Farik Ibrahim Abboud, President of the Supreme Council for the Armed Forces of the Republic of the Sudan, the President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, said:

It gives me very great pleasure to extend to you, Mr. President, a very hearty welcome on behalf of the people and the Government of India. We are sorry that you and the members of your party will spend only two or three days with us but I hope during this short period, you will see something of what we have done since the achievement of independence. There is a maxim inscribed in one of the archways in our Secretariat buildings. It says : "Liberty will not descend on a people. A people must raise themselves to liberty. It is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed."

Your country has now achieved independence as we did a few years ago and the great point of achieving independence is to utilise that independence for the purpose of giving comfort, security, education and such other things for the ordinary citizens of our countries. You are striving your very best to achieve this goal for your people. We are trying to do something in the same direction.

#### PROBLEM OF INTEGRATION

You have the great problem of integration. You are a link, so to say, between the Arab States and the African States. Just as the two rivers, the Blue Nile and the White Nile mix together their waters in the Sudan, so also the African and the Arab States mix their traditions in Sudan and you are striving to help them to achieve integration, a sense of belonging, a sense of feeling that they belong to one common territory with one common tradition. You are trying to do your utmost to bring the results of education and industrial development to your people. These things can only be achieved if there is a climate of peace and understanding in the world. You are striving by your different endeavours to effect that kind of peace. You are a non-aligned country. You were present at the Bandung Conference and at the Belgrade Conference and you were also present at Accra There you were attempting to achieve African unity, unity of the African States and of the Arab States too, the whole Africa to be welded together into a common whole.

#### PERSPECTIVE OF HISTORY

If we look at the wide perspective of history, in what may be regarded as a fleeting moment of historic time, a new culture, a world culture is sprouting, a new set of values and a new order of reality-all these things are unconsciously growing in the minds and hearts of the common people of this world. It is these things that we have to develop and make them feel that ultimately this world is our home. There is humanity which binds us all together and the differences which divide us today must be regarded as more or less contingent and arbitrary. It is that kind of outlook which you are attempting to practise. COMMON IDEALS

## We have also something of that idea in our minds. Whether it be in the United Nations or in its subsidiary agencies, wherever we happen to be, we are having this vision of humanity as one whole, a humanity which is knit together by certain common ideals and purposes. A humanity without these things it will be merely a togetherness and not a society. We want to develop a living organism which is not a mere organisation, it is an organism which has a vital spirit about it. It is that vital spirit that we have to endow ourselves with. That is what you are attempting to do. We in our own way are attempting to achieve it. Therefore, in the United Nations and its organisations, there is so much where you and I or nations can cooperate. We symbolise these great ideals of humanity which is beckoning us from. afar, which may not be an accomplished truth today but all the same it is the goal which gives life and purpose to all our activities.

It is my great pleasure to wish you and your people a healthy future, great prosperity and happiness. May I request you, ladies and gentlemen, to drink to the health of His Excellency the President of Sudan.

146

## SUDAN INDIA USA PERU INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA GHANA

**Date** : May 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

**REPUBLIC OF SUDAN** 

Reply by President Abboud

In reply to the toast, the President of Sudan said

Your Excellency President Radhakrishnan, President of India, Excellencies, dear friends : I am most grateful to you for your wonderful welcome and your most generous hospitality.

I bring front the land of two Niles the sincere greetings of the people of Sudan; and may I here, express the hope of our people that your efforts may be crowned with success and that your dedicated endeavour may lead to the attainment of your great objectives. The immense task that you have shouldered with such fortitude is not directed towards the exclusive benefit of your own people, nor is it confined to your country of to your continent : yours has been one of those great movements for liberation; and is a source of inspiration to all people.

## TRIBUTE TO MAHATMA GANDHI

I am not speaking only of the present, Your Excellency. The leaders of the national liberation movement in my country, and the other countries, have been inspired by the principles of your great teacher the immortal Mahatma Gandhi and his disciples. The walls of many humble village homes in my country had carried the portrait of the Mahatma; and the patient and determined hearts of many of my countrymen had drawn solace and strength from his example.

I greet the memory of the Mahatma, in the name of the people of the Sudan; this is the greeting of a people who believe in his message and who responded to his clarion call, the greeting of a people who believe, as he did, in the unity of our struggle and in our common destiny.

This community of feeling in the past, and our present cooperation in facing the problems of today has prompted me to respond to Your Excellency's kind invitation to visit your country.

At this stage of our development, it is imperative for us to meet you, our friends and to witness your great and progressive achievements. It is only proper for us to meet and discuss with you the ever-changing political scene in the world of today.

Such periodic exchange of views at all levels is of undoubted importance and benefit to- our countries.

### POLICY OF NON-ALIGNMENT

Your Excellency, now that we have had the opportunity to visit the birth place of the principle of non-alignment-which has proved its potency and efficacy, in spite of all difficulties and contradictions, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to hail the policy of non-alignment, to uphold its tenets and to reiterate my belief in its dynamism. The achievements of the countries and governments who have adopted it beatwitness to its effectiveness in our present world.

I should like to emphasise the belief of the Sudan Government in the positive role played by the policy of non-alignment in restoring tranquility and peace when the peace of the world is threatened; and to declare that it has servedand still serves-as a principle of unity in a divided world; and, a rallying point for cooperation, for tolerance and understanding, in spite of the differences of political organisation and social systems.

More than two years have passed since the meeting of non-aligned countries in Belgrade. Since then the world has witnessed many deve-

lopments and has been subject to many changes. Such changes and developments as the world has been through necessitate another meeting to discuss the applications of the policy of non-aligdment to the new situations. I have no doubt that our policy will cope with these situations because its dynamism and adaptability are amongst its greatest virtues.

Moreover, there have emerged in Africa new powers that are bound to become increasingly effective in the international field. These new states of Africa declared at the great Addis Ababa Conference that they would fulfil their international obligations and will endeavour to their utmost to use whatever means in their power to support the efforts of all peace-loving nations for the preservation of peace in the world. It is only thus that we can devote all our energies to the development of our countries and the welfare of our people.

Your Excellency, in the world of today it is it regrettable fact that in spite of scientific and technological progress, in spite of the evidence of international awareness and responsibility one world feature remains unchanged. The wide gap between the 'haves' and the 'havenots' is still unbridged; it is even becoming wider.

The expostulations of leaders and the protestations of the people have been of no avail.

The governments and the leaders of the more developed countries have not been unmindful of these calls, but the actual efforts expended in the alleviation of this state of affairs have so far fallen short of the needs. they have been completely unfruitful.

### 147

### PEACE IN WORLD

The thinkers and leaders in the more developed countries are well aware that there is little hope for peace in the world, as long as the condition of discrepancy in the standards of living of its peoples remains unresolved. In the same way, it is unlikely for internal security to prevail in a country if the people of that country are divided into masters and slaves; if some can boast every wordly possession while others Suffer from inequality, privation and injustice. We, therefore, hail the efforts of your government in the international field for the solution of this problem and I assure you, Your Excellency, of the support of my government in this respect.

I have already mentioned at the beginning of this address the heartening and praise-worthy qualities of your internal and international policy. It, therefore, goes without saying that the fighters for freedom all over the world look up to you for support so that liberty may be restored to them from the hands of an obstinate and rapacious master, or that they may regain independence for their country which has been exploited by an aggressive and unheeding colonialist.

In central Africa, in South Africa. in Palestine --the heart of the Arab lands and the Southern Arabia imperialist tragedies are daily re-enactedappearing every time in different guise and assuming different roles; in racial discrimination, in the exappropriation of land and property and in the preposterous claim of protection, the motives and objectives of these different roles being always one and the same.

How can we be asked then to show a change of heart to colonial powers ? How can we declare a truce and learn to live together in a world governed by new spiritual values and lofty humanitarian ideals if the colonial powers themselves do not show this change of heart ?

Mr. President, we in the Sudan still remember the cordial visit that Prime Minister Nehru paid to our country. The words of his address to the citizens of Khartoum assembled at the junction of the two Niles still echo in our hearts. But, if Your Excellency is able to visit us our joy will indeed be great and you will be able to see for yourself the endeavour of the Sudanese people who are at the start of a long and arduous march, to achieve their national aspirations. You will witness abounding evidence of our friendship for your people which has found practical realisation in our readiness to explore the avenues of cooperation between our two countries. There have been delegations from India to the Sudan who have sought to increase the extent of economic and cultural exchange between our two countries. The importance of such visits cannot be over-emphasised.

#### WIDENING ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Economic relations between our two countries are proceeding, day by day, from strength to strength. And I have no doubt that your government accords the same importance and high regard for our products as we have for goods and articles imported from India. On our part we shall endeavour to develop these material relationships as we have endeavoured, now and in the past, to maintain the non-material bonds.

#### KASHMIR

Your Excellency, the day when a happy solution is found by India and Pakistan for the problem of Kashmir will be a day of celebration and rejoicing for all the people of the Sudan. We should be no less happy when a peaceful solution is found for the border problems with the people of the Republic of China by some permanent demarcation of these borders.

In this, Mr. President, we suffer no conflict of loyalties, as we are loyal to the good and wholesome principles which we were agreed upon at the Bandung Conference, and upheld by us in Belgrade. We shall continue our adherence to these principles and our belief in them. I have no doubt that each of the three countries, will play an important role in realising these principles and that our efforts, if unified. will be a great force for the good of humanity, for freedom and peace.

# SUDAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC YUGOSLAVIA ETHIOPIA SOUTH AFRICA PAKISTAN CHINA INDONESIA

**Date** : May 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

#### REPUBLIC OF SUDAN

President Abboud's Banquet for Dr. Radhakrishnan

Speaking at a dinner given on May 21, 1964 at Ashoka Hotel in honour of the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, H. E. Farik Ibrahim Abboud, President of the Supreme Council for the Armed Forces of the Repulic of the Sudan, said :

Mr. President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, Mr. Vice-President Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I wish to thank you all for accepting this invitation which gave me the opportunity to meet you once again, and express to you my deep satisfaction of what I have seen during my short stay in your great country. Some of you might know that this is not my first visit to India. I had the privilege of coming here ten years ago, and had the chance to stay for a longer period. I note

#### 148

with pleasure and appreciation the great achievements attained by India in all fields of progress.

The three Five-Year Plans of economic development are undoubtedly a practical proof of the determination of India to build a Welfare State based on social justice. The daring and ambitious objectives of these Plans, and the practical and scientific implementation pursued deserve every praise. We are sure that India will soon take her prominent position among the highly developed countries.

We in the Sudan since independence have determined to take all the necessary steps to utilise our resources, raise the standards of living of our people and strengthen our national economy bearing in mind that political independence has no meaning without the complete eradication of poverty, ignorance and disease. The Ten-Year Plan which the Sudan has embarked upon is but a first step for building our national economy and shall certainly be followed by other plans which live hope will enhance the progress of our country.

Mr. President, it is to be noted with satisfaction that India in spite of her preoccupation with her internal affairs, has not been oblivious to her obligations towards the international community. Your foreign policy, Mr. President, which emanates from your philosophy and tradition, calls for peace. and friendship among nations of the world. Mr. President, the complete understanding in the exchange of views in all matters that concern our two countries has strengthened my conviction that this visit will open new avenues of mutual cooperation and thereby promote our traditional and friendly relations in all levels.

Mr. President, I wish I could stay for a longer period to be able to witness the great achievements of your country in all the spheres of development and to have the pleasure of accepting the invitations extended to me by the different organisations in this country to whom I am more than thankful.

Mr. President, on my behalf and on behalf of the Government and people of the Sudan, I would kindly request you to convey my heartfelt greetings and best wishes to the Government and people of India and to you, Mr. President, my best wishes for happiness and good health and success to continue to lead your country towards prosperity and progress.

My best wishes also to the great leader of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru for happiness and wellbeing. I pray to Almighty God to give him strength to continue his mission for India and the world.

SUDAN INDIA USA

**Date** : May 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

### REPUBLIC OF SUDAN

Reply by Dr. Radhakrishnan

In reply to the toast, Dr. Radhakrishnan said:

Mr. President, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. President, we are grateful to

you for your very generous words of appreciation of the little we did to make your stay here as comfortable as possible. One of the most remarkable features of our generation is the emergence of the nations of Asia and Africa into freedom. We both belong to the class of people who were subject for a long time politically, economically etc. and have now emerged into independence and are striving to use that independence for building an economy which is socially just, economically prosperous. We are attempting the same task and so it is possible for us to learn from each other. I was pleased to hear from you that you are now trying to put up dams and raise the standards of your people by the development of mechanical things, application of science and technology to the development of industry etc. We are doing the same thing and therefore it is possible for us to benefit from each other's experience.

You also spoke to us about the shortness of your stay. You came here yesterday and we are in the second day today. And your stay is very, very short but I hope that in the few days left to you here when you travel in other parts of India, you will find the same useful experiences and the same courtesy and consideration which you have seen here from the people of India.

We are greatly appreciative of the efforts you have made in your own country and the efforts you are making in the world at large for seeking to establish a world of peace.

We note with special gratification a kind of support you gave us when we had our conflict with China in 1962. You spoke in very unambiguous terms of your moral sympathy and support for us. We appreciate that very much.

There are attempts we both are making in the international world to help one another and to help the establishment of peace in the world. That is the only way which is left open to us. The alternatives to the world today are either

## 149

suicide or survival. If it is survival, we have to help each other, condone each other's faults, forgive each other's shortcomings and understand why people behave as they do. If we develop that spirit of understanding, we will understand other peoples' weaknesses, what may appear to be weaknesses.

So far as we are concerned, we hope, Mr. President, you and members of your party will enjoy the period of your stay in this country. You have established links of friendship between Sudan and India and I hope that these links of friendship will get stronger in years to come. We are thankful to you for your kind words and I hope your visit will strengthen Indo-Sudanese friendship and I ask you to drink to the health of the President of Sudan and the development of good relations between the two countries of India and Sudan

SUDAN USA INDIA CHINA **Date** : May 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

**REPUBLIC OF SUDAN** 

Joint Communique

The following is the text of the joint communique issued simultaneously in New Delhi and Khartoum on May 25, 1964, at the conclusion of President Abboud's State visit to India :

On the invitation of the President of India. His Excellency President El Farik Ibrahim Abboud of the Republic of the Sudan paid a State visit to India from the 20th to the 24th May, 1964. He was accompanied, among others, by H.E. Major General Mohamed Talaat Farid, Minister of Education and Instruction, H.E. Major General Hassan Beshir Nasr, Deputy Commander-in-Chief and Minister of State for Cabinet Affairs, H.E. Major General El Magboul El Amin El Hag, Minister of Commerce, Industry and Supply and H.E. Sayed Ahmed Kheir, Minister of Foreign Affairs. The President and his party received a warm and spontaneous welcome from the Government and the people of India.

After a two-day stay in the Capital. President Abboud visited Agra, the Bhakra Dam and the Nangal Barrage. He was thus able to get a glimpse of India's historic past and composite culture and also to see something of her present progress and development. President Abboud paid a tribute to India's steadfast adherence to the principles and objectives embodied in India's Constitution and her progress towards her cherished goal of improving the standards of living of the people. His present visit, which is his second to India, helped in cementing old friendships and in forging new bonds of mutual respect and understanding between the leaders and peoples of the two countries.

During his stay in Delhi, President Abboud had cordial and frank exchanges of views with the President of India, the Prime Minister and other members of the Government of India, on the current international situation and on matters of mutual interest. These exchanges confirmed a wide community of interests and similarity of approach towards world problems. The President and the Prime Minister welcomed the Partial Test Ban Treaty as a concrete step towards total disarmament and world peace.

The Prime Minister welcomed the dynamic and progressive developments on the African Continent, and the enunciation of the concept of African unity at the Summit Conference of African Heads of States and Governments held in May 1963. This was a momentous and historic development, signifying the emergence of Africa as a powerful new factor in promoting peace and international cooperation. The Prime Minister appreciated Sudan's position as a bridge between the Arab countries and the countries of Africa. He paid special tribute to President Abboud's positive role in the promotion of understanding and amity between the African states.

The Prime Minister observed that the Conference of the Kings and Heads of States of the Arab countries held at Cairo in January 1964 was an event of great significance, and noted with appreciation its success towards which Sudan had played an important part. The Conference has helped to strengthen the unity and solidarity of the Arab nations and has paved the way for the realization of their common aims. The Prime Minister reiterated India's support for the just claims of the Arab countries to the waters of the river Jordan and for the rights of the Palestinian refugees wishing to return to their homes.

The President paid a tribute to India's contribution in supporting the liberation movements in all parts of the world under the inspiring guidance of Mahatma Gandhi and expressed his appreciation of the peaceful role played by India in world affairs. The President and the Prime Minister condemned the use of force in settling territorial disputes and affirmed the principle that if aggression is committed in pursuit of territorial aims, its fruits must be denied to the aggressor. Recalling the guiding principles of Afro-Asian solidarity, the President and the Prime Minister re-affirmed the principle of respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States. In that

#### 150

context, the President and the Prime Minister declared that the historic and well defined boundaries of States should be regarded as firm and inviolable.

The President and the Prime Minister noted with gratification that both India and Sudan followed a policy of secularism, guaranteeing freedom of worship and equality of status under the law, to all their citizens. In this context, the President and the Prime Minister condemned the misuse of religion for political ends.

The President and the Prime Minister made a general review of the world situation in the light of their common adherence to the policy of non-alignment, with special reference to the problems of colonialism and racial discrimination. They expressed their conviction that the policy of non-alignment which both countries had resolutely pursued ever since their independence and which all newly emergent countries of Asia and Africa had adopted, had contributed substantially to the lowering of world tensions and the broadening of international cooperation among nations. They welcomed the decision to hold a conference of non-aligned States in Africa this year and they felt sure that like its predecessor, the Belgrade Conference of non-aligned States in

1961, the deliberations of the second and numerically larger conference would make a further contribution towards the promotion of peace and goodwill among nations and the realisation of principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. The President and the Prime Minister also welcomed the proposal to hold an Afro-Asian Conference in Africa in 1965 which they hoped, like the earlier Conference held at Bandung, Indonesia, in 1955, would promote Afro-Asian cooperation and solidarity.

The President and the Prime Minister viewed with great concern the continuance of colonialism and neocolonialism on the continents of Asia and Africa. They expressed their full support to the freedom movement in Southern Rhodesia and in Aden and South Arabia. In particular, they were gravely concerned at the continued denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms to the African people in South Africa. They expressed their hope that the full weight of international public opinion and the authority of the United Nations would be brought to bear without any further delay in securing to the people of South Africa their just and legitimate rights. The President and the Prime Minister agreed that the denial of freedom and fundamental rights to the people of Angola and Mozambique and other Portuguese colonial territories was wholly contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

The President and the Prime Minister recalled with satisfaction the development of mutual cooperation between India and Sudan in various fields. They both expressed a desire for further cooperation to the mutual advantage of both parties, particularly in the fields of trade and cultural exchanges. The Prime Minister informed the President that India would be very happy to extend cooperation and facilities to the Sudan in technical and scientific fields and, in particular, to extend technical cooperation in starting new industries in the Sudan. The Prime Minister also referred to the possibility of India's purchasing additional quantities of Sudan cotton, and offered a credit of 50 million rupees to Sudan for the purchase of Indian goods such as engineernig goods, industrial machinery, chemicals and pharmaceuticals and other products of India

mutually agreed upon. The President expressed his appreciation and thanks for the Prime Minister's offer. The President and the Prime Minister agreed that such cooperation will further strengthen the close bonds of friendship and understanding between the two countries.

The President of Sudan extended an invitation to the President of India to visit Sudan at a time convenient to him. The President of India was happy to accept the invitation.

# SUDAN INDIA USA EGYPT JORDAN YUGOSLAVIA INDONESIA SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE

**Date** : May 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Defence Minister's Address to National Press Club

The Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan made the following speech at a luncheon at the National Press Club in Washington on Thursday, May 21, 1964 :

You have done me great honour in inviting to address your Association. I have been in your Country for a little over three days. I had been looking forward to visiting it since

#### 151

long. Now I have come here for a specific task--to seek aid and assistance for implementing the plan that we have prepared for the defence of India against external aggression.

I have had during the last three days very useful discussions with the Secretary of Defence, Mr. McNamara and his colleagues. I had also the pleasure of meeting prominent people in the political and other walks of life of your great country. I am going to talk to you frankly and I presume you would like me to do so-about some of the problems that we are facing, particularly in the context of the Chinese aggression against India. These could be appreciated only if one could know the objectives that China had in mind in committing military aggression against India. I consider that China had three primary objectives.

## CHINA'S THREE OBJECTIVES

By asserting its military superiority China wanted to create for itself an image of the "strongly nation" in Asia.

China wanted to disrupt our efforts of planning and economic development through democratic processes.

China wanted to establish itself as a political power in Asia as a prelude, as subsequent events have shown, to asserting its leadership over the Communist group of countries in the world.

With the achievement of independence in 1947 India emerged as an integrated democratic country. From the beginning it wedded itself to the democratic processes of planning for is economic and social development. It adopted a Constitution with freedom and democracy as its two comer stones. These were two precious gifts which your President Washington gave to you as Head of the Revolutionary Army and as the architect of your Constitution. Our Constitution while declaring India as a Sovereign Democratic Republic gave to the people the rights of liberty, equality, fellowship and justice and a right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. In this respect it almost echoed the words and phrases of your Constitution.

In external affairs our country adopted a policy of non-alignment. It was a policy not born out of any desire to stay aside and aloof from what is happening in the world. It is a bve-product of our historical experiences and philosophical development. To a country which lost its freedom as a result of pacts on trading rights and small territorial concessions, there is a natural suspicion of any military involvement. It is a policy which commits us to freedom, peace and peaceful methods of bringing about changes. We support freedom from colonial rule; we support racial equality, peace and international cooperation. I am glad to see that this policy has slowly won recognition and understanding and has become an integral part of the international pattern. It is being increasingly recognized that this is a legitimate policy suitable specially for the emergent Afro-Asian States for whom economic development must have the highest priority.

## FACTORS MOTIVATING CHINA

In 1962 this is how the world looked at India. China which had recently emerged after centuries of imperial and foreign rule was building itself militarily and economically through other methods. While we were glad that the Chinese people were making efforts to develop and progress through their own economic and political system, it was obvious that our progress with democratic means and our image as a country aligned to neither of the Blocs was something which did not suit Chinese thinking or objectives.

At that time China also confronted herself with ambitions of leadership of the Communist world and it was probably waiting. for some opportunity to assert not only its military strength but its ability to take action independently of the Soviet Union-the acknowledged leader of the Communist nations. Just at the time when U.S.S.R. was involved in a critical war of nerves with the U.S.A. over the Cuba affair, China launched aggression against our country. The avowed Object was no doubt satisfaction of some territorial claims but the aggression was also meant as a threat to our right to order our livein our own way, to our right to freedom and democracy.

Immediately after the aggression our Prime Minister annealed to friendly countries and sought military and other assistance to repel the aggression. The manner in which President Kennedy. the people and the Government of the United States reacted to the proposal and the promptness with which they extended assistance to India at that time is something for which we will be grateful.

#### INDIA NOT MILITARISING

As I said in the beginning, I have come here to seek assistance for implementing the Plan that we have prepared for the defence of India against external aggression. You may ask what does this planning represent? Does it mean that India is on the way to militarisation? Have we overassessed the Chinese military strength, overassessed her capacity for military action or her military threat?

I would like to tell you that we are not militarising. We are a peace-loving people and we

#### 152

realize the dangers inherent in building military strength beyond our needs and beyond our resources. Our programme for building up our defence potential is based on our appreciation of the existing Chinese threat.

# DEFENCE PLAN OBJECTIVE

Our plan for expansion of the armed forces, modernisation of its equipment, expansion and modernisation of the Air Force and the establishment of an adequate and proper defence production base are what we consider the minimum to face the Chinese threat.

Even this minimum we have to spread over a certain period-may be, five years, may be seven--because today we have not the resources, particularly the foreign exchange resources, certain plants and machinery and technological skills which are prerequisites for implementing the Plan. The Plan thus represents the, efforts that have to be made to build up our defence potential to adequately meet the external threat to our borders in the immediate future.

What is the assessment on which we are building up this defence potential?

### TRIPLE THREAT FROM CHINA

As I have already mentioned, it is a threetold threat. It is a threat to our territory, it is a threat to our economic development and, thirdly, it is a political threat, a threat to our way of life. We consider ultimately it is a threat to those countries who share and treasure with us the same pattern and values in life and in the mode of economic development.

For the last five to six years China has been staking claims on some Indian territory. At first there were small border skirmishes between the Chinese troops and the Indian troops stationed in these particular areas. To satisfy its territorial claim China was continuing its military build-up, strengthening its posts and roads on its side of the border etc. Even while this was going on-looking to the long and traditional peaceful relations between the Chinese and the Indian people, almost 5,000 years old, and considering that China had signed the Panchsheel agreement with us, advocating the use of peaceful means for settlement of disputes-India never thought that the Government in Peking would go so far as to commit aggression against India.

India's faith in China was belied and shaken when it let loose its military forces against us in October 1962. After the ceasefire the Colombo Powers made certain proposals for starting talks with China. We have accepted them but the Chinese Government have not. Even if these talks start, it cannot be assumed that the Chinese Government will not again use force and commit aggression when it finds an opportunity to do so.

# CHINESE BUILD-UP BIGGER NOW

Our information is that the Chinese forces across our northern borders today are in larger strength than in November 1962. They have consolidated their positions and built new roads and air fields. They are building up logistical and other support. The Chinese intention may, therefore, well be to launch aggression against our soil at a time that suits her, at a place she chooses.

This military nature of the Chinese threat has further increased because of the new relationship that has developed between the Government of China and the Government of Pakistan. Their alliance is an ominous one for us. What have they otherwise in common except a hostile attitude towards us ? Ideologically, politically and in every other respect Pakistan and China are poles apart and, therefore, their coming together is a new factor.

But more significant than the threat to our territory is the nature of the, other Chinese threat. The picture of democratic India achieving progress and development by democratic means is against the basic political objectives that Peking has in mind. By committing military aggression against our country and keeping up military pressures against our borders, China hopes that we shall drop our Plans for economic development, reduce our pace of implementing such Plans and cripple our economy under the burden of defence expenditure that we have to incur for meeting their challenge. Therefore, the Chinese threat has to be assessed in terms of the stresses and strains that it will put on our economic development.

Thirdly, the political nature of the threat, This arises from the fact that the Chinese attack was directed towards our external policy-the policy of nonalignment. China wanted India to be dislodged from its fundamental policy and if that happens it would mean the smaller nations of Asia and the newly emergent nations of Africa would have no hope of non-aligned existence. China's activities in those areas are not Unknown.

#### DEFENCE PREPAREDNESS

Our defence preparedness has, therefore, to be related to this assessment of Chinese threat. Militarily we have to be sufficiently strong to resist violations of our borders and as well as aggression across our frontiers. The consciousness that our country's defences are sufficiently strong to repel any aggression is the minimum guarantee that we have to give to the people of India to

#### 153

pursue peacefully their economic development through democratic means.

Our defence effort cannot be conceived entirely or directly in narrow military terms. The pace of economic development has to be kept up and I can assure you that we propose to do so. When the Chinese Government launched aggression against us we were in the earlier stages of our Third Five Year Plan. Even in the midst of that aggression our National Development Council under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister took a decision that whatever may be the sacrifices involved in strengthening ourdefences, there should not be any reduction in the size of our economic programme because that would strike at the very roots of our progress and possibly achieve for China, without waging a battle, the objective that it has in mind. For this reason we not only maintained the pace of implementation of the Plan but increased Plan allocations in certain vital sectors-agriculture, industry, transport and communications.

## BURDENS CHEERFULLY BORNE

As may be expected, Chinese aggression has imposed heavy burdens on us.

Our defence expenditure which in 1961-62 expressed in dollars was 960 million, increased to 1620 million dollars in 1963-64. During the current financial year we have planned an expenditure of 1720 million dollars. To meet this defence expenditure people of India have not only accepted unprecedented tax burdens but have come forward generously to donate gold and money to Government for the defence effort. We are making sacrifices and will continue to do so. We are determined to carry through the current Five Year Plan without any significant scaling down.

We hope external aid in adequate measure will be available in support of the special effort that we are undertaking.

We are resolved to meet the Chinese threat on all fronts whatever may be the sacrifice because what we are defending is our bard won freedom, our democratic way of life, our love for liberty, our heritage of tolerance and our desire for peace. These, are the values for which hundred's of thousands of American young men have shed blood and given their liver, on distant battlefields all over the world. We know how dear these values are to you.

During my brief stay in Washington I have found in the mind of your administration awareness of the problems of the defence of India. I would like You to realise that the effort India is making to build up her defence potential to meet aggression from an untrustworthy neighbour is an effort to save democracy and democratic values in that sensitive part of the world.

# USA INDIA CHINA CUBA SRI LANKA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

# Date : May 01, 1964

# June

# Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record Jun 01, 1964 Vol. X JUNE No. 6

# CONTENTS

PAGES CZECHOSLOVAKIA Agreement for Technical Collaboration Signed 155

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's First Broadcast to the Nation 155

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in the Security Council on Apartheid 158 Shri Narendra Singh's Statement in the Security Council on Apartheid 162

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE Shri Sanjivayya's Speech at the Conference 163

LAOS Communique on Situation in Laos 166

# NEPAL

# Indo-Nepal Telecommunications Agreement Signed 168

POLAND

Indo-Polish Trade Agreement Signed 168

# UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Oil Contracts Signed 169

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Communique on Defence Aid Talks 169

Agreement for Construction of Methanol Plant Signed

170

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

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA LAOS NEPAL POLAND USA

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

# CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Agreement for Technical Collaboration Signed

An agreement for technical collaboration for the development of production at the Heavy Electricals High Pressure Boiler Plant at Tiruverumbur, Tiruchirapalli, was signed in New Delhi on June 12, 1964 by Mr. J. Jonas, Chairman of Messrs. Technoexport, and Shri K. B. Mathur, Chairman, Heavy Electricals (I) Ltd. The agreement covers the following services :

1. Technical cooperation and consultancy service for the production of :

(a) High pressure boilers ranging from 125

to 450 tonnes--steam per hour capacity.

(b) Package boiler units with output 6 tonnes per hour above 22 atm. pressure-Temp. 380 (degree) C.

(c) High pressure valves and fittings for the above boilers.

2. Training of Indian personnel in the C.S.S.R.

3. Working Drawings for:

(a) the, production of non-standard equipment in India.

(b) Test equipment.

(c) Factory layout, services etc. The total payment for the various services amounts to Rs. 2 crores.

It may be recalled that an agreement was signed on November 24, 1959 between the Czechoslovak Government and the Government of India for a credit of Rs. 23.1 crores for financing a number of projects in India, one of which was the High Pressure Boiler Plant.

A Technical Committee appointed by the Government had suggested the site for this plant at Tiruverumbur, Tiruchirapalli, which was approved by the Government. After the preliminary report had been submitted by the Czech experts, the basic details of this project were agreed to and an agreement for the preparation of the project report was executed on 7th June, 1961. The project report was received by the end of August, 1962. An agreement for the supply of machine tools and equipment from Czechoslovakia through the agency of M/s. Technoexport was executed on the 30th of May, 1963 and thereafter the construction work was started at the project site.

Messrs. Technoexport are collaborating in the execution of a number of projects in India, prominent being the Foundry Forge Project at Ranchi, the Heavy Power Equipment Plant at Hyderabad and the High Pressure Boiler Plant at Tiruchi. Recently the Czechoslovak Government have agreed to another credit of Rs. 40 crores for the development of some of the existing and new projects including supply of components for the existing plants.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

#### HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's First Broadcast to the Nation

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri broadcast the following speech from All India Radio, New Delhi, on June 11, 1964:

Friends : The towering personality who was in our midst till but a few days ago is no longer with us to lead and guide us. The last of his mortal remains has gone to join the soil and water of the India that he loved. Even though Jawaharlalji has passed from our sight, his work and his inspiration lives on. And we, to whom

#### 155

was given the privilege of being his countrymen, contemporaries and colleagues must now brace ourselves to the new tasks ahead, and face up to the situation whose very prospect we once used to dread-the situation of an India without Jawaharlal.

There comes a time in the life of every nation when it stands at the cross-roads of history and must choose which way to go. But for us there need be no difficulty or hesitation, no looking to right or left. Our way is straight and clearthe building up of a socialist democracy at home with freedom and prosperity for all, and the, maintenance of world peace and friendship with all nations abroad. To that straight road and to these shining ideals we re-dedicate ourselves today.

No better beginning could have been given by my colleagues of the Congress Party, who in the hour of decision resolved to come together. I am also grateful to the nation for the way they have, received my taking over of the heavy burden cast on me. What I need in the discharge of these heavy responsibilities is the willing cooperation of our people. They are our real source of strength and it is from them that I shall seek to draw my inspiration.

#### NATIONAL INTEGRATION

Among the major tasks before us none is of greater importance in our strength and stability than the task of building up the unity and solidarity of our people. Our country has often stood as a solid rock in the face of common danger and there is a deep underlying unity which runs like a golden thread through all our seeming diversity, but we cannot take national unity and solidarity for granted, or afford to be complacent for there have been occasions when unfortunate and disturbing divisions, some of them accompanied by violence, have appeared in our society. I know that these disturbances gave a deep shock and caused great anguish, to Jawaharlalji who had, all through his life, worked untiringly for communal harmony, and mutual toleration. Let people in different parts of the country, however strong their feelings might be on particular issues, never forget that they are Indians first, and that all differences must be resolved within the unalterable framework of one nation and one country. Let us make every endeavour to foster this feeling of oneness and to carry forward the work of national integration started with the National Integration Conference in 1961.

Political democracy and the way it has functioned in our country is surely a great achievement. Here again we owe an immeasurable debt to Jawaharlalji for his deep attachment to democracy as a form of Government and as a way of life. There is something in our older cultural heritage too. I have particularly in view that enduring strand in Indian life which can be best described as respect for human personality and the spirit of toleration. I have no doubt in my mind that it is by methods of persuasion and mutual accommodation, and by a constant search for areas of agreement as basis for action, that democracy can be worked. It is in this spirit that I shall devote myself to the duties and responsibilities of the office I have been called upon to fill.

Of all the problems facing us, none is more distressing than that of the dire poverty in which tens of millions of our countrymen continue to live. How I wish that I would be able to lighten the burden of poverty on our people. I cannot forget particularly the claims of the most backward sections like the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, who had suffered neglect, and had to endure disabilities for many centuries. It would be my proud privilege to work for the establishment of a more, just social order.

At the moment we are in the process of building up our defences. The burden is a heavy one, but recent events have left us with no choice. There can be no letting-up in these preparations, but we are determined that these should not affect our first and foremost prioritythe development of our economy.

The main question before us is of execution of our plans and policies and how to introduce the necessary vigour and efficiency required for it.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

This naturally takes me to the problem of efficiency and integrity of the administration. Our public services have on the whole responded well to the numerous calls that have been made upon them since Independence. But there is a widespread feeling-which I share-that extensive reform of the administration is essential if the, tasks of economic development and social reconstruction are to be accomplished. Apart from this, it is essential in a democracy that the public services should be sensitive to the feelings and sentiments of individual citizens. They shouls under all circumstances function not only with formal courtesy but in a spirit of service, sympathy and humanity. The administrative organisation and its methods and processes. must be modernised if it is to become an effective instrument of economic change. I shall do my best

to have systematic attention paid to these major problems and I shall apply myself closely to the problem of administrative reforms in its various aspects.

156

#### UNITED ACTION

I know that our people are full of enthusiasm and that they are prepared to accept many sacrifices in order to keep the nation stable and strong. But sometimes their impatience gets the better of them and then there are unfortunate happenings which cause pain to everyone. Discipline and united action is the source of real strength for the nation. May I also appeal to the members of the various political parties to lend us a helping hand in the task of national reconstruction. Similarly the Press can play a very useful role as indeed they have been doing all this time. Theirs is a position of great strength and influence and I have no doubt that their influence will always be exercised for the public good. We are all of different elements working in different ways towards a common goal-the service of the people. I shall respect these differences, but I shall continue to lay emphasis on the oneness of our objective.

#### NON-ALIGNMENT

In the realm of foreign affairs we shall continue to seek friendship and develop our relations with all countries irrespective of ideology or their political systems. Non-alignment will continue to be the fundamental basis of our approach to world problems and our relations with other countries. It will be our special endeavour to further strengthen our relations with neighbouring countries. With most of our neighbours we have friendly and cooperative relations. We have problems with some of them which we would like to settle peacefully and amicably on an equitable and honourable basis.

### INDO-PAK RELATIONS

India and Pakistan are two great countries linked together by common history and tradition. It is their natural destiny to be friends with one another and to enter into close cooperation in many fields. Goodwill and friendship and mutual cooperation between these countries will not only be of immense benefit to them but will make a great contribution to peace and prosperity in Asia.

Far too long have India and Pakistan been at odds with one another. The unfortunate relations between the two countries have somehow had their repercussions on the relations between communities in the two countries, giving rise to tragic human problems. We must reverse the tide. This will require determination and good sense on the part of the Governments and peoples of both India and Pakistan. President Ayub Khan's recent broadcast showed both wisdom and understanding and it has come just at the appropriate time. However, a great deal of patience will be necessary.

#### CHINESE AGGRESSION

It had always been our desire to establish friendly relations with China. But all our efforts were nullified by the Government of the Peoples Republic of China. China has wronged us and deeply offended our Government and people by her premeditated aggression against us. Despite our strong feelings about this aggression we have shown our desire for a peaceful settlement by accepting in toto the Colombo Proposals. We adhere, to them and it is for China to reconsider her attitude towards these proposals as well as give up the anti-Indian campaign that has been carried on in China itself and amongst our friends in Asia and Africa.

#### COLONIALISM

For the greater part of this century the names of Gandhi and Nehru have been symbols of the movement of subject peoples for freedom from colonial domination. We who have gone through our own struggle for freedom cannot but look with sympathy at peoples struggling for freedom anywhere. Our country has, for many years, been a stout champion of the freedom of dependent nations at the United Nations and elsewhere in the councils of nations. Unfortunately there are still some parts of the world where colonialism remains and where large sections of people are denied freedom and fundamental rights. We would consider it our moral duty to lend every support to the ending of colonialism and imperialism so that all peoples

everywhere are free to mould their own destiny.

### AFRO-ASIAN SOLIDARITY

Our late Prime Minister was one of the founders of the Afro-Asian movement. We conceive of Afro-Asian solidarity not as an end in itself but as a means for achieving certain noble objectives. These are to work for the freedom of the people of Asia and Africa to build up the area of peace and understanding among all nations and to promote economic growth and higher living standards among our peoples. We seek no leadership of the Afro-Asian group. We are content to be humble collaborators with the sister nations of Africa and Asia in the common cause of world peace and freedom of peoples.

#### UNITED NATIONS

We have always been a staunch supporter of the United Nations. As a member of that august body India has undertaken its full measure of responsibility in all aspects of United Nations activities. My Government reaffirms its unflinching support for the United Nations. The United Nations is the one hope of the, world for bringing peace and freedom to humanity.

#### 157

Towards the achievement of these goals India has played an active role in the past and will continue, to do the same in the future.

#### WORLD PEACE

The problem of problems that faces mankind today is the achievement of peace and disarmament. For countless generations mankind has been yearning for peace. The supreme task facing the United Nations is to ensure not only that war is banished but that war is made impossible. As President Johnson has said, a world without war would be the most fitting memorial to Jawaharlalji. We pledge, ourselves, in cooperation with other peaceful nations of the world, to continue to work for the realisation of this ideal.

Before I conclude may I repeat that I am only too conscious of the, magnitude of the tasks before us and the responsibility placed on my shoulders for the service of the people of my country. I approach these tasks and responsibilities in a spirit of humility and with love and respect for all my countrymen. I will try to serve them to the limit of my capacity. The memory of our departed leader is still fresh with us. With him has ended the great age which Gandhiji began and Jawaharlalji consolidated. We have, now to build on the firm foundations they have left behind. Let us then bend ourselves to the great task before us-an India free, prosperous and strong and a world at peace and without war-these would be the most fitting memorials to Gandhiji and Jawaharlal.

## INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN CHINA SRI LANKA TOTO

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in the Security Council on Apartheid

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Security Council on June 8, 1964 on the question of race conflict in South Africa :

On behalf of the Government of India may I thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for your courtesy in allowing me to participate in this debate.

My delegation is most grateful to the representatives of Morocco and the Ivory Coast for sponsoring the draft resolution (S/5752). We are, of course, in entire agreement with the contents of that draft resolution, and we hope that it will be adopted without delay and unanimously. We hope that the Council will realize the urgency of the situation so that the terrible consequences of violence may be eliminated. If violence is unleashed as the result of our failure to take action expeditiously there will be no chance for a peaceful settlement. May I respectfully submit that we, take the steps without hesitation to implement the measures suggested in the draft resolution.

We are meeting here today under the shadow of an impending tragedy. The Rivonia or socalled Sabotage trials have shown the world to what extent South Africa can flout world opinion and proceed on its insane course. Hundreds of Africans are imprisoned without trial, tried without jury, tortured without compunction and they are likely to be convicted without reason. The United Nations has shown a sense of urgency in appointing committees, collecting information and sifting evidence of the course pursued by the Republic of South Africa. But the sands are running out, and unless immediate and drastic action is taken it will be too late. Sentences are likely to be pronounced on the 11th on patriotic leaders such as Mendella, Sisula, Bernstein, Goldberg, Ahmed Kathrada and others, and if that happens as a result of our tradiness we will stand condemned for inhumanity.

South Africa has been inventing new techniques to discredit the United Nations Charter which it has pledged to support as a Member. In the last 18 years it has done everything possible, deliberately and consistently, to defy the United Nations decisions. The Group Areas Act, the Suppression of Communism Act and the Bantu Education Act, to mention only three, have made South Africa worse than the Nazi Concentration Camps for 13 million non-white people in it. The Members of the United Nations cannot remain unaware of the seriousness of the situation. World wars have been fought and millions were killed and many more millions suffered to restore human dignity and freedom. Today human dignity and freedom are violated with greater impunity and they are in peril. This is likely to push us into another conflict which will be more unjust and inhuman than anything that has happened before. An un-

#### 158

armed, exploited, humiliated and tortured people are demanding justice, appealing to the only hope mankind has today-the United Nations. The may be killed by the rashness and madness of They South African Government; this august body may become the object of the growing suspicion and scepticism of the smaller nations; but the spirit of a people struggling for freedom and equality will not yield to the pressures and policies of the South African Government, however much they may be supported by external assistance.

It is in this unhappy context and with a sense of unprecedented urgency that my Government has decided to participate in this debate.

A few months before his death, in 1910, a famous Russian writer wrote a letter to a young Indian who was then living in Johannesburg in the province of Transvaal in South Africa. The name of the Russian was Leo Tolstoy and the world knows the Indian by the name of Mohandas Gandhi. Count Leo Tolstoy's letter in part read :

"Consequently your work in Transvaal, which seems to be far away from the centre of our world, is yet the most fundamental and the most important to us, supplying the most weighty practical proof in which the world can now share and with which must participate not only the Christians but all the peoples of the world."

Thus it is evident that India's interest in the question of apartheid is nothing new; it is not a post-independence interest, nor is it meant to embarrass any group, country or people. Member nations of this Organization know that ever since India's entry into the United Nations as a full-fledged Member it has sponsored the question of apartheid as an item on the agenda of the General Assembly. The question has grown in scope and strength. The growing awareness of the world to this injustice, the emergence of a large number of Asian and African countries as free nations and the intransigence of South Africa in this matter have had their inescapable impact even on those countries which have been supporting South Africa directly or indirectly. I remember the days in the United Nations General Assembly when India and other co-sponsors had to do intense canvassing first to get the item on the agenda, and then to get the two-thirds majority to have a resolution passed. Therefore, it is a matter of gratification to know that in 1962 resolution 1761 (XVII) was passed by a vote of

67 in favour, 16 against and 23 abstentions. Certainly, the winds of change have begun to blow over from Africa to other countries as well. Today, world Opinion is neither hesitant nor cautious in expressing disapproval of South Africa's policies. What is more significant is that--thanks to the efforts of African countriesthe United Nations is compelled not only to pass resolutions appealing to south Africa to abandon its uncivilized policies but to seek measures for effective sanctions against that country. For over a decade this Organization patiently hoped that South Africa, as a Member of the United Nations, would make efforts to satisfy the minimum demands made on it in various resolutions passed by the General Assembly. But all this has been in vain. South Africa refused to pay the slightest heed to the decisions of the General Assembly. The result has been disastrous. Before the eyes of a waiting world, before the eyes of the oppressed, the suppressed, and the enslaved, whose only hope for justice and humanity is the United Nations, the Organization will be discredited if we do not take steps to bring its Members to the discipline of this body. More than what happens in South Africa, more than the cruelty and humiliation inflicted on the non-whites, is the deliberate and persistent attempt made by one of our Members to flout the decisions of this august body.

The latest news from South Africa is anything but encouraging. We are told by the South African leaders that the recent build-up of the nation's defence forces is designed to give the country a bigger "fist" to prevent an internal up,rising by the country's black majority, an outside invasion by "liberation" forces. Although the United States has imposed an embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa, Britain is still supplying her with machine tools, etc. We are told that South Africa has built the strongest military and naval force in its history. These developments are an expression of further defiance of the United Nations and international opinion and, therefore, a threat to the peace of the world.

None of us here can claim perfection. Certainly the delegation of India is fully conscious of its own shortcomings, and our late Prime Minister acknowledged our difficulties in precise terms when he said : "There are racial conflicts elsewhere in the world. In India we have no racial conflict in that particular sense, but something akin to it when we suppress the people because they are called 'untouchables' or 'depressed classes'. We are fighting it. Again for instance, there are racial conflicts in the United States of America. But there is a difference. In the United States of America efforts have been made with growing success to ease the racial problem. I do not say they have solved it, but the Government have tried to solve it, with the help of public opinion, and there is progress in a certain direction; so also elsewhere.

"In South Africa, on the other hand, it is the deliberate, acknowledged and loudly-proclaimed

#### 159

policy of the Government itself to maintain this segregation and racial discrimination. This makes the South African case unique in the world. It is a policy with which obviously no person and no country which believes in the United Nations Charter can ever compromise, because it uproots almost everything the modern world stands for and considers worthwhile, whether it is the United Nations Charter or whether it is our, ideas of democracy or of human dignity.

"The racial policy of the South African Union is, I think, more basically wrong and dangerous for the future of the world than anything else. It surprises me that countries, particularly those who stand for the democratic tradition and those who voted for the United Nations Charter and for the Declaration of Human Rights--express themselves so moderately or do not express themselves at all about the racial policy of the South African Union. It is not a question of policy only. I say it is the greatest international immorality for a nation to carry on in that way."

But it is open to all of us to strive towards the objectives and ideals of the Charter which we have underwritten when we took our pledge as Members of the United Nations. A pledge is not a hollow affirmation but an article of faith. This pledge enjoins on all of us to work towards the creation of a rational, humane society in which war will be a myth, and equality and social justice the rule of law and life. Today because of inequalities of wealth and opportunities, we are far from that ideal. But in our determination to pursue these ideals and actively co-operate with one another we have indeed set our face in the right direction and we are definitely moving towards the ideal. The Republic of South Africa should be as genuinely concerned about this as any of us, being one of the founding Members of the United Nations. Hence our sorrow and disappointment are all the greater, all the more intense; and if harsh and unkind words are uttered here about these policies, they are the inescapable consequences of our own disappointment which is shared by the entire world.

South Africa has always invoked Article 2 (7) in her defence. Since this has been countered again and again to the satisfaction of all concerned, it will not be necessary for me to sing the same tune all over again. As a Member of the United Nations, the least that it could do was to extend its co-operation to the Experts Committee to study the evil on the spot. Even that has been denied. Here my delegation would like to congratulate the Committee chaired by Mrs. Myrdal for the courage with which it proceeded with its allotted task by using all the available avenues of co-operation. It is their sincerity and determination which have enabled us to meet here today and focus attention on constructive methods of approach to this problem. I would also like to place on record the deep appreciation of my delegation for the dedication and zeal with which the Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid Ambassador Dialo Telli, and his colleagues on the Committee have worked. Their various reports are very valuable documents and my delegation have found them extremely useful.

The International Conference on Economic Sanctions which met in London in April this year as well as the Committee presided over by Mrs. Myrdal have analysed the causes that have made South Africa so defiant of world opinion and so determined in pursuit of its wrong policies. Two reasons are alleged: first, the economic prosperity which has enabled South Africa to go it alone-if necessary without suffering the consequences of isolation; and second, that this prosperity is dependent on the help and support South Africa receives from some of the big Powers. These, have certainly strengthened and are strengthening the determination of South Africa. We do not mind any nation becoming rich and prosperous. In fact, we welcome it. But we should certainly strongly object to it if prosperity enables South Africa, or any other country, to supplement its massive powers by financial allocations for repressive action. It is this support to its policies which has led the London Conference on Sanctions to take expert advice on economic sanctions. As long as economic prosperity is used for repression it is our duty to undermine that support lest the problem, which has already assumed undesirable proportions, should really become a threat to world peace by unleashing violence.

I may recall here that India was one of the first countries, or perhaps the first country, to enforce economic sanctions against South Africa. We prohibited trade with South Africa in 1946 when that trade was considerable. Our experience in this has been ably summarized by Professor Raj of Delhi University, whose words I would like to reproduce here :

"The case for economic sanctions is obviously a political one and the factors that determine, their success are also in the ultimate analysis of a political character. If all countries decide on severing trade relations with South Africa, and if action is taken more or less simultaneously, the boycott will be certainly effective. Even if all countries are not prepared to be actively involved, the boycott can be made effective provided those who join are numerous and strong enough to prevent others from taking advantage of the situation. But if a small group of countries decide to 'go it alone', it is very unlikely that sanctions can achieve their objective however

#### 160

large the share of South African trade enjoyed by the sanctioning countries might be now and however vital the requirement of the South African economy for their products. The loss is likely to fall more heavily on them than on the country against which the boycott is imposed. This is essentially the main lesson of the Indian experience in boycotting South Africa."

It has been alleged that it will be difficult for

the big countries to suffer the losses consequent on withdrawal of investments in South Africa. The London Conference on Sanctions has pointed out that the losses are likely to be small and marginal. Unless the big countries enforce sanctions, we cannot pursue the matter with any success. Why should countries like the United Kingdom and the United States support South Africa, whose policies of apartheid-they have condemned "as evil totally impracticable, leading inevitably to disaster in South Africa itself", or strengthen her economically when the policy is condemned as "morally abominable, intellectually grotesque and spiritually indefensible"? These are not my words but words used by the representative of the United Kingdom. If as the Permanent Representative of the United States said, "progress in Africa is overshadowed by the racial bitterness and resentment caused by the policies of the South African Government", certainly there is no reason for the United States to invest its capital in South Africa and thus lend support to it.

The report of the Group of Experts, document S/5658, contains the key to the problem. Paragraph 96 of the report states :

"But while many African and other States have responded to the call of the General Assembly for sanctions, the hard fact remains that the South African economy is not seriously affected by the actions so far undertaken. Even if full sanctions were imposed by all the States whose representatives voted for the resolution in the General Assembly, the effect on the economy of South Africa would still be entirely inadequate. It is on the trading relations of South Africa with a few main trading partners that the strength of its economy rests. Nearly 40 per cent of South Africa's exports go to the United Kingdom and the United States, and nearly 50 per cent of her imports are drawn from these two countries. As Mr. Eric Louw pointed out in referring to the vote in the General Assembly in 1962, 'The nations not supporting sanctions absorb 79.6 per cent of South Africa's exports and send her 63.7 per cent of her imports'."

And now I shall quote paragraph 97

"Without the co-operation of the main trading partners of South Africa, no move to impose sanctions can be effective. This being so, and since the United Kingdom is both the principal supplier of South Africa's imports and the principal purchaser of South Africa's exports, we have studied the papers presented to the International Conference on Economic Sanctions held in London in April 1964."

The question that the Council and the world at large must pose is this : Will or will not the trading partners of South Africa put their words into practice and apply economic sanctions? This is the crux of the problem. Half-hearted measures will not do. Partial or limited sanctions will not do. Total economic boycott is the only answer. If the trading partners of South Africa are willing to accept the challenge, then they shall earn the gratitude of millions of people all over the world. If not, then history is unlikely to forgive them for permitting yet another Nazi-like monster to destroy civilization and civilized behaviour. It would have been wrong for us to ask the United Kingdom, and, to a lesser extent, the United States, to apply economic sanctions if we had not done so ourselves. As I stated, India was the first country to undertake an economic boycott of South Africa many years ago. We did this in 1946 when the responsibility for India's foreign policy was vested in the Government of the United Kingdom.

Many countries in Asia and Africa have followed suit but, as has been stated in the report of the Experts, strangely enough, the passing of resolution 1761 (XVII) has led to an increase rather than a decrease in the export and import trade of South Africa. If effective economic sanctions are applied, the loss to the economics of the United Kingdom and the United States would be inconsequential, as was made abundantly clear during the International Conference on Economic Sanctions held in London in April 1964. Besides, even if their economies were to suffer, surely these great countries could be expected to undergo certain sacrifices to improve the lot of millions of people in South Africa.

The responsibility of the Great Powers at this moment is as grave as it was in the League of Nations in the '30s. They shirked it then with consequences which, among other things, rendered the Covenant of the League a dead letter. The big question today for the Security Council to answer is whether it wants the United Nations to wither away like the League. Now, as then, if the Great Powers fail to face their responsibility, they would place in jeopardy the future of humanity itself. May Providence give them a right judgement to enable them to uphold the dignity of man and the peace of the world.

161

INDIA MOROCCO USA SOUTH AFRICA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Narendra Singh's Statement in the Security Council on Apartheid

Shri Narendra Singh, Acting Permanent Representative of India in the United Nations, made the following statement in the Security Council on June 18, 1964 on South Africa's policy of apartheid:

I have asked for the floor to make a few remarks on behalf of my delegation on the resolution which has just been adopted.

At the outset the Indian delegation would like to convey its appreciation for the labours of Mr. Nielsen and Mr. Castrillo Justiniano. The record of the Nordic countries in the field of decolonization and the fight against apartheid is well known. What the delegation of Norway has to say on these matters we listen to with respect. We are also grateful to Mr. Castrillo Justiniano of Bolivia. Latin America represents, as we know, a multiracial society. We have, of course, heard with interest and respect the views expressed on the resolution by the representatives of African States.

We are happy at the reaffirmation of the Council's call to all States to cease forthwith sale and shipment of arms and ammunition, military equipment and material for manufacture of arms in South Africa. With the situation in South Africa ever worsening, it is all the more necessary that all States now adhere to this call of the Security Council.

We can also draw satisfaction from the fact that the Council's resolution recognizes that the future of South Africa can be decided only by all the people of South Africa at the national level. Here the Council recognizes that South Africa is not a fief of the few. This means that it is for the ruling minority to come to terms with the majority. The resolution also recognizes that the convention has to be at the national level, that is, that it is against any partition and is for the upholding of the territorial integrity of the country.

I should, however, like to express to the Council the disappointment of my delegation on that portion of the resolution that deals with the economic boycott of South Africa.

My Minister of State speaking to the Council last week had made our position on the action we want the Council to take absolutely clear. Thirty African and other States including India are committed to General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII). Paragraph 4 of that resolution asks for a total trade embargo on South Africa. The Indian view is that a total economic boycott of South Africa should be enforced by the world to force the racist Government of South Africa to change its policy of apartheid before the racial issue blows up in the face of all the world. We also feel that the main responsibility for success in applying the policy of economic sanctions lies with the major trading partners of South Africa. Conditions in South Africa have not improved since the above resolution was passed, but have grown much worse, as has indeed been clearly recognized by nine members of the Council including one of the two main trading partners of South Africa.

When the Security Council passed resolution S/5471 last December appointing the Experts Group to go into the question of sanctions, we

expressed our reservations on this procedure. We felt this might prove time-consuming and distract the attention of the countries from the brutal realities in South Africa. The Group of Experts has, however, in paragraph 121, unambiguously called, for economic sanctions if South Africa refuses to reply favourably to the proposal of a national convention. The South African refusal is contained in the South African permanent representative's letter to the Security Council dated 22 May. If we were to proceed on the lines laid down by the Security Council meeting in December, there was no alternative left but to adopt a resolution applying sanctions.

It has been argued that the Council should not apply economic sanctions to South Africa as this would be a policy of pressure or coercion. Instead, we should work for an alternate solution--a negotiated settlement with the Government of South Africa. This view fails to take into account the fact that the South African Government has defied the United Nations for all these years. The, letter of the permanent representative of South Africa to the Security Council, dated 22 May 1964, is the latest proof of the rejection of South Africa to co-operate with us. The representative of Norway went so far as to call it an insult to the Group, who were appointed by this Council. Furthermore, it is not clear to us what alternatives to the policy of sanctions the advocates of persuasion have in mind. None was given to the Council. Persumably there is none. We agree with the Group of Experts that economic sanctions are the only hope left of bringing about a peaceful change in the policy of apartheid.

At least one of the main trading partners of South Africa has placed the responsibility for suffering and violence in South Africa on the repressive measures of the South African Government. The main trading partners of South Africa must bear a large share of responsibility for the consequences of the continuation of the policy of apartheid.

#### 162

India remains committed to the full implementation by all the Member States of the United Nations of General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII). Further, India has fully supported the decisions of the Heads of African States taken in Addis Ababa in May 1963 and the resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the OAU at Lagos in February 1964.

Paragraph 8 in the resolution definitely falls short of our expectations. The representative of Norway has explained that the Experts Committee of the Security Council is not intended to get bogged down in legal squabbles-that is, on Article 2(7)--or on the political advisability of sanctions. He says the intention is to go into the consideration of the question so that the Council may have before it the nuts and bolts-the details, as he called it-that is, the logistics of economic sanctions.. We are sorry this point has not been clearly spelled out-that the Committee was concerned with logistics of sanctions only.

But let not our disappointment on this issue of application of sanctions be interpreted as a victory for South Africa. The day of doom for apartheid is inexorably drawing near. First of all, the resolution does not preclude any State from enforcing boycott of South Africa immediately. We who have boycotted South Africa since 1946 indeed hope that further and total measures of boycott will be ordered by other States without delay. Secondly, there is a measure of a slightly greater involvement toward sanctions among the main trading partners of South Africa. Their position is something like that of the man who says that he has no intention of going to California but does not mind going to the railway station to find out the time of the train to California. I can only repeat the words of my Minister of State here the other day :

"May Providence give them a right judgement to enable them to uphold the dignity of man and the peace of the world." (1127th meeting, page 76).

Finally, I should like to make it clear that, so far as we can see, the resolution does not preclude the Security Council or the General Assembly or the Committee on Apartheid or any other body set up by the United Nations from continuing to discuss apartheid in the light of developments in the Republic and suggest or take action before the Experts Committee has given its word.

May I thank the President and the members of

the Security Council for permitting my delegation to make these remarks in the present debate. I close with the hope that we will remain determined to take action here and everywhere to change the course of events in South Africa and abolish apartheid. We will not get tripped by small steps, but we will use them as steppingstones to our goal of total economic boycott of South Africa and the mashing of apartheid.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA NORWAY BOLIVIA RUSSIA ETHIOPIA

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Shri Sanjivayya's Speech at the Conference

Shri D. Sanjivayya, Union Minister of Labour and Employment, delivered the following speech at the 48th session of the International Labour Conference in Geneva on June 19, 1964:

May I be pardoned if I begin my speech by referring to the bereavement which my country -nay the whole world, has suffered in the passing away of one of the greatest men of our generation-Shri Jawaharlal Nehru? He did not belong to us alone. While he lived he worked for a world without war and for man without want-ideals which give meaning to A that we do here in the I.L.O. Today, Nehru belongs to history. But our task remains-the task of making this world a happy home for mankind. It is in a spirit of dedication to the unfinished task of my master that I join you, ladies and gentlemen, in the work of this organisation.

But the I.L.O. can have only limited success in a divided world where the few nations that are rich spend so much of their resources on armaments and the many nations which are poor wait for effective aid in their way on poverty. Yes, this division is, in no sense, the last word in history. For, the rich and the poor nations are bound by a common economic nexus. The islands of affluence in today's world

#### 163

and the vast regions of retarded growth are both products of the same historical process. And the ultimate guarantee of continued affluence in the isolated pockets of prosperity lies in the economic advance of the regions peopled by the world's poor.

When the clouds of mutual suspicion clear up and the economic distortions disappear with growing disarmament, the prosperous societies will see the need for employing their limitless productive capacity for the development of the comparatively poor or developing regions of the world. The increasing flow of development assistance is a recognition of this prospect.

The proclamation of the Development Decade by the United Nations also registers this recognition. Twenty years ago the I.L.O. made the declaration that poverty anywhere constituted a danger to prosperity everywhere. The time has come when it is possible to proclaim that prosperity anywhere must be the means to end poverty elsewhere. As the economic collaboration between the rich and the poor nations develops, the humane ideals of the I.L.O. will find a more fertile field for fruition. I have no doubt that the coming years will bring to the I.L.O. greater opportunities for work and better chances of fulfilment.

The Director-General has called the I.L.O. a normative organisation wedded to certain principles. In a world of uneven social development this may make as much for strength as for weakness. The principles by themselves are unexceptionable. But many of them would sound hollow unless applied in a pragmatic manner to the under-developed regions of the world. Take for instance, the principle of freedom of labour. For the majority of the I.L.O.'s membership the primary problem is one of finding gainful employment for their growing millions. To the vast humanity caught in the quagmire of hunger and enforced idleness, freedom of labour has little meaning. In the absence of capital resources, utilisation of community labour through collective consent may at times appear to many of them the only means of escape from stagnation. It would be taking too technical a view if every effort on these lines is frowned upon as forced labour.

Similarly, in applying the principle of freedom of association one has to reckon with realities. The freedom to form associations is always conceived as a right to be asserted against interference by that most meddlesome of all institutions-the State. But the fact remains that in many countries trade union organisations are either non-existent or too weak to resist political manipulation by outsiders. If in such a situation a democratic State takes promotional measures or imposes restrictions on the outsiders right to run trade unions, the legal experts would call it interference with the freedom of trade unions. That may save the form set by the ILO but not the workers in their weak state of organisation. That is why it is very necessary to take a close look at the social structure in a particular region before applying these norms rigidly.

Many of the developing countries have set in motion special machinery to accelerate the pace of economic development. For them economic development is only the means of realising broader social objectives. It justifies itself by creating jobs for the unemployed, by raising the level of living and by reducing the inequalities of income and wealth. In fact, when economic growth is guided by the State and the State itself operate on a completely democratic base, as in my country, social objectives naturally have the primacy of place in the plans of development. Where the workers' representatives participate in the planning process and the Government itself depends on the free vote of the people there is no question of withholding from them the fruits of common endeavour.

It is in this context that the question of distribution of incomes assumes importance. It is, therefore, only natural that the ILO should feel deeply concerned with incomes policy. The spread of income in a community has to be just. It must also feed the forces of growth. But it is not easy to spell out the norms of income distribution as each individual economy has its own configuration of growth. I am not sure if the ILO should enter the contentious ground of incomes policy in a big way.

The Director-General has suggested an international instrument on the subject. This can at best have only limited utility. An incomes policy has many facets. It impinges on costs, profits and prices and has to encompass the whole gamut of government policy from land reforms to taxation and investment. To enter this field might take the ILO too far away from responsibilities which are "central to its mandate".

Wages and social security are, however, familiar grounds. The ILO can usefully expand its activities in these spheres. In many countries even the essential perequisites for settling wage questions like arrangements for carrying out family budget surveys and construction of cost of living indices do not exist. Here, the ILO can provide the necessary expert services. It can also help the developing countries in setting up social security schemes suitable to their circumstances.

Collective bargaining is yet to emerge as the principal instrument of wage determination in many countries. But as workers' organisations gain in strength they have an increasing say in

#### 164

setting wage questions. We started in our country with wage determination through the judicial process and are changing over to the mechanism of wage boards where the workers' and employers' representatives sit with independent experts to evolve wage structures appropriate to the industry as well as to the economy as a whole. These wage boards have no legal sanction behind them; it is the responsibility of the workers' and employers' organisations to ensure that their recommendations are implemented. I am glad to say that occasions were few when anything more than mild persuasion was required to secure hundred per cent implementation of these recommendations. This is collective bargaining at the highest level and has been found very suitable in our country.

The participation of workers' and employers' representatives in the framing of incomes policy or in the determination of wages depends a great deal on the existence of responsible organisations. The Director-General has rightly emphasised the need for developing autonomous organisations of workers and employers. As I have said earlier, this is not merely a question of non-interference by government. Autonomy also implies a degree of cohesion and strength in the organisations themselves. In many countries, the government may not constitute a menace to the autonomy of workers' organisations. Their own inner weakness may be the main cause of an inhibited growth. At times trade union organisations get mixed up with political organisations. Possibly, such a link-up was inevitable in the course of the struggle for freedom from colonial rule, But the consequences of the continuance of this alliance have still to be sorted out in many countries. When trade union organisations are used as pawns in political rivalry they cease to be authentic and their autonomy has to be safeguarded against usurpation by interested outsiders. It is not easy to get out of what has developed as part of a historical process.

We have sought to meet the situation by persuading the rival organisations to abide by an agreed Code of Conduct. This Code lays down certain forms of behaviour between rival trade union organisations. But we know that it is only through a patient process of education that the workers can be put on their feet. Then only will they be in a position to withstand manipulation by others. Here, again, the State may have to come forward to assist workers to educate themselves because their organisations lack the resources in material as well as men to run any effective scheme of education on any significant scale.

In our country, therefore, the State has entered this field. But its functions are limited to providing the funds only. The large network of education centres, that have been created under the scheme all over the country am run by an independent board on which workers' representatives work in co-operation with the representatives of employers. I think the best assistance that the ILO can provide in the field of labour management relations is through promotion of workers' education and of education of the management. The ILO has already taken up schemes in this field. I only wish that these will develop so that they may have an impact on the outlook of trade unions as well as managements.

The Director-General has raised the question of discrimination. Here, it is necessary to go beyond the surface. It is possible that the legal structure of a country does not leave room for any discrimination in the matter of employment but it is equally possible that groups of people in a society may suffer because of social inhibitions embedded in the historical past. Removal of such discrimination cannot be achieved merely by legal prescription. More positive action is necessary. In my country we have provided special educational and other facilities for identifiable groups who suffer because of social handicaps. We have also prescribed that a given percentage of jobs be reserved in all public appointments for persons belonging to these groups.

The ILO has done much good work in protecting the status of individual workers. In our legal system also we have sought to strengthen the position of the individual worker and give him the greatest measure of security in his job. In the matter of disputes also the individual worker is being given certain rights of redress even when his case is not sponsored by any union. But any security that one might provide to the individual worker would always remain in peril as long as the few in employment are menaced by the many without jobs. Where full employment prevails the security that an individual worker enjoys stems from the social situation itself and not much is needed to bolster his status or protect his rights.. But when employment itself is almost a privilege it is bound to suffer from an insecurity which is basic.

I welcome the Director-General's suggestion regarding the regional work of the organisation. It is essential that the ILO should have an intimate knowledge of local realities. Its research work should, therefore, proceed rather from the regions and the cooperation of local research institutions will only enrich the organisation's own work. There is also every point in coordinating the work of the ILO with that of the regional commissions of the United Nations. I think it would be a good idea if the ILO could, on request, prepare for countries entirely new to the task a minimum programme of action in

# the social and labour held which would be well within their means to realise in a short period of time.

The suggestions made by the Director-General in the matter of dealing with industrial questions are also important. If the establishment of the industrial committees was a departure after the Second Word War, I think the time has come to break fresh ground again. The industrial committees have certainly done good work but it would be more realistic to consider some problems of different industries in common and, as far as possible, in the regional context and I also believe that the association of experts will only strengthen the tripartite machinery for considering industrial questions. It does not seem necessary to have any rigid routine of periodicity for convening the established industrial committees of the ILO. The other course, now being increasingly followed, of having ad hoc meetings on industries not covered by regular committees, should be more fully developed.

We expect much from the ILO in the coming years. In the shaping and evolution of labour policy throughout the world the ILO has hitherto been an invisible influence. The developing regions want it to be much more visible. We would like to think of the ILO as an organisation directly assisting in the development of skills. We want this organisation to assist in the training of persons who will run trade unions and man the management, particularly those who will be in charge of personnel in the growing number of factories. We also want this organisation to assist in raising cadres of labour administrators wherever they do not exist.

Sir, I represent a country which has travelled some distance on the road to development. We have known the slumber and sloth of stagnation and are now feeling the strains and stresses of growth. This is an experience which is shared in varying degrees by people throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is for the ILO to help developing countries shake off the slumber and relieve their strains. This it can best do by undertaking bold programmes of practical action and executing them with vigour. As the

#### 165

Director-General himself has put it, the ILO must "swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action." It is only then that it can fulfil the expectations it has raised and fulfil the purpose it has set for itself.

# SWITZERLAND USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

# **Volume No**

1995

LAOS

Communique on Situation in Laos

The following is the text of a communique issued in Vientiane, on June 29, 1964, at the end of the 6-Power consultations on the situation in Laus :

On May 26, 1964, the British Charge d'Affaires in Vientiane, acting as representative of the British Co-Chairman of the International Conference on the settlement of the Laotian question held at Geneva in 1961/62, and in response to a request from the Prime Minister of Laos in a letter of May 19, addressed to the representatives of both Co-Chairmen, invited representatives of each of the signatory powers to attend consultations under Article 4 of the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos, signed at Geneva on July 23, 1962 the consultations opened at the British Embassy in Vientiane on June 2 and the final meeting was held on June 29, 1964. They were presided over by the British Charge d'Affaires.

Heads of Missions representing the Governments of Canada, Thailand, the USA and the Republic of Vietnam took part in the consultations on the basis of this invitation.

The Ambassador of India also participated in the consultations on the understanding that:

(a) He regarded the consultations merely as informal consultations among Ambassadors of certain Geneva Powers in Vientiane.

(b) He did not regard the Ambassador's meetings in Vientiane as consultations envisaged under Article 4 of the Geneva Declaration, nor as a substitute for a 14-Power International Conference which his Government strongly supported.

#### 166

(c) Participation would be aimed at, besides an exchange of views on the situation in Laos, the convocation of 14-Power consultations under Article 4 of the Geneva Declaration and/or an International Conference.

The Ambassador of India was consequently unable to associate himself with any statement in the nature of a finding on the military situation as set out in paragraph six below, or with any proposal concerning matters of which the ICSC was or should be seized, in view of India's status as a Supervisory Power and Chairman of the ICSC. He expressed the view that the Commission was the only body charged by the Geneva Conference to make investigation into the present military situation and to report urgently to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference if they had not already done so.

He also expressed the view that the Commission should be requested to make a speedy investigation into violations of the cease-fire and to furnish appropriate reports to the Co-Chairmen.

The consultations were intended to provide for an exchange of views between the participating countries aimed at finding ways and means to bring about an improvement in the situation in Laos, and as a means of supporting and strengthening the Government of National Union. The Prime Minister held regular and frequent exchanges with the Chairman of the consultations and the Laotian Government made available any information requested by the consultants; in the way the Government was associated with consultations, maintaining contact and showing its continuing interest in the proceedings. The Prime Minister expressed his satisfaction with the work carried out during the consultations.

The representatives agreed that the deteriorating military situation in Laos presented a grave threat to the peace of South East Asia. They unanimously agreed to call on the Co-Chairmen in the way each thought appropriate to do every thing in their power to urge two parties concerned to bring about an immediate cease-fire throughout the Kingdom and withdraw all forces to the Positions which they held before the recent fighting. The cease-fire and withdrawal should be verified by the Co-Chairmen.

During the meeting a detailed assessment of recent developments of the situation was made by the representatives of Canada, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Republic of Vietnam. (India did not participate in this assessment for the reasons set in paragraph 3 above). On the basis of this assessment the five representatives condemned the recent Pathet Lao attacks on the Neutralist Forces of General KONGLAE, attacks clearly made with North Vietnamese assistance, as being in flagrant violation of the Geneva Agreements. In the course of this study evidence was produced concerning the use by North Vietnam of Laos territory to interfere in the internal affairs of the Republic of Vietnam. The conclusions of the assessment and the action which these representatives are recommending in the way each thing appropriate to the Co-Chairmen is set out in the document annexed to this communique\*.

### \*The annexure has not been included.

The representatives were agreed that the Geneva Agreements, if carried out in a constructive spirit, provide the necessary framework to assure the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Laos. They considered, in relation to the work of ICSC and the duties imposed on it by the protocol, certain recommendation that might be made to the Commission by the Co-Chairmen under Article 8 of the Protocol. They considered in particular recommendations relating to : The resumption of full participation in the work of the Commission by the Polish Commissioner; the importance of the continued and effective functioning of the Commission in full enjoyment of security and immunity for members of the Commission and its personnel; the provision of all facilities to the Commission to move without hindrance in Laos and for the purpose of carrying out investigations; and the according of maximum co-operation by the Royal Laotian Government and all political groups in Laos to the Commission to enable it to perform its functions under the Geneva Agreements.

The representatives looked forward to a stabilization of the political situation in Laos which would ensure the willing co-operation of all the principal political groups in the country to enable the Government of National Union, with Prince Souvanna Phouma as Prime Minister, to discharge its responsibility for the execution of the cease-fire as contemplated under Article 9 of the Protocol to the Geneva Declaration on the neutrality of Laos. To this end they expressed the hope that an early meeting could be held between the leaders of the political parties and urged the Co-Chairmen to use their influence to bring this about.

The meeting also discussed on an exploratory basis and without commitment the nature of prior conditions that would be necessary if agreement were ultimately to be reached on the holding of a new international conference on the Laotian question. In this context reference was also made to other proposals for consultations on the Laotian question.

### 167

LAOS USA SWITZERLAND CANADA THAILAND VIETNAM INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

NEPAL

A Telecommunications Agreement between India and Nepal was signed in New Delhi on June 25, 1964. This followed the successful conclusion of the Telecommunications Conference which was inaugurated by the Union Minister for Communications, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha on June 16, 1964.

The agreement was signed by Shri S. K. Kanjilal, Member (Telecommunications Operations), P&T Board, on behalf of India and by Shri H. P. Upadhyaya, Nepal's Chief Engineer (Telecommunications) on behalf of His Majesty's Government of Nepal.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, India's Minister for Communications and Parliamentary Affairs, and the Union Deputy Minister for Communications, Shri B. Bhagvati, were present on the occasion.

The agreement provides for the opening of a direct wireless telegraph circuit between Delhi and Kathmandu, and a direct radio-telephone circuit between Calcutta and Kathmandu. The equipment for operating these circuits has been supplied by the United States of America under the Tripartite Agreement between the Government of India, His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the United States Government, which was signed in 1958. The new services will be inaugurated later on a date to be decided by the Government of India and Nepal.

The charges for a telegram from India to Nepal will be Rs. 2 for the first 10 words and Re. 0.20 for each additional word. Express telegram facility will also be available at double the rates for ordinary telegrams. Press telegrams will be accepted at cheaper tariffs, namely, Rs. 1.50 for the first 50 words and Re. 0.15 for each additional 5 words for ordinary telegrams. "Express" press telegrams will be charged at double the rates for ordinary press telegrams.

As against the pattern on Indian inland trunk calls, where the charges vary according to distance between the calling and the called stations, a new system has been evolved for radio-telephone calls between India and Nepal under which India has been divided into two zones. Zone I comprises the States of Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Kerala, Madras, Maharashtra, Mysore and Orissa and the Union Territories of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Goa, Daman and Diu, Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Pondicherry. Zone II comprises the rest of India.

The total charges for a call from any point in Nepal to any point in Zone I in India would be Rs. 17 for the first three minutes and between any point in Nepal and any point in Zone II in India, it shall be Rs. 13 for the first three minutes. Each additional minute after the first three minutes will be charged proportionately. There shall be no different priorities on calls between India and Nepal, all calls between the two countries being treated at par with the "Urgent" trunk calls on the Indian trunk network.

The "Particular Person" facility will be available also on India-Nepal calls, without any extra charge.

Under the Telecommunications Agreement, India will provide full transit facilities for telegrams and telephone calls between Nepal and all other countries.

India has also agreed to assist Nepal in maintenance of accounts in respect of the telephone and telegraph service for an initial period of up to two years.

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

POLAND

Indo-Polish Trade Agreement Signed

A trade agreement was signed between India and Poland at Warsaw on June 18, 1964 following the negotiations held at Warsaw between an Indian trade delegation and the Polish Government for trade between the two countries during 1965 and 1966.

As a result of the agreement the volume of trade between the two countries is envisaged to be of the order of Rs. 380 million both ways by 1966. There will be considerable diversification of goods to be exported by India, including engi-

### 168

neering goods, cotton textiles, and various items of manufactured goods. There will also be expansion of trade in traditional goods particularly in iron ore, manganese ore, mica, jute goods and tobacco. Poland is also interested in imports of deoiled linseed cakes from India.

Poland will export steel, machine tools, textile machinery, and various chemicals.

POLAND INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Oil Contracts Signed

Two contracts were signed in New Delhi on June 15, 1964 between the Oil and Natural Gas Commission and the Soviet Trading Organisation, Technoexport of Moscow, at a function presided over by Prof. Humayun Kabir, Union Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals.

Mr. N. N. Kashyap, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals, signed the contract on behalf of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission and Mr. Silouianov, Economic Counsellor of the USSR Embassy on behalf of Technoexport, Moscow. Among others present at the function were Mr. O.V. Alagesan, Minister in the, Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals and His Excellency, Mr. Benediktov, Ambassador of USSR in India.

The first contract relates to off-shore-seismic survey to be carried out by Soviet technicians in the coastal waters of India. The Soviet Organisation will send to India a specially equipped ship, the "Agademik Arkhangelskiy", initially for a period of 16 months. It will be manned by Soviet experts in seismic and radiogeodetic survey. A provision has been made for the inclusion of some Indian technical experts in the ship for association in the survey work.

The second contract relates to deputation of 15 high-level experts from USSR dealing with exploration and production of oil and natural gas. The tenure of these experts will range from one to two years.

The Oil and Natural Gas Commission has already undertaken a certain amount of off-shore seismic survey in the gulf of Cambay in a converted Indian vessel. The potentiality for discovery of large-scale reserves of oil and natural gas in some of the coastal areas like the gulfs of Cambay and Cutch and the Coromandal coast, is rated very high. It is for this reason that preparatory work for exploration in the coastal waters is sought to be expedited by the present contract. This will also give an opportunity to young geophysicists of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission to get training in modem methods of seismic survey in off-shore areas.

INDIA RUSSIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Communique on Defence Aid Talks

The following is the text of a Communique issued on June 6, 1964 on the defence aid talks the Union Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan had in Washington in May, 1964 :

During their discussions in Washington, which were interrupted by the sudden death of Prime Minister Nehru, Defence Minister Y. B. Chavan and Defence Secretary Robert S. McNamara reviewed the threat to India of Chinese aggression directed from Peking, the related Indian defence plan and future US Military grant aid and credit assistance to India. Following the Defence Minister's return to India there have been further useful talks in New Delhi.

During the discussions in Washington, Minister Chavan explained that the Indian defence effort, including foreign exchange expenditures for defence purposes, should not impair the rate of the economic development of India. It was agreed that to secure this objective careful control of

### 169

defence expenditures as well as continued external aid would be necessary.

General agreement has been reached as to the military grant assistance which the United States plans to provide with respect to the fiscal year 1965, subject to necessary action by the United States Congress. This assistance, to be continued at about present levels, includes such items as continued support for Indian mountain divisions, air defence communications equipment, transport aircraft support and road building equipment for India's border roads.

In addition, the United States has agreed that credit will be provided immediately in fiscal Year 1964 to the Government of India for the purchase of such defence articles and services as vehicles and communications equipment, certain equipment for the modernization of Indian ordnance factories and an engineering study for the new Ambajhari ordnance plant.

Secretary McNamara has also informed Minister Chavan that the United States plans to extend additional military sales credit to India in fiscal year 1965, including funds to provide equipment for the new Ambajhari ordnance plant.

It also has been agreed that the subject of air defence aircraft for India would continue under examination by both sides.

Secretary McNamara and Minister Chavan agreed that the Government of the United States and the Government of India will continue to consult upon United States assistance related to India's long range. defence effort.

### USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Agreement for Construction of Methanol. Plant Signed

The Governments of India and the United States concluded on June 19, 1964 an agreement providing for an American loan of \$7.8 million (Rs. 3.7 crores) for the construction of India's first methanol plant at Trombay. The project will make India self-sufficient in methanol, a key chemical in the manufacture of plastics, drugs, resins, synthetic fibres and dyestuffs.

Mr. P. Govindan Nair, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, and Mr. Joseph N. Greene, Jr., Charge d'Affaires of the U.S. Embassy, signed the agreement.

The loan has been extended by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The methanol plant will be constructed by the Fertiliser Corporation of India Ltd. (FCI) adjacent to its Trombay fertiliser plant and will commence production in late 1965, utilising synthesis gases produced during the course of fertiliser manufacture.

Earlier loans from the United States totalling Rs. 27.7 crores are meeting both the foreign exchange and the rupee costs of the fertiliser plant itself, which will produce 420,000 tons of chemical fertilisers annually, making it India's largest producer of fertilisers. It is estimated that the application of this amount of fertiliser will increase annual food production by more than ten lakh tons.

A portion of the loan will be used for the installation of ancillary facilities, including a sulphuric acid plant and an argon gas recovery plant in connection with fertiliser production.

The FCI has entered into a contract with the Girdler Corporation, Louisville, Kentucky, U.S.A. for design, fabrication and erection of the methanol plant, which will have an annual productive capacity of 33,000 tons.

At the present time, India's total requirements for this chemical are met through imports. The plant's production will result in a foreign exchange saving equivalent to Rs. 4 crores per year, and will make available an essential raw material for the manufacture of a wide range of both industrial and consumer goods.

Argon gas, which is utilised primarily for arc welding, will be obtained as a by-product in the synthesis of ammonia, a principal ingredient of nitrogenous fertilisers. The argon gas recovery plant will have an annual production capacity of 116,820 cubic metres and will be the second argon production facility in India.

170

USA INDIA RUSSIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1	a	0	5
T	7	7	э

Content

Foreign Affairs Vol. X	Record		n 01, 1964 .Y No. 7			
		CONTEN	NTS	<b>D</b> .4		
GES CONFERENC	E OF AFRI	CAN HEA	DS OF ST	PA ATE		
President R 71	adhakrishna	n's Messag	e to Presid	lent Nasse	er	
COMMONWE	CALTH PRI	ME MINIS	STERS' CO	ONFEREN	NCE	
Final Comn 71	nunique				1	
CZECHOSLO	VAKIA					
Protocol on 76	Foundry Fo	orge Plant S	Signed			1
PAKISTAN						
Joint Comm 77	unique on I	ndo-Pakist	an Rice Ag	greement		
PEOPLE'S RE	PUBLIC OF	F RUMAN	IA			
Agreement 77	for Technica	al Assistan	ce			1
SYRIA						
Message by 78	the Syrian I	Patriarch o	n his visit	to India		
UNION OF SC	OVIET SOC	IALIST RI	EPUBLICS	8		
Indo-Soviet 78	Agreement	for Techni	cal Assista	ance		

Soviet Assistance for Precision Instruments Plant

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreement Signed 79

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

President's Message on Civil Rights Bill 80

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

1

1

1

### NORWAY SLOVAKIA PAKISTAN SYRIA INDIA USA

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### CONFERENCE OF AFRICAN HEADS OF STATE

President Radhakrishnan's Message to President Nasser

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, sent on July 17, 1964 the following message to His Excellency Mr. Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic :

I have much pleasure in sending our cordial greetings and best wishes on the occasion of the Second Conference of African Heads of State, to Your Excellency. personally and to the eminent Heads of State and Government now assembled in Cairo. We were deeply impressed by the results of the First Conference in laying the foundations of African unity and we are convinced that at the present meeting, the striking results already achieved will be consolidated and thereby help in the liberation of those parts of Africa which are not yet free and promote the interests of progress and development, and world peace.

79

# EGYPT **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

#### COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

### Final Communique

The following is the text of the final communique issued in London on July 15, 1964 at the conclusion of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference :

The meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers ended today. Pakistan, Ghana, and Tanganyika and Zanzibar were represented by their Presidents. Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ceylon, Malaysia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Kenya, and Malawi were represented by their Prime Ministers. India was represented by the Minister of Finance; Cyprus by the Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Jamaica by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.

This was the first meeting at which Uganda and Kenya were represented as independent members; and the other Commonwealth heads of government were glad to greet their Prime Ministers. They expressed their satisfaction at the establishment of Malaysia which they had welcomed at their last meeting in 1962, and they greeted Tunku Abdul Rahman as Prime Minister of Malaysia. They also welcomed the attainment of independence by Malawi on July 6, 1964. and agreed that Malawi should be admitted to membership of the Commonwealth. They invited the Prime Minister of Malawi, Dr. Banda, to join their meeting; and Dr. Banda took his seat on July 9. They noted that Northern Rhodesia would become independent on October 24, 1964, as the Republic of Zambia; and they looked forward to welcoming Zambia as a member of the Commonwealth on the completion of the necessary consti-

#### tutional processes.

In the course of their discussion, the Presidents and Prime Ministers reviewed the major issues of the day.

They agreed that one of the most important of these is race relations. It was agreed that the Commonwealth has a particular role to play in the search for solutions to the inter-racial problems which are threatening the orderly development of mankind in general, and of many particular areas in the world today. As a community of many different races, the Commonwealth is itself an almost unique experiment in international cooperation among peoples of several races and continents. Within their own borders, many of its members have faced and are facing issues raised

#### 171

by the co-existence of differing cultures within a democratic society. The Prime Ministers affirmed their belief that, for all Commonwealth Governmerits, it should be the objective of policy to build in each country a structure of society which offers equal opportunity and non-discrimination for all its people, irrespective of race, colour or creed. The Commonwealth should be able to exercise constructive leadership in the application of democratic principles in a manner which will enable the people of each country of different racial and cultural groups to exist and develop as free and equal citizens.

The Prime Ministers recalled the critical international situation which had developed shortly after their last meeting in the autumn of 1962 and the grave threat to peace which it had implied. They believed that the fact that it was successfully resolved may have been in some sense a turning point in the relations between the major Powers and may have marked the beginning of a new period in international affairs in which the world may hope for a gradual relaxation of tension. This will not be a short or simple process; but the Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the further steps which had already been taken to reduce the causes of friction, particularly the conclusion of the tests-ban treaty and the subsequent agreements between the Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union not to place nuclear weapons in outer space. They also welcomed the

reductions in the output of fissile material for military purposes which these Governments have made.

Against this background, the Prime Ministers expressed their hope that these steps would lead progressively to general and complete disarmament. They reaffirmed their support for the work of the Geneva disarmament conference and their determination to seek to extend the scope of disarmament in accordance with the principles expressed in their statement of March 17, 1961. particularly by endeavouring to promote an agreement to prohibit the further dissemination nuclear weapons and of knowledge relating to their manufacture and use. They will maintain their efforts to reduce the areas of international disagreement by all the means within their power, while maintaining both the strength and the resolution to resist aggression from without or subversion from within. In this connection, they assured the Prime Minister of Malaysia of their sympathy and support in his efforts to preserve the sovereign independence and integrity of his country and to promote a peaceful and honourable settlement of current differences between Malaysia and neighbouring countries. They discussed the great significance of China for South and South-East Asia. They also discussed the question of relations with China and of her membership of the United Nations. They expressed anxiety about the continuing tension in South-East Asia and affirmed their support for all measures which might Promote a just and peaceful settlement and help to re-establish stability in the area.

The Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the friendly public statements by the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India and expressed their hopes that the problems between their countries will be solved in the same friendly spirit.

While recognizing that it was not a function of the Commonwealth to act as an arbiter in disputes between member-nations, the Prime Ministers agreed that Commonwealth countries could play a role of liaison and, where possible, consider using their good offices to help towards the settlement of disputes between member-nations provided the parties concerned accepted such mediation. The Prime Ministers renewed their support for the United Nations and its efforts to resolve disputes in various parts of the world. They reaffirmed their adherence to the principles of the Charter and emphasized the importance of reinforcing the strength and capacity of the United Nations to respond to the demands which it must meet if the Charter is to be fulfilled.

The Prime Ministers expressed concern about the situation with regard to Cyprus. They reaffirmed their full support for United Nations Security Council's resolutions of March 4, March 13 and June 20, 1964. The Prime Ministers asserted that the Cyprus problem should be solved within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the principles of democracy and justice.

They appealed to all countries concerned to refrain from any action which might undermine the task of the United Nations peace-keeping force, to which a number of Commonwealth countries are contributing, or might prejudice the endeavours of the United Nations to find a lasting solution in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

The Prime Ministers undertook to consider practical measures to strengthen the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations and to reduce the degree of improvisation required in an emergency. They agreed that consultation and cooperation among interested Governments in this matter could be of great value in contributing to the improvement of the peace-keeping effectiveness of the United Nations.

#### 172

The Prime Ministers expressed their concern at the possible effect on United Nations operations in all fields of a prolongation of the United Nations financial crisis. They expressed a common desire to work towards a long-term equitable solution of the problem of financing large-scale United Nations peace-keeping operations, and agreed that any such solution should be based on the principles of collective financial responsibility and relative capacity to pay.

Britain made the following statement to the meeting about the progress of British colonial dependencies towards independence :

Already more than 20 countries (with a total population of some 700,000,000) had achieved soverign independence under British guidance. This process was continuing a the time. Northern Rhodesia would be independent in October, and the Gambia very soon after. Basutoland had been promised that she could have independence in about 18 months' time; Bechuanaiand would be free to follow when she wished; and Swaziland's new constitution had now set her on the same course. In addition, it had been agreed that the Federation of South Arabia should become independent within the next 3 1/2 years. British Guiana- would become independent as soon as she was able to assure internal peace. Southern Rhodesia would attain full sovereignty as soon as her governmental institutions were sufficiently representative.

There were a number of other colonies which already enjoyed a wide measure of selfgoverment. These included the Bahamas, Barbados, British Honduras, and Mauritius. In addition, there were some 20 other colonies and protectorates with a combined population of about 5,000,000. Of these, over 3,000,000 were in Hong Kong, where the circumstances were exceptional. Of the remainder, only two territories had a population of more than 100,000. Several had less than 10,000. The smallest (Pitcairn) in the Pacific had only 90 inhabitants. It was clear that no uniform pattern would fit all these very different territories. Some might feel strong enough to proceed to independence on their own. Some might join with others to form larger and more viable units. Some might wish to couple independence with a treaty of friendship such as Western Samoa concluded with New Zealand. Some would for the present prefer to remain as they were.

The Prime Ministers of the other Commonwealth countries welcomed the progress of British territories to independent membership of the Commonwealth. They recognized that the authority and responsibility for leading her remaining colonies to independence must continue to rest with Britain.

At the same time, Prime Ministers of other

Commonwealth countries expressed their views to the Prime Minister of Britain on the question of the progress of Southern Rhodesia towards independence within the Commonwealth. They welcomed the decision already announced by the British Government that, as in the case of other territories, the existence of sufficiently representative institutions would be a condition of the grant of independence to Southern Rhodesia. They also noted with approval the statement already made by the British Government that they would not recognize any unilateral declaration of independence; and the other Prime Ministers made it clear that the would be unable to recognize any such declaration. The view was also expressed that an independence conference should be convened which the leaders of all parties in Southern Rhodesia should be free to attend. The object would be to seek agreement on the steps by which Southern Rhodesia might proceed to independence within the Commonwealth at the earliest practicable time on the basis of majority rule. With a view to diminishing tensions and preparing the way for such a conference, an appeal was made for the release of all the detained African leaders. The Prime Ministers called upon all leaders and their supporters to exercise moderation and to abstain from violence; and they afirmed their belief that the best interest of all sections of the population lay in developing confidence and co-operation, on the basis of tolerance, mutual understanding and justice. In this confection, they recognized the necessity for giving confidence to the minority community in Southern Rhodesia that their interests would be protected.

The Prime Minister of Britain said that he would give careful consideration to all the views expressed by other Commonwealth Prime Ministers. At the same time, he emphasized that the Government of Southern Rhodesia was constitutionally responsible for the internal affairs of that territory, and that the question of the granting of independence was a matter for decision by the British Parliament.

The meeting expressed concern at the political rivalries in British Guiana which had led to disorder and inter-racial strife and had prejudiced the attainment of independence. While several different views were expressed on the methods to be employed, a number of Prime Ministers expressed the hope that the political leaders of British Guiana would seek urgently a basis for collaboration in the interest of their fellowcountrymen of all races in order to restore mutual

### 173

confidence among the races and to strengthen a spirit of national purpose and unity. Only in these circumstances could British Guiana hope to sustain true independence.

The question of the progress of the smaller dependent territories in the Caribbean to independence was raised. It was emphasized that the problem for the territories was mainly one of viability; and the hope was expressed that every practicable effort would be made to help them to strengthen their economies and so enable them to sustain the obligations of independence, whether in a federation or in some other form of associalion.

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed their condemnation of the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of the Republic of South Afica. Some Commonwealth Prime Ministers felt very strongly that the only effective means of dealing with the problem of apartheid was the applicalion of economic sanctions and an arms embargo. It was recognized, however, that there was a difference of opinion among Commonwealth countries as to the effectiveness of economic sanctions and as to the extent to which they regarded it as right or practicable to. seek to secure the abandonment of apartheid by coercive act-ion, of whatever kind. But the Prime Ministers were unanimous in calling upon South Africa to bring to an end the practice of apartheid, which had been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations and was deplored by public opinion throughout the world.

The Prime Ministers expressed their regret that Portugal had not so far given recognition to the principle of self-determination for her territories in Africa.

The Prime Ministers agreed that the issues of Commonwealth and international relations which confront them in the political field, however complex and contentious, must be seen in perspective in relation to the many factors which bring together the peoples of the Commonwealth and enable them to make a unique contribution to the promotion of peaceful development. The Commonwealth now consists of 18 independent member-countries, widely distributed over the globe and accounting for nearly a quarter of the population of the world. It is, indeed, a crosssection of the world itself; and its citizens have an unparalleled opportunity to prove that, by mutual co-operation, men and women of many different races and national cultures can live in peace and work together for the common good.

The Prime Ministers reviewed the world economic situation as it affects their countries. and reaffirmed the resolve of their Governments to promote the economic development of their countries. To this end they emphasized the need of developing countries for improved and more remunerative outlets for their trade and for increased financial aid on easier terms and on a continuing basis. They took note, of the problems presented to developing countries by the conditions and terms often attached by donor governments to their aid, of the desirability of the encouragement of private investment in developing countries, and also of the upward trend in the level of financial aid extended by the more developed countries in the Commonwealth and of the easier terms on which it is offered.

There was agreement on the importance for all Commonwealth countries of following up the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in particular with regard to expanding international trade in primary products through freer access to markets and, in appropriate cases, through commodity agreements and stabilized prices at equitable levels; working out arrangements for increasing access by preferences or otherwise to markets in developed countries for manufactured goods from developing countries; and elaborating proposals for supplementary finance to assist countries whose development might be threatened by adverse movements in their export earnings. The Prime Ministers affirmed their intention of working for a solution of these and other problems of the developing countries through the new institutions resulting from the conference as well as through existing international bodies such as the GATT.

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed the resolve of the member-countries of the Commonwealth to

promote the economic and social progress of developing countries. They wished to maintain their support of the work of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, the Colombo Plan, and other similar arrangements in this field. At the same time, they wished to establish how best the members of the Commonwealth could make a further distinctive contribution of their own to the development of its member-countries. They conceived that the purpose of any new initiative in this respect should be not merely to increase the economic strength and material well-being of the recipients. vital though these considerations are, but also to strengthen the links between the countries of the Commonwealth by encouraging their peoples to work more closely together in a variety of practical ways. For this purpose they selected for further examination several fields of action in which they believed the practice of Commonwealth co-operation might be extended; and they agreed that these schemes should not be in substitution for existing arrangements but supplementary to them.

#### 174

In particular, they considered a proposal that development projects might be launched in individual Commonwealth countries, which would be implemented by various members acting in close collaboration and contributing whatever resources-in men, money, materials and technicat expertise-they could most appropriately provide. Such projects, which would be additional to the support which Commonwealth countries already provide to the United Nations Special Fund and Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, could be directed to a number of different purposes-the improvement of agricultural production and the development of natural resources through extension services, training and research; the enlargement of protessional and technical training; the development of new industries; and so forth. But they would all be inspired by the common purpose of promoting the development of the Commonwealth by a coordinated programme of joint or bilateral projects. The British Government said that they would be prepared to make a substantial contribution to projects of this kind within their expanding programme of development aid. The other member-governments expressed support for the objective of the proposal and agreed that further consideration should be given to the basis on

which such a programme might be established.

Development projects of this kind would need to be planned, carefully and thoroughly, at all stages in their execution; and the Prime Ministers therefore considered that it might be valuable to supplement the existing arrangements for promoting the study of the techniques of administration and development planning throughout the Commonwealth. They considered that there might be advantage in making arrangements, which could include the formation of a new institute, to provide facilities for specialized training and research for senior administrators concerned with administrative and development problems in relation to the needs of new countries. They agreed that further consideration should be given to the most appropriate form for arrangements for additional training, including the strengthening of existing institutions.

The Prime Ministers took note of the scope which exists for co-operation between the Governments and peoples of the Commonwealth in social as well as economic development. They noted with satisfaction that the third Commonwealth Education Conference will be held in Ottawa in August; and they expressed warm wishes for its success, together with appreciation for the British Government's offer to increase to an average of œ 5,000,000 a year, over the five years starting in 1965-66, the capital assistance which they already provide for higher education in developing Commonwealth countries, both independent and dependent.

They decided in principle that an initiative similar to that which was launched in the field of education by the first of the Commonwealth Education Conferences several years ago should now be taken in the field of medicine, and that for this purpose consideration should be given to the convening of a Commonwealth Medical Conference during the course of 1965. Such a conference would enable the members of the Commonwealth to discuss mutual assistance in medical education, including links between institutions, the provision of ancillary staffs, the development and planning of health services, and the supply of medical equipment and facilities for research.

The links between the countries of the Com-

monwealth are strengthened not only by co-operation between their Governments in initiatives of this kind, but even more by frequent personal contacts between individuals who share common professional interests.

The Prime Ministers recorded their support for the valuable work which the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association performs in bringing together members of the parliaments of all Commonwealth countries. The British Government stated that they would be prepared, if other Commonwealth Governments would do the same, to increase their contribution to the Association.

The Prime Ministers considered that further steps should be taken to promote contacts in other fields, and that it might be desirable to establish a Commonwealth Foundation to administer a fund for increasing interchanges between Commonwealth organizations in professional fields. This Foundation could be administered by an independent board; and while it could be financed by contributions from Commonwealth Governments, it would also welcorne support from all quatrers, whether public or private.

The Prime Ministers also took note of the current international discussions on the establishment of a global system of satellite communications. They endorsed the desirability of establishing such a system, and considered how Commonwealth countries could best co-operate with each other and with other countries in its development. They discussed the provision of technical assistance to the developing countries in this field. particularly as regards the establishment of ground stations and inter-connections in Commonwealth countries . They agreed that further consideration should be given to the feasibility of such a plan and the basis on which it might best be implemented.

The Prime Ministers directed that the Commonwealth liaison committee, with the assistance of special representatives, should now give more detailed consideration to all aspects of these new initiatives in the hope that they could be launched

### 175

and carried forward at an early date. They noted that thereafter further opportunities to review many of these projects would-be afforded by the third Commonwealth Education Conference in Ottawa in August and by the Commonwealth Economic Consultative Council meeting in Kuala Lumpur in September.

Finally, they were anxious that some permanent expression should be given to the desire, which had been evident through their deliberations, for closer and more informed understanding between their Governments on the many issues which engage their attention and for some continuing machinery for this purpose. They, therefore, instructed officials to consider the best basis for establishing a Commonwealth Secretariat, which would be available inter alia to disseminate factual information to all member-countries on matters of common concern; to assist existing agencies, both official and unofficial, in the promotion of Commonwealth links in all fields; and to help to co-ordinate, in co-operation with the host country, the preparations for future meetings of Commonwealth heads of government and, where appropriate, for meetings of other Commmonwealth Ministers. This secretariat, being recruited from member-countries and financed by their contributions, would be at the service of all Commonwealth Governments and would be a visible symbol of the spirit of co-operation which animates the Commonwealth.

UNITED KINGDOM USA GHANA PAKISTAN AUSTRALIA CANADA MALAYSIA NIGER NIGERIA SIERRA LEONE KENYA TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO UGANDA MALAWI INDIA CYPRUS JAMAICA ZAMBIA SWITZERLAND RUSSIA CHINA THE GAMBIA SWAZILAND BAHAMAS HONDURAS MAURITIUS HONG KONG WESTERN SAMOA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SOUTH AFRICA PORTUGAL SRI LANKA

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Protocol on Foundry Forge Plant Signed

A protocol, defining the scope of the proposed

new Foundry Forge plant, which is being set up in the public sector with Czechoslovak collaboration, was signed in New Delhi on July 29, 1964 between the representatives of Governments of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and India.

The protocol was singed in pursuance of the second agreement of economic collaboration between the two Governments signed on May 11, 1964.

Czechoslovakia will supply the requisite machinery and equipment for the project and assist in putting up the plant. This is the second foundry forge plant, which is being set up in India with Czechoslovak assistance.

The protocol was signed by Mr. Ing M. Chocholous, Deputy Managing Director at the Ministry of Foreign Trade, on behalf of the Government of Czechoslovakia and by Shri R. V. Raman, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Industry and Supply. on behalf of the Government of India.

The protocol was signed after discussions between a team of Czechoslovak experts led by Mr. Ing M. Chocholous and senior officials of the Government of India. The Czechoslovak experts had come to India on June 25, 1964, to inspect the site and examine technical data for the preparation of a detailed project report.

The proposed Foundry Forge project will comprise a Main Plant to be situated in Wardha, which will include a steel foundry and forge shop, and a Branch Plant for grey iron foundry, to be located at another place. The steel foundry will have a total capacity of 12,000 tons in castings and 13,500 tons a year in ingots for forgings.

The plant will manufacture moulds required by producers of cast iron pipes and steel castings needed in trucks, tractors and other industries. This basic industry will also add to the defence potential of the country.

It is proposed to set up a grey iron foundry with necessary auxiliary shops and facilities at the Branch Plant.

### Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique on Indo-Pakistan Rice Agreement

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued on July 17, 1964 at the conclusion of the talks held in Rawalpindi between the officials of the Governments of India and Pakistan on the purchase of rice from Pakistan :

An Indian delegation led by Shri Y. T. Shah, Joint Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, arrived in Pakistan on July 1, 1964 to purchase Kangni and Joshi rice from Pakistan. The visiting delegation held discussions at the Ministries of Commerce and Agriculture and Works. As a result of these discussions, the Governments of Pakistan and India on July 17, 1964 concluded an agreement in Rawalpindi under which Pakistan would supply Kangni and Joshi rice to India valued at Rs. 36.5 million during the next six months. In exchange, India would supply to Pakistan coal, railway equipment and other specified commodities over the next 12 months. A Protocol for the exchange of these commodities was concluded on July 17, 1964.

The two Governments also concluded another Protocol providing for the exchange of fresh fruits to the value of Rs. 5 million each way during the next 12 months.

The Agreement for the sale of rice was signed by Mr. M. Khurshid, Secretary, Agriculture, on behalf of the Government of Pakistan. The Protocol for import of coal and other specified Indian goods as well as the Protocol for exchange of fresh fruits was signed by the Commerce Secretary, Mr. M. Aslam. Shri Y. T. Shah, Leader of the Indian delegation, signed the Agreement and the two Protocols on behalf of the Government of India.

The Agreement and the two Protocols were signed at a ceremony in Rawalpindi.

The Indian delegation comprised Shri Shah (Leader), Shri H. K. Kochar, Deputy Secretary in the Ministry of Commerce and Shri Ishwar Chandra, Deputy Secretary in the Department of Food.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF RUMANIA

Agreement for Technical Assistance

The representatives of the Governments of India and Rumania signed an agreement in New Delhi on July 4, 1964 for setting up a mechanised brickmaking plant in Delhi.

The agreement was signed by Shri D. Dutt, Managing Director, on behalf of the National Buildings Construction Corporation of the Union Ministry of Works and Housing, and Shri G. Salcese, Second Secretary to the Trade Representation of the Rumanian People's Republic. The plant will produce about 1,12,000 solid, hollow and perforated bricks per day. It will also manufacture special type of decorative bricks and roofing tiles.

The total cost of the project is expected to be Rs. 2.45 million. The estimated cost of the machinery is Rs. 800,000 out of which machinery worth Rs. 550,000 will be imported from Rumania.

About 55 acres of land have already been ac-

quired by the National Buildings Construction Corporation at Sultanpur, a village near Delhi where the plant is to be installed.

### 177

The cost of bricks produced by the factory is expected to be about Rs. 25 per thousand. The perforated and hollow bricks to be produced by the plant will be lighter but as strong as the traditional bricks and will help in bringing about economy in the cost of construction.

INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

SYRIA

Message by the Syrian Patriarch on his visit to India

On the conclusion of his visit to India His Holiness the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch Ignatus Yacob III issued on July 3, 1964 the following message about his visit :

We were extremely happy to be in India. We have visited New Delhi, the States of Kerala, Madras, Mysore and Maharashtra and were greatly impressed by India's traditions of hospitality and cultural synthesis. We visited India's illustrious great philosopher President Dr. Radhakrishnan, a man of learning and religion. We also met Dr. Zakir Hussain, Vice-President of India and the late Pandit Nehru, the great Prime Minister of India who was a great statesman, a fighter for freedom and a true devotee of peace and non-violence. We are very thankful to Government of India whose guests we have been throughout our stay in India for making our time there extremely comfortable and really enjoyable. We understand that India is a secular state and its secularism has gained appreciation of the world. India is now engaged in the noble

enterprise of building a great and prosperous nation, working its various Five Year Plans for spiritual uplift of this great nation and for its material and social prosperity. Government of India is interested in imparting education to all citizens. We were really impressed with the tolerant attitude that India is adopting towards all religions. When it framed its constitution, the fundamental right of every individual to profess, practise and propagate his religion has been guaranteed. He has the freedom of conscience and equality of opportunity. We are confident that the edifice of secular democracy which India has built up under the leadership of its great men will not only maintain the right atmosphere for its all-round progress but also provide a beacon light for other countries.

May the Almighty God shower his choicest blessings upon the Indian nation so that it may live and prosper in peace. friendship and universal goodwill.

SYRIA INDIA USA **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Agreement for Technical Assistance

The Governments of India and the U.S.S.R. signed an agreement in New Delhi on July 6, 1964 providing for Soviet assistance for further expension of the Bhilai Steel Works in the setting up of a sixth blast furnace complex.

178

Shri P. Govindan Nair, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, signed on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. N. M. Silouianov, Counsellor for Economic Affairs, Embassy of the U.S.S.R. in India, signed on behalf of the Government of the U.S.S.R.

The supply of the main equipment and rendering of technical assistance in the establishment of the blast furnace and coke battery will be provi-(led by the Soviet organisations under the Indo-Soviet Credit Agreement of February, 1961.

A portion of the equipment will be manufactured at the Heavy Machine Building Plant in Ranchi for which the components required will be supplied from the U.S.S.R.

In the Bhilai Steel Plant, which has a capacity of one million tons of steel ingots annually, three blast furnaces are at present working. Two more blast furnaces of a capacity of 1719 cubic metres capacity each are under construction which will increase the capacity of the plant to 2.5 million tons of steel ingots annually by the end of the Third Plan.

The next and the sixth blast furnace of 1719 cubic metres capacity is intended for production of foundry iron and will meet to some extent the demand for pig iron in the country.

INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

### **Volume No**

1995

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Soviet Assistance for Precision Instruments Plant

A contract for the supply of equipment and materials and for rendering technical assistance for the establishment of a Precision Instruments Plant at Kota has been concluded between in strumentation Limited (A Government of India Undertaking) and V/O Prommashexport, Soviet Supply Organisation. The contract was signed in New Delhi on July 7, 1964 by Mr. A. R. Ravi Varma, General Manager of Instrumentation Limited and Mr. N. M. Silouianov, Counsellor for Economic Affairs, U.S.S.R. Embassy, on behalf of V/O Prommashexport.

The contract provides for the supply of 616 tons of machinery, equipment and instruments costing Rs. 13.37 million for. the establishment of the Plant. It also provides for rendering of technical assistance by Soviet specialists and the training of about 120 Indian engineers and technicians in the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Assistance for the project will be financed from the Indo-Soviet Credit of September, 1959.

When this public sector plant achieves full production, electromagnetic and electronic instruments and accessories with a total capacity of 138,000 instruments and 400,000 transmitting elements will be produced annually. A second plant for the manufacture of mechanical, hydraulic and pneumatic instruments is also proposed to be establisbed in Kerala with Soviet Financial and Technical Assistance. The production programme of these two plants is complementary and when they achieve full production, the requirements of industrial instruments for Indian industry can be largely met.

INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreement Signed

An agreement for a loan of œ 10 million to the Government of India from the British Government was singed in New Delhi on July 28,1964 by Shri Govindan Nair, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and His Excellency Sir Paul Gore-Booth, the British High Commissioner in India.

### 179

This loan is part of the offer of further aid amounting to œ 30 million made by the British Government at the meeting of the Aid-India Consortium held in Washington on May 26. The whole sum of œ 30 million is to be committed in 1964-65 as part of the British contribution towards the Foreign Exchange costs of economic development under India's Third Five Year Plan.

The Government of India will use the loan to provide exchange for the purchase of a wide range of goods from Britain.

The loan is not tied to any development project and can be used for current import requirements. consequently it is an especially welcome form of aid to India.

The signature of this agreement brings the sum which the British Government has so far made available towards India's Third Five Year Plan to a total of  $\alpha$  135 million. Over  $\alpha$  72 million of this has already been disbursed. Discussions are proceeding between the two Governments for the allocation of the balance of  $\alpha$  20 million from the 1964-65 pledge of  $\alpha$  30 million.

INDIA USA

**Date** : Jun 01, 1964

### Volume No

#### 1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

President's Message on Civil Rights Bill

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, sent the following message to the President of the United

States on July 5, 1964, congratulating President Johason, the U.S. Congress and the people of the United States on the enactment of the Civil Rights Bill :

On the occasion of the enactment of the Civil Rights Bill as law of the land in the United States would you allow me, Mr. President, to express my sincere congratulations to you, the United States Congress and the people of the United States of America on the successful completion of the historic measure. This is a great achievement and expresses the firm determination of the American people to ensure the enjoyment of equal rights by all citizens irrespective of race, colour or creed. We in India share the rejoicing of the American people on this historic occasion.

180

USA INDIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1964

# August

# Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs RecordAug 01, 1964Vol. XAUGUSTNo. 8

CONTENTS

PAGES

AFGHANISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Goodwill Visit 181

COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION CONFERENCE Shri M. C. Chagla's Address to the Inaugural Session 181 **CYPRUS** President's Message to Archbishop Makarios 183 India's Concern over the Cyprus Situation 184 HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS President's Independence Day Message 184 NEPAL Joint Communique on Sardar Swaran Singh's Visit 187 PAKISTAN Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the President of Security Council on Kashmir 188

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

### USA AFGHANISTAN CYPRUS INDIA NEPAL PAKISTAN

**Date** : Aug 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### AFGHANISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Goodwill Visit

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, paid a two-day goodwill visit to Afghanistan from August 27, 1964. The Afghan Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Mohammad Yousuf gave a banquet in his

#### honour on August 27.

While welcoming Sardar Swaran Singh, the Afghan Prime Minister Said :

"The pursuance of the policy of non-alignment, as also our joint endeavours for maintenance of world peace and security, often reiterated in the United Nations and in other international gatherings, as in Bandung and in Belgrade, is an important factor in assuring continuity of understanding and goodwill between our people.

"Visits paid by the leaders of our two countries have always helped in emphasizing mutual understanding between our two Governments and in further strengthening ancient ties of friendship existing between our two peoples. The visit of the President of India, as also the visit of late Jawaharlal Nehru have left very pleasant memories with us.

"In mentioning late Mr. Nehru's name I cannot refrain from expressing once again our deep regret and sympthy at the loss of a really great personality of our time."

Replying, Sardar Swaran Singh thanked the Royal Afghan Government for their hospitality and said, "During the short period I have been here I have had a very valuable experience which I will remember all my life. I have in this short period seen a good cross section of your people who have a twinkle of friendship in their eyes and I am very powerfully effected by the feeling of friendship."

The Indian Foreign Minister added, "Relationship of our two countries is a remarkable example of striking similarity between the views of our two countries on many international matters. We will always be watching the great progress that is being made in your country in the economic field. We would like to participate in this exciting adventure. Both Afghanisstan and India are developing countries seeking to raise standards of living of their people and India will continue to endeavour to do whatever it can to assist Afghanistan in its development projects."

Referring to late Prime Minister he said,

"He is unfortunately no longer there to lead us and to show us light, but we will continue to follow the path shown by him. The Government of India will continue to pursue the same policy of secularism and non-alignment and do its best to end colonialism and ease world tensions."

### AFGHANISTAN USA INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA INDIA

**Date** : Aug 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

### COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION CONFERENCE

Shri M. C. Chagla's Address to the Inaugural Session

Addressing the inaugural session of the third Commonwealth Education Conference, which opened in Ottawa on August 21, 1964, Shri M. C. Chagla, Union Minister of Education and leader of the Indian Delegation. said:

The Commonwealth is at the cross-road. There are cynics and sceptics who feel that it

#### 181

is merely a facade which conceals a disintegrating institution which has served its purpose. There are others who have greater faith in human nature, who still believe that it is a great experiment in multiracial cooperation. It is true that at best it is an organisation without a constitution comprising nations who are completely independent both with regard to their domestic and external policy, But there is a strong bond between these nations-the English language and the traditions, ideals and values that are enshrined in this language. There is something more-there is deep and abiding desire among them to help each other economically and educationally. The Commonwealth is divided between the haves and affluent countries and the

countries which are underdeveloped and do not have all that makes life worthy of the dignity of human beings.

The main purpose of this Conference, as I see it, is to devise ways and means by which those Commonwealth countries which have the educational and technical resources should place them at the disposal of those who are still climbing the ladder which leads to a society which is modem and progressive and contains within it the necessary strength and energy for development to satisfy the needs for a full, rich and happy life.

This is an age of interdependence. The nuclear age, while it has underlined the dangers of a mass annihiliation, has also emphasised the need for peace and international understanding. Modem means of communication has made the world physically smaller and has -narrowed the gulf that divided races and cultures. While the United Nations pursues the policy bringing all the nations of the world on a common platform of mutual understanding and adjustment, the Commonwealth seeks the same goal in a narrower sphere but with the possibility of producing quicker and more striking results.

Now there is one field where the Commonwealth should definitely accept interdependence and that is education. There has been a great deal of financial and economic assistance from the wealthy members of the Commonwealth to the poorer. But this aid is tied up with difficult and complicated questions such as foreign exchange, balance of payments, etc. These difficulties do not arise, or at least not to the same extent, in the case of assistance for education. What is even more important, while financial and economic aid is very often a one-way traffic, education can and must be made a two-way or even multi-way traffic.

Let me look at some of the pressing educational problems of my country and I am sure they will strike a sympathetic chord in the hearts of many of my colleagues from Asian and African countries.

The first problem is teacher-training. There is a vast expansion of education in my country and the figures are astronomical. Boys and girls are knocking at the gates of educational institutions all over the country for admission and for an opportunity to come out of the darkness of ignorance into the light of knowledge. Apart from the question of buildings after schoolsafter all we can sit under a tree and receive and impart knowledge-the main problem is the lack of trained teachers. This need is most felt in two subjects, the teaching of English and the teaching of science.

With regard to the teaching of English, in many Commonwealth countries English continues to be the medium of instruction at all levels. In my country in schools, both primary and secondary, the medium of instruction in most cases is the regional language. In the universities, English continues to be the medium but preparations are being made for switching over to the regional language. But we recognise the growing importance of English as a window on the outside world and as an international language which acts as a link between ourselves and the other Commonwealth countries and also the United States of America.

But this change-over in the medium of instruction has led to the necessity for an almost revolutionary change in the methods of teaching English. When English is taught as a second language and not as the first language, more modem and direct methods of teaching a language have to be adopted. Today we have many new and modern methods for teaching languages and these are the methods which we must adopt in India for teaching of English. There are language laboratories, linguistic appliances and many other mechanical methods of teaching a foreign language quickly and efficiently. We have set up special institutions for the teaching of English, but we need both teachers and these modern appliances and it is here that the English-speaking members of the Commonwealth can be of considerable help.

The teaching of science is even more important. We are fast changing over from a purely literary education to an education which has a definite scientific and technological bias. It is easy to train teachers to teach subjects which are broadly classified as humanities. It is much more difficult to train science teachers. Here again the assistance of scientifically and technologically advanced Commonwealth countries can be very useful.

#### 182

When I am talking of science-teaching, I should like, to emphasize one important aspect. For the proper teaching of science, we must have properly fitted up laboratories both at school level and at college level. We are manufacturing many of these appliance ourselves, but still there is a great need for machines and instruments which can only be imported from abroad and our scientific advance is very often held up because our scare foreign exchange does not permit us to import all the scientific appliances which we require. I think Commonwealth cooperation in this sphere is of the greatest importance.

On the whole the scheme of Commonwealth scholarships has worked well. We must remember that these scholarships were intended to set up an exchange of students between different Commonwealth countries. I do not want them to be only a one-way traffic between developing and the developed countries. I think apart from exchange of students, we can step up the programme for exchange of teachers and professors. Even professors can come to our country for a short time to deliver a course of lectures in various universities and if our professors can go to other Commonwealth countries to do the same, such a programme will lead to a much clearer understanding of each other's educational needs and appreciation of the different educational methods adopted by different countries.

I have only briefly indicated some of the important questions we might discuss at this conference, but having discussed these questions and having passed necessary resolutions, we must see to it that we have a proper machinery to implement the resolutions and, in this connection, I think we should ask the Commonwealth Education Liaison Unit play a more active and important role than it has been doing so far. It can assume the initiative for close collaboration in education between different Commonwealth countries.

I think it is but right that we should remember the fact that the countries of the Commonwealth represent one-fourth of the World-population, one-fourth of the world's land surface and almost one-fourth of the world's trade. But neither the world's trade nor the affluence resulting from it is evenly distributed. It takes time to achieve affluence, but there is no reason why the Commonwealth cannot make a concerted attempt to see that at least advance in education is equally shared by the Commonwealth as a whole. The Commonwealth can set a target and take concerted steps to abolish illiteracy front Commonwealth countries and to see that one-fourth of the world's population has all the benefits and advantages which the modem educational system can yield.

In a sense, the objectives of this conference are parallel with those of UNESCO and we are meetmg here today on the eve of the UNESCO conference which will be meeting in Paris towards the end of October. Many of us will be there and I think we should try to see whether the programme we chalk out here cannot be dovetailed with the larger and more international programme of the UNESCO Conference. Although our deliberations are confined to the Commonwealth, they constitute an important exercise in international planning for education. In that sense we are really doing the work of UNESCO. We should, therefore, see that the work of this conference and that of UNESCO supplements each other and is not overlapping.

I cannot close my remarks without expressing my deep appreciation to the Government of Canada for inviting this conference to Ottawa. The hospitality of this country is proverbial and we are thankful to the authorities for making it possible to carry on our work in such pleasant surroundings.

CANADA USA INDIA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE **Date** : Aug 01, 1964

## Volume No

### CYPRUS

#### President's Message to Archbishop Makarios

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan sent on August 13, 1964 the following reply to Archbishop Makaros' appeal to President Radha krishnan to use his influence to put an end to the Turkish air attack against towns and villages in Cyprus :

Your Excellency.

We are greatly distressed to learn from your two telegrams of 9th August of the air attacks

#### 183

launched by the Turkish Government against towns and villages in Cyprus resulting in heavy loss of life and property.

Our Government have issued a statement deploring the action taken by the Turkish Government in resorting to bombing and air attacks against towns and villages in Cyprus and ships in Syprus territorial waters. Our Government has, is this connection, fully supported the appeal made by the President of the Security Council to all concerned to desist from any further actions which might aggravate the situation and retard the possibility of restoration of amicable and peaceful conditions in Cyprus.

I would request Your Excellency to convey our sympathy to Cypriot nationals and their families who have suffered loss of life and property in these attacks. The Government of India are taking steps to despatch immediately sonic supplies of medicine and clothing for the relief of these unfortunate victims.

CYPRUS USA INDIA **Date :** Aug 01, 1964

## Volume No

### CYPRUS

#### India's Concern Over the Cyprus Situation

The following is the text of the statement issued by the Government of India on August 10, 1964 deploring the deteriorating situation in Cyprus :

The Government of India deplore the recent detcrioration. in the Cyprus situation, resulting front the action taken by the Turkish Government in launching air attacks against towns and villages in Cyprus and ships in Cyprus territorial waters.

The internal situation in Cyprus has been Undoubtedly difficult for some time. The U.N. Peace-keeping Force is already functioning there to help the Government to resolve this situation. In these circumstances, bombings and armed attacks against the civilian population of Cyrups, whatever the reasons therefor, are a matter of serious concern, as these intensify the atmosphere of conflict and tension and make the tasks of the U.N. Peace-keeping Force more difficult.

The Government of India fully support the appeal made by the President of the Security Council and in the resolution passed by the Council appealing to all concerned to desist from any further actions which might aggravate the situation and further retard the possibility of restoration of amicable and peaceful conditions in Cyprus.

The Government of India extend their sympathy to the Government of Cyprus and to the unfortunate Cypriot nationals who have suffered loss of life and property in these incidents.

CYPRUS USA INDIA **Date :** Aug 01, 1964

#### 1995

## Volume No

#### 1995

#### HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

#### President's Independence Day Message

Broadcasting to the Nation on the eve of Independence Day, 1964 the President. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan said

#### Friends.

It is my privilege once again to say a few word, to you on the eve of the seventeenth anniversary of our Independence Day. This would normally have been a day of rejoicing for us; but we are living in the shadow of the loss we have suffered by the passing away of our great national leader-Jawaharalal Nehru-who left an imprint on our life and gave a new outlook to it. He strove to build a new future for India and gave to us a purpose in national life; and we should adhere to this purpose and dedicate ourselves to the task of accomplishing it. He gave us the ideals of parliamentary democracy, a non-communal state, planned development, sobriety in international affairs, friendship among nations and peace in the world. There were many in our country who were impatient with what they called the unnecessary patience of Nehru, but being a democrate, he

#### 184

wished to carry the bulk of the people with him in whatever he did.

Our situation at home is not free from difficulties. Our achievement in the industrial sector is somewhat encouraging. It is a matter of satisfaction that at long last, work will be begun on the Bokaro Steel Project. What is necessary is increased production in agriculture and industry and equitable distribution of the products. Soaring prices of foodgrains and other essential commodities are causing great concern among our people. I am glad that the Government is taking speedy and effective measures to check this rise in prices.

We should face the present situation with concreted action. The members of all parties, I dare say are interested in fighting this evil and so would co-operate and work together in increasing food production and organising fair distribution of the produce. Personal rivalries and group factions have caused much injury to our progress and our good name. We should avoid them at all times, specially at a time like this, when we are facing many problems. Lawlessness should be discouraged and it is my hope that members of all parties would help in putting down any expression of violence. Democracy and lawlessness are inconsistent with each other.

A recent report shows that food adulteration is being practised on a large scale. Of all antisocial practices there is none more heinous than adulteration of foodstuffs. The practitioners of this evil, the hoarders, the profiteers, the blackmarketeers and the speculators are among the worst enemies of our society. They have to be dealt with sternly, however well-placed, important and influential they may be. If we acquiesce in wrong doing, people will lose faith in us.

The increase of corruption against which we are putting up a heroic fight is due to a considerable extent to our misplaced kindness and indifference to wrong doing. Maudlin sentimentality is not to be confused with generosity or compassion. If we are soft to the anti-social wrong-doers, we will be doing a great wrong to society.

When we speak of a free, classless society, we mean that we should not use other people as tools for implementing our desires. Democracy strives to provide all individuals with the wherewithal and opportunity for self-expression and development. Artificially imposed barriers should be removed and the opportunities for self-development of all individuals should not be restricted. Whatever they are capable of by their genius and ability, all individuals should be able to manifest. We have still the problem of the hungry, the neglected, the poor and the down-trodden. We should avoid the extremes of colossal affluence and grinding poverty, and whatever measures are necessary to bring about greater equality among our people should be attempted. We are attempting to bring about a revolution---economic and social-through consent and not through coercion.

An essential element of socialism is the application of social purpose to our national life. Most of us suffer from a streak of laziness; and a progressive society has little scope for lazy people.

The other major problem, which is engaging our attention today, is that of national integration. We have been attempting to build it structure of society, where everyone, whatever his tribe, race, religion or caste may be, has equal rights with every other citizen.

Even when we lived as members of different tribes, speaking different languages and professing different religions, we all felt that we belonged to one whole. We acquired this sense through education and experience. By these processes we recognised the human in member% of all tribe, creeds and communities. It is this process of consideration for other men and women that has been governing our conduct. It is the only safe way for emotional integration of our people into a single whole. When in 1962, we had the attack by the Chinese, all the pepole from Kashmir to Kanya Kumari felt they were members of one community. The great -sorrow, which recently engulfed the whole country on the passing away of Jawaharlal Nehru, again demonostrated this basic unity of our people.

Our country has today the representatives of all the living faith of mankind and they dwelt together in peace until political indoctrination and personal ambition interfered with their harmonious living as members of a common fellowship. The one Supreme is too vast to be comprehended adequately by the finite mind, and so. all our definitions are tentative and halting approximations and not the complete revelation of the mystery of Godhead. We recognise the diversity of pathways to the realisation of the Supreme and so really had violent religious quarrels. Unfortunately today we are here and there, witnessing this phenomenon. Education, en lightenment and economic opportunities for all are the ways by which these differences can be minimised and ultimately abolished.

I hope the members of all communities will seek areas of agreement and co-operation and not

#### 185

of discord and dissension. It is easy to rouse the lower passions of human nature but what we have to do is to enlist the higher qualities of understanding and appreciation of one another.

We have had people following different cultural patterns and all the-se by action and reaction brought about a common spiritual outlook. We also, from the beginning, spoke different languages and looked upon all these languages as vehicles of culture. Because our people speak different languages it does not follow that they belong to different species. A twelfth century 1125 A.D.) Kannada writer observes :

sarvajnam tad aham vande paran-jyotis tamopaham pravrtta yan-mukbad devi sarva-bhasa sarasvati

All the languages are the utterances of the great goddess Saraswati and we should try, as far as possible, to understand the languages of others and the cultures they express.

In our country we have banned untouchability by law, but, in practice, it is still to be met with in many places. To root it out, law alone will not do. Education is necessary. The recognition of human nature leads to elimination of race prejudices and social discrimination. We are committed to a continuous process of self-education and self-discipline; without them we will fall apart. History is a dynamic process and we cannot escape from it. If we try to do so, we will fail to survive. No pride or prejudice should prevent us from accepting the purpose of time-the purpose that has not spent itself in the past but moves onward to fulfilment in the future. Our future is larger and longer than our past. We can change history and are not merely to be changed by it. In the matter of industrial development, food

production and such other vital topics. the country has to be treated as one whole and all parts of it should receive equitable treatment.

We expect to have soon restoration of normal conditions in Nagaland. We hope that the present attempt at settlement of outstanding issues will succeed.

We are trying to remove hate and violence from our national and international life. We cannot say that we have succeeded in this attempt though we are working for these ideals.

We welcome the progress that is being made towards complete disarmament. But disarmamerit by itself cannot remove wars. We will have to establish concepts and institutions that will adjust the minds of people to a world without arms. Let us open out our hearts to other people, understand their cultures and feel a sense of oneness with all human beings, irrespective of their race, politics or religion.

Each country, large and small, should have the liberty to live in peace and independence thus enabling its people to prosper and enjoy the fruits of their own independence and pursue their own policy with regard to international relations. How far we are from this ideal is evident from the events in Vietnam, Congo and Cyprus. Small nations must have a sense of safety and security and big nations must behave with justice and generosity. We are pledged to the removal of race discrimination and colonialism in every part of the world. We welcome the emergence of many countries in Africa and Asia into freedom and we earnestly hope that the few that still remain under foreign domination will soon gain independence.

Our relations with our neighbours, especially with Pakistan and China, are not very satisfactory. Our differences with these countries have cost us and them a great deal, have hurt us and them a great deal. We shall not relax our efforts until these differences are settled with honour and dignity.

In some of our neighbouring countries people of Indian origin are subjected to harsh treatment. Their contributions are forgotten. I hope these irritations will be removed in the near future. A few of our people, when they go abroad, behave sometimes with an unnecessary and unwarranted sense of superiority and this has not made us very popular in some foreign countries. It is essential for us to conduct ourselves both at home and abroad with decency, dignity and humility. These are not qualities which we can acquire from text books. These have to grow from within. Education of the human mind and heart is the only way by which we can grapple with human relations.

Our duty to the world today is to work for peace. Talk of mace is not a mere sedative slogan. We can save the future only by working seriously for peace. Our whole age is in arras against the temper of violence, yet, in many parts of the world, we come across a will to death, a will to destruction, a will to settle disputes by force of arms. The world is torn by many and difficult problems. We must not be deterred by them, rather, we should look on them as opportunities greater than any we have yet had for service to man's well-being. A true leader must guide his nation beyond the moods and movements of the general public. He should raise the public to a higher quality of consciousness a higher level of feeing, a higher degree of enlightenment. Sensitivity and vision

#### 186

of the future move civilizations forward. The stakes are high and the prospects are bright and they should challenge our best and most imaginative effort, It is a heritage of hope and a vision of the future that have come down to us from the past.

Nehru, who gave to the profession of politics a high dignity, himself felt that many promises which he made were still unfulfilled and he had a long distance to go to his goal. It is for us now to do our best to further the unfinished tasks that he left behind.

# USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM CONGO VIETNAM CYPRUS CHINA PAKISTAN

**Date** : Aug 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Joint Communique on Sardar Swaran Singh's Visit

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, paid a visit to Nepal from August 23 to August 25, 1964. At the conclusion of his visit a joint communique was issued on August 25 in Kathmandu and New Delhi.

The following is the text of the joint communique :

At the invitation of His Excellency Shri Kirtinidhi Bist, Minister of Foreign Affairs, His Majesty's Government of Nepal, Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs in the Government of India, accompanied by the Foreign Secretary and senior officials of the Government of India, visited Kathmandu from August 23 to August 25, 1964.

During his stay in Kathmandu, the Minister of External Affairs conveyed to His Majesty, His Majesty's Government and the people of Nepal the greetings and good wishes of the President, the Prime Minister and the Government and people of India. His Majesty's Government welcomed the visit of India's Minister of External Affairs, as a further step in the strengthening of the most cordial and friendly relations between the two counrties. The Minister of External Affairs expressed his gratification that his first visit to a foreign country in his capacity as Foreign Minister was to Nepal, India's closest and most friendly neighbour. He thanked the Foreign Minister of Nepal and His Majesty's Government for their kind invitation and expressed his deep gratitude to the Government and people of Nepal for the warm and affectionate welcome accorded to him and his party.

The Minister of External Affairs was graciously

received by His Majesty the King of Nepal on the afternoon of August 23. 1964. He had friendly and informal exchange of views with the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of His Majesty's Council of Ministers, the Foreign Minister and the Minister of Commerce and Industry of Nepal. These talks covered a wide variety of subjects of interest to Nepal and India as well as the current international situation as it affects the two countries.

These talks took place in an atmosphere of great cordiality and mutual understanding and highlighted the friendship, the basic unity, and the identity of approach on international issues based on the policy and principles of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence, which characterise the relations between the two countries and their respective governments. It was recognised that Nepal and India are bound by ties of geography, history and culture and that the two countries have a vital interest in each other's welfare, prosperity and strength.

On behalf of the prime Minister, the Minister of External Affairs invited the Chairman of the Council of Ministers to pay a visit to India and the Chairman was pleased to accept the invitation. The visit will take place on a date to he decided to suit the convenience of both governments. The Minister of External Affairs also extended an invitation to His Majesty's Minister of Foreign Affairs to visit India at his convenience as soon as possible. The invitation has been accepted by the Foreign Minister. and it is hoped that he will visit India in the near future.

The details of an agreement concerning the execution of the Sonauli-Pokhara road were negotiated and the agreement signed on the morning of August 25. The work on the project, which will be constructed by an agency of

#### 187

the Government of India at a cost of Rs. 9.11 crores (Indian Currency), is to commence in October this year. It is expected that the project will be completed by December, 1968.

Among other things, the Minister of External Affairs and the Ministers of His Majesty's Government discussed questions relating to supplies of essential materials such as iron and steel to Nepal from India. The Minister of External Affairs assured His Majesty's Government of India's anxiety to meet Nepal's needs to the greatest extent possible. As a result of these discussions, the supplies of iron and steel and transport vehicles, which are needed in Nepal, will be very considerably augmented and the speed of supplies accelerated.

His Majesty's Ministers and the Minister of External Affairs reviewed the progress of development projects being constructed in Nepal with Indian cooperation. It was agreed that the two Governments should undertake a periodic review of such development projects with a view to ensuring their expeditious implementation. The first such review will take place in October, 1964, when a delegation of the Government of India will visit Kathmandu for the Purpose. The Minister of External Affairs assured His Majesty's Government of India's continuing interest in Nepal's rapid advancement and that such further assistance and cooperation as was in India's power to give would be made available to Nepal after 1966 when India's present programme of assistance comes to an end. The development projects to be undertaken with India's cooperation and assistance during the five-year period 1966-71 will be determined in consultation between the two Governments.

The position concerning matters relating to facilities for transit across India for Nepal's trade with third countries was also reviewed. The Minister of External Affairs conveyed to His Majesty's Government the desire of the Government of India to help Nepal in every possible way. The Government of India would sympathetically consider the suggestions made by His Majesty's Government in this matter in the course of the talks. These matters will be further considered at the talks scheduled to take place in Kathmandu in October, 1964, between the delegations of the two countries.

His Majesty's Ministers and India's Minister of Exernal, Affairs welcomed the opportunity afforded by the latter's visit for a renewal of valuable personal contacts between the two Governments at Ministers' level. They are of the view that the outcome of the talks, which were marked by cordiality. friendliness, understanding and sincerity on both sides, has been most satisfactory and that these exchanges should take place in the future as frequently as possible. The Government of India look forward to the forthcoming visits of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and the Foreign Minister of Nepal.

NEPAL USA INDIA **Date :** Aug 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the President of Security Council on Kashmir

The following is the text of a letter dated August 21, 1964, from India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, to the President of the Security Council in reply to Pakistan's letter to the Security Council dated 27th July, 1964

As repeatedly established in the records of the Security Council, the Government of Pakistan have not hesitated from resorting to suppression and misrepresentation of facts about the Kashmir situation. The Government of India would normally be reluctant to burden the members of the Security Council with a full and detailed reply to another misrepresentation of facts, as attempted in the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan's letter dated 27 July 1964 (s/5836). However, in the interest of keeping the record straight, I am compelled to expose the false and baseless allegations made in the letter under reference.

The Government of Pakistan have sought to build up their case on the ground that Indian forces have been violating the Cease-Fire Agreement by "callous and cold-blooded acts of attacking, kidnapping and murdering unarmed civilians". Having committed aggression in Kashmir and having set their face against vacation of aggression, it is hardly surprising that the Government of Pakistan have to twist and distort the facts and to assume an attitude of injured innocence.

The Government of India on their part have brought to the notice of the Security Council Pakistan's complicity in training and arming its civilians as guerillas and commandoes, with the specific object of subverting the Cease Fire Agreement and the cease fire line. As far back as 1957, the Indian Military authorities reported the illegal activities of Pakistan armed civilians to the U.N. Chief Military Observer who not only took up the matter with the Pakistan military authorities but also obtained an assurance of good conduct from them. In his letter No. OMD/92 dated 25 June, 1958, the Chief Military Observer stated :

"I have drawn the attention of GHQ Pakistan to the advisability of exercising stricter control over the activities of civilians close to the cease fire line particularly in relation to the use of expensives".

Again in his letter No. CMO/ 115 dated 23 July, 1958, the Chief Military Observer informed India as follows :

"I have had assurance from the Chief of Staff, Pakistan Army, that immediate steps will be taken to control the civilians in this area on the Pakistan side of the cease fire line".

Between 1959 and 1962, the Pakistan Government, in reply to protests lodged by the Government of India, against the unlawful activities of civilians and armed personnel on Pakistan side of the cease fire line-protests based on the Chief Military Observer's awards-had to admit these illegal activities and gave assurances of good conduct on their behalf to the Government of India. Details of these assurances are given in Appendix "A". India's Representative in the Security Council referred to this development on May 4, 1962 (S/PV 1011, page 63). He said that "none of these assurances was honoured. Since that time Pakistan has used civilians as a screen to conceal its activities of aggression. Civilians have been encouraged not only to cross

the cease fire line or to fire across it. or to open fire on our army and police piquets and our villap-es, but also to occupy areas on our side of the cease fire line and generally to promote instability in the region. A large number of encroachments have taken place-as many as 29".

Thus the Government of Pakistan adopted a hypocritical attitude in the matter, giving assurances of good conduct to the Chief Military Observer and the Government of India and deliberately violating such assurances by causing incitement to violence. - To quote a few representative statements by the President of Pakistan and others :

"The President, Field Marshal Ayub Khan, said that Pakistan Army as the defender of the Motherland could never afford to leave the Kashmir issue unsolved for an indefinite time. "Our communications, our rivers and even the cease fire line in Kashmir, one and all, are sufficient factors to indicate that our neck is in the grip of others". (DAWN, Karachi, 7 October, 1960).

President Ayub Khan "emphasised that the people of Pakistan could not forget Kashmir, because the present cease fire line was a constant source of danger to Pakistan's rail, river and road system, and provided innumerable defence problems" (DAWN, Karachi, August 29, 1961).

President Ayub Khan in an interview given to William R. Fry, U.N. Correspondent of Christian Science Monitor, said : "India will face an Algerian type guerilla war in Kashmir if peaceful settlements is not negotiated soon". (Christian Science Monitor, March 21, 1962).

President Ayub Khan referring to the cease fire line, said : "Is it any rational line ? What does it indicate ? It is an outcome of war. What purpose does it serve ? Does it serve any strategic or economic or other interests ? (Dawn, March 23, 1962).

"President Mohd. Ayub Khan said that it was very difficult to control the people of Kashmir who wanted to oust India from the State by force." (Dawn, May 4, 1962). Mr. Bhutto described India's no-war proposal as "a most sinister offer made by India". Its acceptance, he said, would mean the acceptance of the cease fire line. (Pakistan Times, July. 25 1963).

Confronted with the mounting violence unleashed by the Pakistan armed personnel and armed civilians, along and across the cease fire line, the U.N. Chief Military Observer decided in October last year to give awards against even civilians if they were found to commit breaches of the cease fire agreement. The Government of India accepted the decision. The Government of

#### 189

Pakistan, rejected it. The Government of Pakistan's strategem of rushing to the Security Council with baseless allegatioas against India of noncompliance with the provisions of the Cease Fire Agreement and undertaking planned measures to subvert that agreement, are thus exposed. If Pakistan is really concerned about the importance of honouring the terms of the Cease Fire Agreement and in protecting the lives of civilians, it should have welcomed the Chief Military Oberver's decision instead of actively opposing it.

The Pakistan Government's policy of creating tension along the Cease Fire Line is further exposed by the Chief Military Observer's awards in recent months in which he has been constrained to comment on the organised methods employed by the Pakistan Army personnel and the Pakistan armed civilians in deliberately flouting the Cease Fire Agreement, with its inevitable consequence of tension and confict resulting in a needless loss of human lives, for which the Government of Pakistan pretends to show so much solicitude. The following awards (fuller details in Appendix 'B') given in March and June, 1964 only by the Chief Military Observer against Pakistan speak for themselves :

JAMMU case 312, 17 March, 1964

"BORDER VIOLATION by Pakistan. An organised armed party crossed the border and fired on Indian police and troops".

GALUTHI Case 745, 7 June, 1964

"VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN. These

posts were constructed by Pakistan troops who later filled them in and camouflaged them in order to deceive UN Observers. They have since been re-opened and used by Pakistan troops".

PUNCH Case 271, 21 June, 1964

"VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN for armed forces crossing the cease fire line and raiding an Indian post, killing two Indians and taking away one of the bodies".

GALUTHI Case 746, 21 June, 1964

"A well planned attack by organised armed party resulting in 2 policemen being seriously wounded, VIOLATION BY PAKIS-TAN".

NAUSHERA Case 160, 21 June 1964

"An armed group of Pakistan troops crossed CFL and fired on Indian positions. VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN".

URI Case 82, 21 June 1964

"Investigation of this case and physical evidence found at the scene of the incident clearly indicated an organised raid by armed personnel from the Pakistan side of the CFL. VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN".

TANGDHAR Case 107, June, 27, 1964

"Planning and execution indicate regular troops responsible. Killing range 60 yards. of 7 policemen at waterhole, 3 killed and 3 seriously wounded. Scene of ambush 1,000 yards on Indian side of CFL and on reverse side of high ridge. Action unprovoked as no previous incident in this vicinity. VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN".

It is noteworthy that six of these awards against Pakistan were given in respect of incidents in June alone. Pakistan newspapers are now openly admitting that the so-called "Azad Kashmir Mujahids" (irregulars trained in guerilla tactics) -not the so-called "Azad Kashmir civilians", a term employed in the Acting Permanent Representative's letter--are clashing with the Indain Army.

Faced with this violence deliberately unleashed by the Pakistan authorities and a planned and continued threat to the cease fire line, the Government of India cannot abdicate their responsibility for ensuring the security of their population on their right of self-defence. The Indian military authorities exercise every care in reducing the number of such occasions to a minimum and in employing the least amount of force to repel the raids and attacks from Pakistan on Indian piquets, posts and patrols. The quickest and the most effective way of preventing such defensive action by India, which sometimes results in Pakistan casualties, lies in the Pakistan Government's own hands. One order from them to their armed forces, to respect the provisions of the Cease Fire Agreement and the Cease Fire Line, as indeed they are honour-bound to do, would put a stop to these incidents and restore peace and tranquillity so desired by every one in the area.

The Security Council will no doubt recall the Pakistan Government's allegations in regard to the alleged incidents in the area of village Chaknot (S/5450). The U.N. Chief Military Observer's award against Pakistan and in favour of India (S/5467 and S/5503) exposed the falseness of the Pakistani allegations.

Among the instances mentioned by the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan in his letter Under reference, there are those in which the

#### 190

Chief Military Observer has either given Violation awards against Pakistan or No Violation awards against India. As was to be expected, the Government of Pakistan promptly suppressed these inconvenient facts. To give a few examples :

(i) Sub-para (d) of para 2 : The acting Representative of Pakistan has suppressed the fact that in this incident, the Chief Military Observer also awarded violation against Pakistan in the following words

TANGDHAR case 104

"Violation by Pakistan for troops crossing the cease fire line.

Violation by Pakistan for constructing new defences in an area contrary to the Karachi Agreement".

(ii) Para 3 : The Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan has suppressed the facts in six out of nine cases mentioned in the appendix to his letter. In at least three cases (Nos. 3, 8 and 9), the Chief Military Observer in corresponding complaints filed by India, awarded violations against Pakistan (Naushera Case 138, Poonch Case 265 and Poonch Case 264). In regard to item 4, the Acting Permanent Representative has chosen to give only part of the award, suppressing the portion unfavourable to Pakistan. The full text of the award is :

"The evidence reveals that both sides fired.

Violation by India for firing across the CFL.

Violation by Pakistan for firing across the CFL."

He should have also informed the Security Council that the alleged violation mentioned in item No. 5 in the appendix was dismissed by the Chief Military Observer (Rawalkot Case 21OB). Further, the date and details of the incident as alleged by the Government of Pakistan in item 7 of the appendix pertain to a complaint (Rawalkot Case 227) which was, in fact, dismissed by the Chief Military Observer. There are other misrepresentations in the appendix to which I need not refer.

(iii) Para 4 : Even here the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan has not been able to resist the temptation of withholding vital information from the Security Council. Details of this grave violation of the Cease Fire Agreement by Pakistan resulting in the death of 14 Indian policemen and the arrest and detention of 9 others, and the Chief Military Observer's award against Pakistan, were given in my letter of 24 April 1964 (S/5668). He has now sought to justify Pakistan's dastardly attack on the Indian patrol in the first sub-para of para. 4 of his letter, suppressing the fact that his Government had lodged a complaint against India with the Chief Military Observer who rejected it by awarding No Violation against India as detailed below:

DICMEL No. 107 (BOR area)

One Indian Patrol of approximately 30 strong fired at our BOR post Sq 9881 at 0915 hrs. on 21 Feb. `64 and carried away 2 men of Armed Constabulary who were at that time cutting wood outside".

CMO's Decision

"No Violation."

It is noteworthy that the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan admits that the Pakistan troops did cross the cease fire line.

In the same paragraph, he has alleged that between December 1963 and February 1964, Indian patrols violated the Cease Fire Agreement on no less than eight occasions in this sector, before the Indian patrol was ambushed. The facts are that Pakistan lodged two complaints covering seven alleged incidents in this sector with the Chief Military Observer. One of these complaints covering six incidents (Domel Case 105) was dismissed by the Chief Military Observer. In another (Domel Case 107) he awarded No Violation against India. Details of the eighth alleged incident are not available to the Government of India.

I should like to add that the Government of India have already lodged this year 29 protests with the Government of Pakistan against grave violations of the Cease Fire Agreement, demanding compensation in some cases. These protests are based on the Chief Military Observer's awards of Violations by Pakistan. More protests are being lodged.

#### 191

Unlike Pakistan, India is anxious to maintain the integrity of the Cease Fire Line and the Cease Fire Agreement. India is also anxious to avoid incidents across or in the vicinity of the cease fire line which create tension and worsen the atmosphere for talks, negotiations and conciliation between the two countries. The Government of India are prepared to concert with the Government of Pakistan in considering ways and means of completely eliminating such incidents and in ensuring the inviolability of the Cease Fire Line to mutual advantage. Further, the Government of India are prepared to do all this in cooperation with the UN Military Observer Group for India and Pakistan. Let the Government of Pakistan accept a gentleman's agreement for avoiding incident and for full cooperation with the Government of India and UNMOGIP in making the Cease Fire Agreement fully effective in this regard.

192

#### APPENDIX 'A'

Pakistan Government's assurances of good conduct in reply to protests lodged by India, based on Chief Military Observer's awards.

(Extracts front communications from Pakistan).

1. The Government of Pakistan stated "that suitable action has been taken against the armed personnel involved in the said incident".

> [Pak. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note No. 1(1)9/S/59 dt. 6-7-1959].

2. The Government of Pakistan stated "steps have already been taken to prevent the reoccurrence of such incidents in future."

[Pak. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note No. 1(1)9/17/

58 dt. 13-7-1959].

3. The Government of Pakistan stated "that appropriate steps have already been taken by the local authorities concerned to control the movement of civilians rear the cease-fire line."

> [Pak. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note No. K/11(9)/ 59 dt. 10th Nov., 1959].

4. The Government of Pakistan stated that "the said new constructions have since been demolished .... Suitable action has been taken against the officer in this case".

> [Pak. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note No. K/11(43) 59 dt. 25th November, 1959].

5. The Government of Pakistan stated "that disciplinary action is being taken against those responsible for the incident".

[Pak. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note No. K/11(40)/ 59 dated 18/19 January, 1960].

6. The Government of Pakistan stated "that the facts stated in the UN Chief Military Observer's d.o. letter No. 265 of 6th October, 1959, were found to be correct and suitable disciplinary action is being taken against those concerned".

> [Pak. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note No. K/ 11(41)/ 59 dated 22/23 January, 1960].

7. The Government of Pakistan stated "that the facts stated in the UN Chief Military Observer's d.o. letter No. 267 dt. 7th October, 1959, were found to be correct and suitable disciplinary action is being taken against those concerned."

> [Pak. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note No. K/ 11 (42)/ 59 dated 22/23 January,

1960].

8. "Nevertheless, the Government of Pakistan regret it and have taken necessary steps to stop recurrence of such incidents."

> [Pak. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note No. K/11(19)/ 60 dated 2nd November. 1960].

9. "The Ministry reiterates that the Government of Pakistan are alive to their obligation to honour the Cease-fire Agreement."

> [Pak. Ministry of External Affairs Note No. PI(D)-10(16)/61 dated 13th January, 19621.

#### 193

#### APPENDIX 'B'

U.N. Chief Military Observer's awards against Pakistan for violations of the Cease-fire Agreement.

### 1. NAUSHERA 144

At about 1230 hours on 8 March 1964 approximately 40 Pakistan/Pakistan Occupied Kashmir civilians accompanied by approximately one section of PAK/POK troops were seen cutting grass in area NR 211132.

CMO's decision.

"Violation by Pakistan for armed party crossing the CFL".

#### 2. JAMMU 310

Approximately 25 Pakistani raiders in uniform raided village BHALWAL MOLU NW 7555 on 16 March at 01 35 hours. Four villagers including one child killed and three wounded. Raiders used grenades and rifles and withdrew after 15 minutes.

### CMO's decision.

"Violation by Pakistan."

#### 3. JAMMU Case 312.

- (i) Pakistani rangers were intercepted by Indian ambush party in area NW 761552 while approaching towards village BHALWAL MOLU NW 7555 at 2315 hours on 17 March, 1964. On Challenge rangers opened fire on Indian ambush party and withdrew under cover of darkness.
- (ii) Approximately 30 Pakistani rangers encountered Indian ambush partv in area NW 710525 at 0205 hours on 18 March, 1964. One non-commissioned officer wounded in chest by fire and evacuated to hospital.
- (iii) Pakistani rangers attempted attack oil Indian post KULIAN NW 7353 at 0335 hours on 15 March, 1964. Empty cases with marking Pakistan Ordnance factory available for examinations.

CMO's decision.

"Border VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN. An organised armed party crossed the border and fired on Indian police and troops. No factual evidence that they were Rangers."

4. GALUTHI Case 745.

On 7 June 1964 Indian troops observed new Pakistan posts established at NR 155482.

"CMO's decision

These posts were constructed by Pakistan troops who later filled them in and camouflaged them in order to deceive UN Observers. They have since been rc-opened and used by Pakistan troops."

5. PUNCH Case 271

Approximately 50 PAK/POK troops armed with sten, LMG and grenades High Explosive raised Indian post NR 086595 at 0130 hours on 21 June 1964. As a result of raid two police personnel were killed. One body with one rifle 303 has been taken away by PAK/POK raiders.

CMO's decision.

"VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN for armed forces crossing the Cease-fire line and raiding an Indian post, killing two Indians and taking away one of the bodies."

### 6. GALUTHI Case 746.

On 21 June 1964 Pakistan troops crossed CFL and fired as under :-

- (i) Approximately 1,000 rifle, LMG, sten rounds and 2 very light shots from 098537 towards NR 1053 at 0430 hours.
- (ii) Approximately 2,000 LMG rifle and sten rounds from NR 3045 towards NR 3145 between 0255 and 0300 hours. Eight hand grenades were also thrown.

CMO's decision.

"A well planned attack by organised armed party resulting in 2 policemen being seriously wounded. VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN."

7. NAUSHERA Case 160

On 21 June 1964 at 0135 hours Pakistan troops fired towards NR 2300 with one LMG. three to four rifles and approximately 12 grenades from area NW 233997. Simultaneously Pakistan troops fired at Indian picquet NW 2399 from area NW 230992 with 3 LMGs and few rifles. Pakistan troops, also opened up with MMGs from areas NW 2298, 1999 and 1800.

#### 194

CMO's decision

"Related to BHIMBER Case 323\*. An armed group of Pakistan troops crossed CFL and fired on Indian positions. VIOLATION BY PAKIS-TAN." \*BHIMBER Case 323 (complaint by Pakistan)

Indian troops fired with MMGs, LMGs and rifles from 2101, 2200 and 2499 in area 2197 from 201115 to 210330 June 1964.

#### CMO's decision

"Related to NAUSHERA Case 160. No voilation.

### 8. URI Case 82

Pakistan troops approximately 1 company strength crossed CFL and attacked Indian picquet at SANGRFAN GR 072057 map sheet 48 J/4 at 0300 hours on 21 June 1964. Hand Grenades used. One Pakistan person killed in encounter. One rifle seized from Indian picquet.

#### CMO's decision

"Investigation of this case and physical evidence found at the scene of the incident clearly indicated an organised raid by armed personnel from the Pakistan side of the CFL. However, the size of the armed party and their exact identity was not clearly established owing to darkness. VIOLATION BY PAKISTAN."

#### 9. TANGDHAR Case 107

Pak patrol crossed CFL and took up position at GR 999701 map sheet 43 F/14. At 0915 hours on 27 June 1964 they fired on Indian police patrol with rifles and mortars killing 3 policemen and wounding 3 policemen.

#### CMO's decision

"Planning and execution indicate regular troops responsible. Killing range 60 yards. Of 7 policemen at waterhole, 3 killed and 3 seriously wounded. Scene of ambush 1.000 yards on Indian side of CFL and on reverse side of high ridge. Action unprovoked as no previous incident in this vicinity. VIOLATION BY PAKIS-TAN."

#### 10. TANGDHAR Case 99 (BOR area)

On 1 February 1964 at 1600 hours 10 armed

Pakistan persons intruded into BOR NL 982815 (Map 43 F/14). They assembled the locals forcibly and proclaimed that henceforth they were under Pakistan. rule. They also told the locals not to have any dealings with India under threat of retributory punishment.

CMO's decision

"Violation by Pakistan."

### 11. TANGDHAR Case 101 (Bor area)

One (Indian) patrol, strength one p1 of the Armed Constabulary one way from Keran to Bor on 21 February 1964, was ambushed at approximately 1100 hours by Pakistanis in area Nullah-Track junction NL 969802. One head constable and one constable have returned to Keran. There is no news of remaining twentythree police troops.

#### CMO's decision

"Extensive investigations were carried out by United Nations Observers in the area. These were started whilst physical evidence was still discernible in the snow and on the rocks by the River. There is no doubt that the Indian platoon, moving Northwards towards BOR, was ambushed by Pakistani troops on the Indian side of the CFL in the vicinity mentioned in the complaint. Fire was also directed from across the Kishenganga River. Two Indians escaped; nine were captured; and the remainder are missing, believed killed. The bodies have not been located by United Nations Observers.

Violation by Pakistan for crossing the cease fire line.

Violation by Pakistan for firing."

195

### PAKISTAN USA INDIA ALGERIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Aug 01, 1964

## September

## Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs RecordSep 01, 1964Vol. XSEPTEMBERNo. 9

#### CONTENTS

#### PAGES

#### BURMA

Joint Communique on Sardar Swaran Singh's Visit 197

CEYLON

Joint Communique on Sardar Swaran Singh's Visit 198

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Letters for extension of Trade Arrangements Exchanged 199

### HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Defence Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Foreign Aid 200

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha opening the Debate on Fore

ign

Affairs

203

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 209

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha opening the Debate on Foreig

n

Affairs

216

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 223

## IRELAND

President's speech at Banquet in Dublin on September 22

228 Reply by Irish Prime Minister 228 President's Speech at the Irish University 229 President's Television Broadcast 230 Joint Communique on President's Visit 231 LEBANON Indo-Lebanese Air Agreement Signed 232 NEPAL Indo-Nepalese Postal Agreements Signed 232 UGANDA Agreement for development of Sugar Industry Signed 233 UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS President's State Visit to Soviet Union 233 President's Speech at Luncheon in Moscow on September 12 235 President's Speech at Indian Ambassador's Reception 235 President's Television Speech in Moscow 236 President's Speech at Kremlin Reception 237 Joint Communique 239 Indo-Soviet Cultural Contract Signed 242 UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC Agreement for Collaboration in Science and Technology Signed 242 Letters for Expansion of Trade Exchanged 243 MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

### BURMA IRELAND LEBANON NEPAL UGANDA USA RUSSIA INDIA

Date : Sep 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

#### BURMA

#### Joint Communique on Sardar Swaran Singh's Visit

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs. paid a 4-day goodwill visit to Burma in September, 1964. At the conclusion of his visit the following joint communique was issued on September 5, 1964:

At the invitation of U Thi Han, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Burma, Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs of the Republic of India, paid a goodwill visit to the Union of Burma from September 2 to September 5, 1964, accompanied by the Commonwealth Secretary, Shri C. S. Jha and other officials of the Ministry of External Affairs of India.

During the visit Sardar Swaran Singh called on the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma and held talks with U Thi Han and also with Brigadier Tin Pe, Minister for Agriculture and Forest, Supply and Cooperative, Land Nationalization and Trade Development; and Colonel Hla Han, Minister for Education and Health, and Information and Union Cuture. Those talks provided a welcome opportunity for a free and frank exchange of views in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding on matters of common interest to the two countries as well as on certain international issues affecting peace and security, particularly in Asia. The talks between the Ministers of the two countries disclosed broad unity and idently of approach on these international issues, and it was recognized by both sides that periodicall exchange of views could help co-ordinate the efforts of the two countries in the cause of peace and friendly relations among nations and would serve to strengthen further the relations between the two countries.

The two Foreign Ministers noted that in the conduct of their foreign relations both India and

Burma are wedded to the principles of equality, mutual respect, non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. These and the other principles embodied in the Bandung Declaration would continue to govern the relations between the two countries.

Sardar Swaran Singh and the Burmese leaders noted with satisfaction that both India and Burma have been doing their best to achieve the common goal of bettering the living standards of their peoples by building up each a society based on socialism. In this connexion, the Minister of External Affairs of India noted with satisfaction that the various measures introduced by the Government of the Union of Burma towards achieving a socialist society are not discriminatory against foreigners as such and equally apply to Burmese nationals and foreigners alike. On the Burmese side, it was affirmed that these measures were not intended to force resident foreigners belonging to the working class out of Burma and that it is the intenion of the Government of the Union of Burma to give a sympathetic consideration to the case of those persons of foreign extraction in Burma who sincerely desire to continue to stay in Burma in accordance with the policies initiated by the Government of Burma and to merge themselves with the common people, participating in the building up of a socialist society.

The Minister of External Affairs of India and the Burmese leaders also studied the various problems which have arisen in connexion with the departure of a large number of persons of Indian origin from Burma and exchanged views on ways of settling these problems. This matter will be pursued further.

On behalf of the President of India, Sardar Swaran Singh renewed the invitaiton to the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma to visit India at a time convenient to him. General Ne Win reaffirmed his acceptance of invitation and expressed thanks for it. The Minister of External Affairs of India also extend an invitation to U Thi Han to visit India at a time convenient to him. The invitation was accepted and it is hoped that U Thi Han will be able to visit India in the near future to renew the valuable personal contacts between the two Governments at Ministerial level.

197

## BURMA USA INDIA LATVIA INDONESIA

**Date** : Sep 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

### CEYLON

Joint Communique on Sardar Swaran Singh's Visit

Sardar Swaran Singh Minister of External Affairs paid a 3-day visit to Ceylon in September, 1964. At the conclusion of his visit a joint communique was issued on September 13, 1964.

The following is the text of the joint communique :

Sardar Swaran singh, Minister of External Affairs of India visited Ceylon from September 11 to 13 on the invitation of the Government of Ceylon. He was accompanied by Mr. C. S. Jha, Commonwealth Secretary and Mr. N. P. Alexander of the Ministry of External Affairs. The Indian Minister of External Affairs on his arrival at the Ratmalana airport was received by the Honourable Felix Dias Bandaranaike, Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs.

In a brief interview with the Press on his arrival, Sardar Swaran Singh stated that on his assuming duties as Minister of External Affairs he had decided to visit Ceylon at the earliest possible opportunity in order to establish personal contact with the Prime Minister and members of the Government of Ceylon as well as with leading Ceylonese personalities as a means of promoting and strengthening the existing friendly relations between the two countries. The Minister of External Affairs called on His Excellency the Governor General the Prime Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs.

On Saturday, September 12, the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and External Affairs of Ceylon and the Minister of External Affairs of India met to discuss matters of mutual interest to the two Governments. Mr. C. S. Tha, His Excellency Mr. B. K. Kapur, High Commissioner for India in Cevlon and Mr. N. P. Alexander were associated with the Minister of External Affairs of India in these discussions. The Honourable Felix Dias Bandaranaike, Mr. N. Q. Dias, Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs, Ms Excellency Mr. H. S. Amerasinghe, High Commissioner for Ceylon in India, Mr. G. S. Peiris, Director General of External Affairs, Mr. H. 0. Wijegoonewardena, Counsellor, Foreign Relations, and Mr. R. B. Weerakoon, Secretary to the Prime Minister, were associated with the Prime Minister in the discussions.

The Indian Minister of External Affairs described briefly India's effort's in the field of economic development and the results achieved under five year plans over the last thirteen years. He also touched upon some of the present day economic problems of the country including the burden cast by the need since November 1962 to strengthen her defences for the purpose of safeguarding her sovereignty and territorial integrity while continuing at the same time to pursue her objective of economic development.

The Prime Minister of Ceylon also gave a brief survey of the economic situation in Ceylon and of the measures that were being taken to meet that situation. She emphasised the attention and importance paid by the Government of Ceylon to the social services such as education and health and food subsidies which absorbed a very high proportion of the national income but served to keen down the cost of living.

The Indian Minister of External Affairs, offered to share with Ceylon the facilities provided by Indian scientific and technological education and engineering institutions and the research establishments of the Government of India. He also expressed the wish for India to benefit it from similar institutions in Ceylon. The Prime Minister welcomed this proposal.

The Prime Minister and the Indian Minister of External Affairs agreed that there was a need for closer economic cooperation on a regional scale and that this question should be examined further at the official level.

The international situation was reviewed with special reference to the principal areas of tension in the world today. The Prime Minister of Ceylon and the Indian Minister of External Affairs agreed that the principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence on which the foreign policies of the two countries were founded, afforded the best hope for the relaxation of these tensions for the avoidance of war and for the resolution of international conflicts. The Indian Minister of External Affairs reaffirmed India's determination to adhere to the policy of non-alignment.

The forthcoming conference of non-aligned nations was discussed and views were exchanged on the various issues that were likely to arise. The two Governments found themselves in complete agreement on all the issues that were dis-

#### 198

cussed. The question of disarmament, which is one of the subjects in the provisional agenda for the conference of non-aligned nations, was discussed. The Prime Minister stressed the desirability of extending to the Indian Ocean the concept of unclear free-zones which has already been accepted in so far as certain land masses were concerned. The Minister of External Affairs reaffirmed India's support to the principle of creating nuclear free-zones and agreed with the idea propounded by the Prime Minister. He suggested a further study of the question.

In regard to the Sino-Indian dispute, the correspondence between the Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of Ceylon was reviewed.

The Indian Minister of External Affairs referred to the forthcoming talks between the Prime Minister of Ceylon and the Prime Minister of India on the problem of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon and expressed the hope that an equitable and honourable settlement acceptable to both the parties would be found. The Prime Minister of Ceylon wholeheartedly endorsed this sentiment.

The discussions took place in the spirit of complete cordiality and understanding which has always characterised the relations between the two countries.

USA INDIA **Date** : Sep 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

#### GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Letters for Extension of Trade Arrangements Exchanged

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on September 12, 1964 between Shri D. S. Joshi, Secretary, Union Ministry of Commerce, and Mr. Kurt Epperlein, leader of the Trade Delegation of the German Democratic Republic, extending the existing trade arrangements between the two countries for a period of three years up to 1967. The volume of trade between India and The German Democratic Republic which has been increasing in a satisfactory manner is expected to reach a level of over Rs. 400 million both ways by 1966.

The German Democratic Republic will import from India engineering goods like motor vehicle components, textile machinery and accessories, radiators, machine tools, tropicalised and electrical equipment, storage, batteries, chemicals, drugs and textiles (cotton and art silk). This is in line with the agreed policy between the two countries to diversify and extend the export and import of non-traditional goods. The German Democratic Republic will continue to import items like coffee, tea, deoiled cakes and other traditional goods.

India will impart from G.D.R. fertilizers like ammonium sulphate, muriate of potash, various items of industrial raw materials like alloy steel, pig iron, caustic, soda, heavy soda ash, dye intermediates and various chemicals. G.D.R. will also supply machine tools rotary printing machines, and other printing machinery, textile machinery and various other items of capital goods.

199

INDIA USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

## **Volume No**

1995

#### HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Defence Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Foreign Aid

The Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan made the following statement in the Lok Sabha, on September 21, 1964 about the assistance which the United States, the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom Governments have agreed to give to India to implement her Five-Year Defence Plan :

This statement is a brief report for the information of Parliament on my visits to the United States of America in May 1964 and the U.S.S.R. during August/September, 1964.

The object of my visit to the United States of America was to secure material and financial assistance for the implementation of India's Five Year Defence Plan covering the period April 1964 to March 1969 to which I had made a reference during the debate on the demands for grants of the Defence Ministry in March 1964. There was also a long-standing invitation from Hon'ble Robert S. McNamara, the United States Defence Secretary, to visit the United States to discuss problems of mutual interest.

I also received later an invitation from Marshal Malinovsky, Defence Minister of U.S.S.R. I took the opportunity to discuss with the Soviet Government various matters connected with the implementation of our Defence Plan.

The task of re-equipping and modernising our Armed Forces is a stupendous one.

## DEFENCE PLAN OBJECTIVES

In order to ensure systematic development of our defence potential in the light of the threat facing the country, earlier this year we prepared a Five-Year Defence Plan. Broadly the Plan envisages :

- (a) the maintenance of a well-equipped army with a strength of 825,000 men.
- (b) maintenance of a 45-squadron Air Force including programmes of reequipment and replacement of the older aircraft like Vampire, Toofani and Mystere by more modern aircraft and improvement of the air defence radar and communication facilities;
- (c) a phased programme for replacement of over-age ships of the Navy:
- (d) improvement of road communications in the border areas:
- (e) strengthening the defence production base to eventually meet the requirements of arms and ammunition of our armed forces; and
- (f) improving the organisational arrangemerits in the fields of provisioning and procurement. storage, training, etc. to ensure most economical utilisation of funds allotted for Defence.

## ADDITIONAL OUTLAY ON DEFENCE

The above programmes of modernisation of the Defence forces and improvement of facilities for logistic support of the Armed Forces would call for additional outlays on defence. The increase, in terms of internal resources, will be of the order of about 10 to 12 per cent over the current level of defence expenditure. But the total requirement of foreign exchange for the Defence Plan has been assessed at about three times the normal allocations which can be made to Defence from our own export earnings.

The major constraint, therefore, which would affect the implementation of the Defence Plan is the availability of foreign exchange in time, to meet the import requirements of the various constitutions of the Plan. As the economic development plans also require heavy investments of foreign exchange in order to ensure that the progress of India's economic development is not affected, it is necessary to secure assistance from friendly foreign countries for the implementation of the Defence Plan.

#### DISCUSSIONS IN U.S.A.

I reached Washington on May 18, 1964 and had discussions with the U. S. Secretary of Defence Hon'ble Robert S. McNamara and other officials of the administration. I also had discussions with Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, and Mr. Averell Harriman. I had also opportunities to meet important members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

The discussions held with the U.S. Government were very friendly and disclosed large areas of agreement in respect of our assessment of the Chinese threat and the measures required to meet it. There is considerable understanding in the U.S. administration of the special problems we are faced with and a desire to assist in build-

#### 200

ing up the defence potential without adversely affecting our economic development plans.

## AGREEMENT WITH U.S.A.

As a result (if these discussions the U. S. Government have agreed to provide to the Government of India the following assistance :

(i) Immediate credit of \$ 10 million for the purchase of defence articles and services. The main items to be financed from this credit relate to replacement and modernisation of plant and equipment in ordance factories;

- (ii) The military grant assistance will be continued by the U.S. Government during their fiscal year 1965 (July 1964 to June 1965) at the same level as during the fiscal year 1964. This assistance includes such items as continued support for Indian mountain divisions, air defence communication equipment, transport aircraft support and road-building equipment for the Border Roads Organisation. As this assistance would be in kind, it is not possible to assess its value financially.
- (iii) In addition, further-credit to the extent of \$ 50 million during fiscal year 1965 would be available. Among other things, the Artilery Shell Plant to be set up at Ambajhari will be financed from this credit.

Successful implementation of the Defence Plan would require continued assistance from U.S.A. at the current levels in respect of both grant assistance and credit assistance. The U.S. authorities have agreed that periodical discussions should be held between our two countries to determine further U.S. assistance in relation to India's defence effort.

## HIGH PERFORMANCE AIRCRAFT

I also discussed the question of supply of high performance fighter aircraft for the Indian Air Force, the need for which was established in Exercise SHIKSHA held last year. The U.S. authorities, while discussing supply of such aircraft under the Military Assistance Programme, pointed out that as we had already plans for introducing in the I.A.F. MIGs and the HF-24, the question of introducing another type of supersonic aircraft may have to be studied further. In the circumstances no final decision was taken. The U.S. authorities offered to send a team of experts to determine whether they could be of assistance in further development of this aircraft and in it, production. The team has since visited India and has submitted a report which is under examination,

On the question of supply of naval vessels for

replacing the over-age ships in our fleet, it was agreed that our requirements in this field should first he discussed with the British Government.

## U.S. AID FOR PRODUCTION BASE

Apart from the grant assistance and credit assistance which the U.S. Government have agreed to provide during the fiscal year 1965 and which they are willing to consider for the subsequent years, I attach considerable importance to the fact that the need for strengthening; the defence production base in India has been fully recognised by the U.S. authorities and a substantial portion of the credits already offered will be utilised for modernisation of the Indian ordnance factories and for setting up the Atillery Shell Plant at Ambajhari.

During my stay I visited a number of defence installations and training establishments in the U.S.

On hearing of the sudden passing away of Jawaharlalji I cut short my visit in the United States and returned to India on May 28, 1964. A meeting with President Johnson scheduled for May 28, 1964 could not take place.

## DISCUSSION IN U.S.S.R.

As Hon'ble Members are aware, we had concluded an agreement in August 1962 with the Soviet Union for establishing production of MIG-21 fighter aircraft. While we have proceeded with civil works and preparation of project reports, it was found that there were several important fields not covered by the original agreement in which without additional Soviet assistance it would not be possible to establish early production of the aircraft. It was also our intention to explore possibilities of securing assistance in respect of certain other equipments included in the Plan.

I reached Moscow on August 28, 1964. I had discussions with Defence Minister Marshal Malinovsky and senior members of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. I had also discussions with the Chairman, Mr. Khruschev.

These discussions were most cordial. ale

Soviet Government fully appreciated our policy of non-alignment. They recognised our need for the strengthening of our defence potential and also our economic difficulties. It was explained that we attached considerable importance to the early establishment of the MIG complex of factories and production of MIG aircraft and associated equipment.

Our requirement for supply of a certain number of MIG-21 aircraft to meet the needs of the Air Force until the production of the aircraft

#### 201

starts in the country and the requirement for light tanks was also discussed.

## AGREEMENTS WITH U.S.S.R.

As a result the following agreements have been concluded with the Soviet Government :

- (i) As an extension of the agreement concluded in August, 1962 the Soviet Government have now agreed to provide plant and machinery, jigs and tools etc. of Soviet manufacture to facilitate the early establishment of the MIG complex of factories. They have also agreed that Soviet technical teams will be more closely associated in the preparation of detailed working projects and production schedules. Arrangements for the supply of major assemblies, sub-assemblies, and raw material from the Soviet Union for the production of initial batches of MIG-21 aircraft have also been finalised.
- (ii) Agreement has been concluded for the purchase of a certain number of MIG-21 aircraft and associated equipment. The supplies under the August, 1962 agreement and the present agreement would enable us to re-equip three of our fighter squadrons with MIG-21 aircraft.
- (iii) Soviet Government have also agreed to the supply of a certain number of light tanks and associated equipment.

The above purchases will be paid for in rupees which ran be used by the Soviet Government for purchases of goods and articles in India according to existing arrangements.

A contract has also been concluded with the Soviet export organisation for the supply of 20 Mi-4 helicopters.

The Soviet authorities provided facilities to me and to the naval officers who accompanied me to see the performance of the naval craft including submarine which they are in a position to Supply to India. The technical details made available during this visit are under study. It may take some time before a decision is reached in the matter as, apart from technical evaluation, the financial feasibility of making additional purchases would require review.

## U.K. To AID FRIGATE PRODUCTION

I had planned to spend a few days in the U.K. at the invitation of the British Government on my return journey from the United States. I could not do so. If convenient to the British Government I hope to visit the United Kingdom some time in November-December 1964.

As I have mentioned earlier I intended to discuss with British Government particularly our requirement for destroyers. As Hon'ble Members are aware, the Indian Navy is at present equipped with British-built ships. Several of our destroyers are over-age and are due for replacement. We are intending that some of the ships required for such replacement should be built in this country itself and we have been exploring ways and means of securing the necessary financial assistance and foreign collaboration.

I am happy to be able to say that the British Government have agreed to provide financial assistance towards the reconstruction of the Mazagaon Docks in Bombay and the subsequent construction there of three Leander-class frigates. We have accepted this offer in principle and negotiations for a loan agreement, as also for a collaboration agreement with Vickers Limited, are progressing.

## BASIC FACTS OF DEFENCE PLAN

I wish to conclude my statement by restating certain basic facts underlying our Defence Plan and the programme to secure foreign assistance.

Our policy in meeting requirements of our defence is necessarily guided by our foreign policy of non-alignment which will continue to govern our actions in the field of defence procurement. In both the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. there was a complete recognition of this policy.

Our Defence Plan identifies the requirements of the defence forces to enable them to discharge the task assigned to them. These carefully worked out requirements guide us in seeking assistance from friendly sources where it is available.

Apart from the U.S., U.K. and U.S.S.R., other countries such as Australia, Canada, Yugoslavia have come to our help in our time of need.

I would like to emphasise that we have not the slightest intention of playing military assistance from one country against military assistance from another. It was heartening for me to find that in both the great countries that I visited, there was full appreciation of our point of view and desire to assist.

202

# USA INDIA MALI RUSSIA LATVIA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA CANADA

**Date** : Sep 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha opening the Debate on Foreign Affairs

Initiating the debate on Foreign Affairs in the Rajaya Sabha on September 22, 1964. Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement

Sir, I beg to move :

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

On the 11th June, 1964, in his broadcast to the nation, the Prime Minister had covered the more important aspects of our foreign policy. I can do no better than reiterate what the Prime Minister said on that occasion as the basic principles of our foreign policy. Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to repeat them.

- We shall continue to seek friendship and develop our relations with all countries irrespective of ideology of their political system.
- (2) Non-alignment and peaceful co-existence will continue to be the fundamental bases of our approach to world problems and our relations with other countries.
- (3) It will be special endeavour to further strengthen our relations with neighbouring countries.
- (4) We shall continue to work for freedom of the peoples of Asia and Africa from colonial rule and we shall continue to collaborate with sister nations of Africa and Asia in the common cause of world peace and freedom of people.
- (5) As a member in the United Nations, we shall unflinchingly support that organisation for bringing peace and freedom to humanity.

## OBJECT OF VISITS

In pursuit of our policy of developing friendly relations with all countries irrespective of their social or political system, it is my intention to visit friendly countries in order to establish personal contact with the leaders of Governments of these countries and thus promote better understanding with them. To begin with, Mr. Chairman, I have just completed visits to four of our closest neighbours, namely, Nepal, Afghanistan, Burma and Ceylon. To me, as some one who has just assumed the responsibilities for India's external relations, these visits have been immensely rewarding, and I have been deeply impressed by friendliness and warmth of feeling for India that I have experienced in all the countries visited by me. I feel that these visits have contributed to the further strengthening of our relations.

As the Prime Minister stated in his broadcast of the 11th June, the development of even closer and more co-operative relations on the basis of mutual understanding and benefit will continue to receive our earnest attention. Problems which necessarily must arise between neighbouring countries are being tackled in co-operation with our neighbours and are being progressively resolved to our mutual satisfaction. Recently I had the opportunity of having detailed discussions and exchange of views on matters of mutual interest in the course of my visits to Nepal, Afghanistan, Burma and Ceylon. These have proved useful in resolving some of the problems and in a better understanding with regard to others.

We are looking forward to visits by the Foreign Ministers and other dignitaries from these countries in the near future. I am sure that the House will welcome frequent exchange of such visits with a view to the promotion of better understanding and to a possible harmonis ing of our respective points of view on various matters.

In recent months, we have taken several steps which have given satisfaction to Nepal. Measures have been adopted to facilitate border trade and to increase the supply of petroleum products and other essential items such as iron and steel and vehicles to Nepal. An Air Transport Agreement, recently negotiated, will enable the Airlines of both countries to increase the frequency of their services on a parity basis within an agreed ceiling; and at a suitable time in the future, with our agreement, it will be possible for the Royal Nepalese Airlines to stage flights beyond India.

We have also signed agreements with His Majesty's Government to regulate the exchange of letters, insured articles and parcels between India and Nepal. These agreements will come

203

into force from the 13th April, 1965, after ratification by the two Governments.

The Government of Nepal appreciate the variety and magnitude of our economic aid to Nepal and it has been arranged that, with a view to remove minor bottlenecks, officials of the two countries will meet periodically to review the progress of our aid performance.

Our close ties with the Afghan people are based on historical, religious and ethnic affinities. It has been our constant endeavour to further strengthen our ties with Afghanistan. During my visit to Afghanistan, I found that tremendous efforts are being made by the Afghan Government for the economic and technical development of Afghanistan. I assured the Afghan Government that in this great endeavour of theirs, we shall be very happy to extend our cooperation.

#### INDIAN NATIONALS IN BURMA

In Burma I had the opportunity of discussing, inter alia, the problem caused by the departure of a large number of Indians from that country. The Burma Government now are engaged in a vast programme of socialisation for the purpose of achieving what they call 'Burmese way to Socialism'. It is not for us to quarrel with the internal policies of the Burma Government; indeed we appreciate their efforts, and the success of such efforts, to adopt a socialist way of life.

The measures taken by the Burmese Government in the implementation of their socialist policies have however affected large numbers of Indian nationals, particularly those belonging to the trading classes including large and small shopkeepers. It was a source of satisfaction to learn that the Burmese Government's measures are entirely non-discriminatory. They affect Burmans and foreigners alike. We were also assured that the Burmese Government were not against the continued stay in Burma of persons belonging to the working class who are prepared to accept the Burmese social order and to merge themselves with the common people of Burma. The departure en masse of Indians, however, has created many human problems as well as those relating to the assets of the persons leaving Burma. During my visit, opportunity was taken to talk over these matters both at ministerial and official levels and it is my belief that as a result of these talks there is a better understanding and sympathy in the Burmese Government with the problems faced by the departing Indians. The rapport that I was able to establish with the Foreign Minister of Burma and other dignitaries and our further meetings in the future will, I am sure, be extremely useful in promoting further understanding between the two countries and in helping in the solution of the complicated problems that have arisen in connection with the mass departure of Indians from Burma. Although many of such problems still remain to be solved, discussions at the official level are continuing.

## PERSONS OF INDIAN ORIGIN IN CEYLON

In Ceylon, apart from questions relating to the non-aligned conference and other international problems of mutual interest, there were talks between Her Excellency the Prime Minister of Ceylon and myself, followed by preliminary discussions at the official level between the Permanent Secretary of Ceylon and our Commonwealth, Secretary on the longstanding problem of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon.

As the House is aware, this problem has been discussed many times before between the Prime Ministers of India and Ceylon. The problem is a complex one and has hitherto defied solution. I am hopeful that given goodwill and understanding which, if I may say so, exist in abundant measure between the Governments and the peoples of the two countries, an equitable and honourable solution of this problem will be found in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish I was in a position to place before the House the game happy and encouraging picture of our relations with our two other neighbours, namely, China and Pakistan.

## SINO-INDIAN DISPUTE

Our relations with People's Republic of China have continued to remain deadlocked. China has persisted in her negative and intransigent attitude towards the Colombo proposals. The House is aware that there was some correspondence between the Prime Ministers of Ceylon and India on the question of the withdrawal of the Chinese posts in the demilitarised area in Ladakh. The Government of India's stand on this question is clear and unambiguous. We have said that we are willing to enter into negotiations with China provided it agreed to remove its posts from the demilitarised zone and accepted the Colombo proposals in full. We have thus gone to the farthest limit possible, within the ambit of the Colombo proposals in order to enable negotiations to take place between the two countries. The negotiations, if they do take place will, of course, be in accordance with the steps indicated in the Colombo proposals. The officially-controlled Press in China has taken up the stand that it is China's internal affairs to set up civilian posts and that no one can ask China to withdraw the posts from what they call "China's own territory".

## 204

I should like to make it clear that the 20 km demilitarised area was seized by China during their massive military operations in the autumn of 1962. It is part of the 14,500 square miles of Indian territory illegally occupied by China. It was from this very same 20 km belt that the Colombo Conference had asked China to withdraw its troops. To say that this area was always Chinese territory and to insist upon the maintenance of Chinese posts there, is an entirely propagandist and intransigent attitude. It is quite clear that while we have shown willingness to have talks with China on a reasonable basis, China has no desire to enter into any kind of negotiations and is finding pretext after pretext to nullify and reject the proposals made by the six non-aligned countries in Colombo. China's attitude indeed gives the lie to its vociferous propaganda that while she is willing to come to the conference table, it is India which is refusing to do so.

#### ANTI-INDIA PROPAGANDA BY PAKISTAN

As regards Pakistan, the House is no doubt aware of the various developments that have taken place during the last few months. Soon after the late Prime Minister's demise, there were genuine expressions of sympathy in Pakistan at our national beravement, both by Government leaders and people of Pakistan. The President of Pakistan made a number of public statements giving expression to his sincere desire for an amicable settlement of a differences between India and Pakistan. These sentiments were reciprocated by our Prime Minister and there has been some exchange of correspondence between him and the President of Pakistan.

Lately, the Press which is under virtual Government control and other media of information in Pakistan have reverted to their usual propaganda line against India; and we have had to take note of some provocative and unfriendly statements by certain highly placed dignitaries in Pakistan.

So far as we are concerned, we are sincerely desirous of living with our neighbour, Pakistan, with whom we are bound by such close ties, in amity and goodwill. In the light of the statements made by the President of Pakistan, we would continue in our endeavours to discuss our differences with Pakistan with a view to reaching honourable and equitable solutions. The Home Ministers' meeting is likely to take place towards the latter part of October.

I have received an invitation from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to visit Pakistan. I would be, glad to visit Pakistan to enable me to discuss the whole range of Indo-Pakistan problems with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Due to my preoccupations in Parliament and the fact that I have to attend the Cairo Conference--I have to leave for Cairo on the 29th of this month--the actual date of my visit to Pakistan will have to be settled by mutual consultations.

Both the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have expressed the desire to meet each other. Such a meeting would have taken place in London at the time of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, but failed to materialise because our Prime Minister was not able to go to London on account of indisposition. We hope that a summit meeting will take place in the not too distant future. Naturally, it has to come about in a proper atmosphere. Any talks and exchange of views between India and Pakistan, at whatever level they might be, can only be fruitful if there is a sincere desire and there is a patient search for equitable and honourable solutions by both sides. All such talks and explorations of the ways and means of resolving our differences will naturally be without prejudice to the respective points of view of India and of Pakistan.

## LAOS AND VIETNAM

The picture of large parts of Asia today is not a happy one. Laos and Vietnam have been the scenes of internal conflict for many years. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 in the case of Vietnam and of 1962 in the case of Laos were devised to bring internal peace and stability to Vietnam and Laos in an atmosphere of freedom from outside interference. These purposes have not been fulfilled and, according to the International Control Commission, of which India is the Chairman, there have been frequent violations of the Agreements. In any case, the spirit of these Agreements has not been observed and today Indo-China presents a grave danger-spot menacing international peace ; We stand by the Geneva Agreement of 1962 in the case of Laos. to which we were a signatory. We also uphold the Geneva Agreement of 1954 in respect of Vietnam, although we were not participants in the Geneva Conference on Indo-China in 1954. We are Chairman of the International Control Commission appointed under the Agreements for supervising them, And, as such, have an onerous responsibility. So far as Laos in concerned we support the proposal for holding a 14-nation conference which seems to us to Afford the best hope of bringing peace and stability to Laos. We hope that agreements between the principal parties in Laos will be reached, so as to make it possible for a conference to be convened with the least possible delay. The leaders of the three Laotian factions have been meeting in Paris. The fact that they are meeting is itself a good sign and although the talks between them have

so far yielded no results, we hope that their perseverance in finding areas of agreements on the issues on which they are at present divided will be rewarded soon.

In Vietnam the situation, in some ways, is much more complicated and dangerous from the point of view of world peace. It is not easy to make ex-cathedra pronouncements on how the situation in Vietnam should be resolved. The Government of India, however, are of the view that eventually political rather than military solutions will have to be found for the problem of Vietnam.

The incidents which took place in the Gulf of Tonkin some six weeks ago caused us great concern to which we officially gave expression at that time. Fortunately, these have not led to a wider conflict. We hope that all concerned will orient their thinking and actions towards the search for political solutions in Vietnam.

#### MALAYSIA

The conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia has greatly distressed us, Hon. Members will remember that, at the time of the Chinese attack on us, Malaysia gave solid support to India. The Prime Minister has already stated this morning that there is no reason why the sovereignty of Malaysia should be disturbed. We are also of the view that, whatever may be the differences between Indonesia and Malaysia, these should be settled at the conference table and without resort to military means. While we do not wish to go into the merits of the specific issues that are dividing Indonesia and Malaysia, we must express our sympathy to the Government and people of Malaysia in the difficulties that are being faced by them.

Even from the time of our freedom movement against colonial rule, we have been deeply interested in the freedom and welfare of the peoples of Africa. After India became independent and could speak with her own voice at the councils of nations, we championed the cause of freedom of African peoples still under colonial domination, staunchly and steadfastly over many years at the United Nations. Now that the vast continent of Africa has come into its own and the African people, except in certain areas where the hard core of colonialism and suppression of Peoples unfortunately still exists, are free and independent members of the world community, it has been the special endeavour of the Government of India, over past years, to develop our relations with Africa. We have diplomatic relations with 28 independent African countries. The policy of non-alignment and our shared outlook on promotion of international peace, anticolonialism and anti-racialism have helped to foster even closer relations with the African countries.

## APARTHEID

The problems agitating the minds of the African people are the racial policies of South Africa, the Portuguese colonialism and the problem of Southern Rhodesia. The persistant violation of the United Nations' resolutions by the South African Government and its defiance of world opinion on the question of apartheid can be a major source of friction, which can escalate into an open conflict. We shall continue to give staunch support to the just demands of Africans for the political and economic emancipation of the African people of South Africa.

In regard to the Portuguese colonies, we have extended our support to the efforts being made by the Organisation of African Unity to liberate these areas.

## SOUTHERN RHODESIA

The problem of Southern Rhodesia has been a source of deep anxiety to us. This matter was discussed at length at the recent Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, wherein a common view was expressed that an Independence Conference should be convened, which the leaders of all parties in Southern Rhodesia should be free to attend and that Southern Rhodesia should proceed to independence within the Commonwealth at the earliest practicable time on the basis of majority rule.

Recently talks have taken place between the Prime Minister of Britain and Southern Rhodesia. We hope these will have resulted in persuading Mr. Smith to desist from the recklessness of making a unilateral declaration of Independence for Southern Rhodesia. I have used the expression 'recklessness' advisedly, because any such declaration will be an affront to the whole of the Afro-Asian world and indeed the United Nations, and would create a most serious situation in Africa. We have made it clear that India will not recognise any unilateral declaration of independence by Southern Rhodesia by the White Government of Southern Rhodesia.

The Government of India have welcomed the independence of the State of Malawi as an equal member of the Commonwealth. We have also established diplomatic relations with that country and have opened an office in Blantyre. As for Northern Rhodesia, we look forward to the emergence of Zambia as a sovereign republic within the Commonwealth with effect from 24th October, and to closer relations in all fields with new Zambia.

#### 206

The Hon. Members must have read that Malta has already attained her independence.

## RELATIONS WITH ARAB WORLD

India's relations with the Arab world find a firm basis in our age-old cultural and commercial ties and an identity of views on international matters based on the common policy of positive non-alignment, promotion of world peace and eradication of racialism and colonialism. I am happy to say that ever since our independence, under the guidance of our late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, there has been increasing understanding, friendship and co-operation between India and Arab countries. India sets great store by her fraternal ties with Arab countries and peoples. The Prime Minister's state visit to the United Arab Republic early next month will give him the opportunity of meeting and having talks with President Nasser. We are confident that these will further strengthen our ties with the United Arab Republic and with the Arab world as a whole.

India has been keenly alive to the hopes and aspirations of the Arab people on the Palestine question. We have lent our unequivocal support to the just claims of the Arab nations in respect of the Jordan waters issue and have supported the rights of the Palestine refugees wishing to return to their homes.

In regard to Aden and the Protectorates of South Arabia, we have supported the claim of the people there to independence with the least possible delay.

The visit by you, Sir, as the Vice-President of India, to the Maghreb countries and the warm and rousing reception received by you from the Governments and people there helped to foster closer relations with Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia. At the non-official level, two goodwill delegations visited the Maghreb and other Arab countries. These visits helped to put in proper perspective the policies pursued by India in the internal and international fields. They were an effective answer to false propaganda by interested parties. The secular character of the Indian Union and the secular approach of the Arab countries as recently demonstrated by their stand on the Cyprus issue is but another bond between our two peoples.

#### FOREIGN AID

Members might recall that in the economic field, the relations of the Government of India with other countries have continued to be governed by the principles of equality and mutual benefit. Socialist and non-Socialist countries alike have given valuable financial and other forms of assistance for the timely realisation of our development plans. We are grateful for the assistance which has been given to us. The volume of our commercial exchanges has continued to expand and to become diversified in character in response to the growth of our economy and its changing needs. It is a matter for some satisfaction that our exports have been expanding steadily. In the field of technical and economic co-operation, the scope and tempo of our efforts have been stepped up in respect of the bilateral as well as multilateral programmes like the Colombo Plan and the Special Commonwealth Programme for Assistance to Africa. We must, however, do much more in this field than we have attempted in the past. For this purpose, it has recently been decided to improve our organisational arrangements, bring about greater co-ordination of our activities and make fuller use of our human and material re-sources. This would be a concrete expression of our faith

in the efficiacy of our policy of non-alignment and of our dedication to peaceful co-existence for promoting the well-being of the people of the other developing countries in a spirit of mutual assistance and co-operation.

A clear proof of the success of India's foreign policy is the fact that in spite of the great stress and strain that we have gone through, there is continued support, encouragement and generous help for India by the leading nations of the world both in the West and in the East. In fact, this has in my view become a major cause of despair in the minds of India's opponents. It is a clear vindication of the fact that a very large number of countries of the world irrespective of their ideologies and allegiance to either bloc, have come to repose confidence in India's basic peaceful approach, her belief in high principles of international behaviour, in her untiring efforts to reduce international tensions in the cause of world peace, and sincere effort to raise the standards of living of her own people.

## U. S. A.

The United States of America is the biggest single contributor of aid in various spheres of India's development plans. India shares with the American people the common belief in democracy freedom of the individual and rule of law. The spontaneous help and support received by India from the U.S. Government at the time of the Chinese attack in October 1962 and subsequently and the timely and valuable help in relieving the food situation are gratefully remembered. After the tragic death of President Kennedy, President Johnson has continued to support the policy of massive aid for India. We have similarly been heartened by the continued support we have received for our industrial and economic progress from Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Japan, Czecho-

## 207

slovakia, Canada and many other friendly countries, in Europe and America.

## U.S.S.R.

The President of India have very recently made an extensive tour of the Soviet Union. He has received a most befitting and warm welcome which highlights the continued friendship and understanding between the Soviet Union and India. The Soviet Union has not only contributed valuable aid for India's rapid industrial development but it has lent moral and material support to India in the face of the threat from China, and has upheld India's sovereignty and territorial integrity in Kashmir. The Defence Minister has already informed the House about the successful result of his recent visit to the U.S.S.R.

## LATIN AMERICA

Our relations with the Latin American countries have always been cordial. There is a considerable amount of goodwill towards India in Latin American countries. When China attacked India in October 1962 nearly all the Latin American countries supported India and condemned China: unequivocally. There are similarities in the economic situation and problems of development faced by Latin American countries and India. There is also a good deal of interest in India's culture. During the past six months delegations have visited Latin American countries, and based on their recommendations, steps will be taken to build up closer relations with countries of this area.

## CYPRUS

The sympathy and support expressed by India for the Cyprus Government in the difficult situation faced by her, shows that we do not attach less importance to smaller countries where basic principles are involved. Cyprus has only recently emerged from a colonial past and there are basic similarities between her recent history and that of pre-independence India. As Cyprus is an independent and sovereign country which is a full-fledged member of the United Nations, which owes allegiance to the policy of non-alignment and independence, India has supported Cyprus's right to remain independent. The solution for the internal strife in Cyprus lies with Cyprus, and in accordance with secular and democratic principles.

#### EXTERNAL PUBLICITY

Coming to a comparatively smaller matter but a matter about which Members have shown a

great deal of interest, the matter of external publicity, I am aware of the feeling inside this House that more needs to be done. I myself agree that our media and methods of external publicity need to be strengthened and improved and I would indeed appreciate constructive suggestions that Members may have to make in this regard. We are, of course, constantly making improvements and have taken measures to reorganise our publicity machinery so as to make it more effective. These measures are constantly kept in review. Increasing the production of publicity literature concerning India's achievements and attitudes, exhibition of documentary films in foreign countries, invitations to foreign Press, film radio and television delegations, etc. are actively undertaken.

In brief, I would like to assure the House that every step is taken to project India's image and expound India's policies in the way it should be done. The results, of course, vary from country to country. The impact that any country can make by publicity abroad is largely conditioned by the receiving country's appreciation of its own self-interest and its own general policies. The persistent and intensified progaganda against India by China and Pakistan makes the task of our publicity agencies overseas much more onerous than before, but the challenge has to be accepted. I am sure that with special attention to external publicity which we are giving and I propose to give further, and the continual improvement in our methods and machinery based on experience, the rightness of India's policies both at home and abroad, are bound to be recognised even more than before.

At the United Nations and in the Disarmament Committee in Geneva, India is continuing to play its usual role of supporting movements against colonialism and all measures towards the halting of underground nuclear tests, a general and complete disarmament, which is the goal adopted by the United Nations. The guide lines of our policy and our active role in the United Nations were laid by the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, and we faithfully continue to adhere to them.

The year 1965 has been designated by the United Nations as the international Co-operation Year. This idea was put forward first by the late Prime Minister.

## CAIRO NON-ALIGNED CONFERENCE

Before I conclude, I would like to say a few words about the Conference of Non-aligned States which is due to convene in Cairo next week. The idea of this Conference was noted by President Nasser, President Tito and Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Ceylon. Our late Prime Minister strongly supported the proposal since he felt that a Conference of Nonaligned States-the second of its kind-would greatly strengthen the forces of peace, co-exis-

## 208

tence and non-alignment, which the world today needs more than ever . Our Prime Minister participate in this Conference and I can say that he is keenly looking forward to the opportunity of meeting Heads of State and Government of non-aligned countries from all the four continents of the world. Prior to attending the Conference, the Prime Minister will, at the invitation of President Nasser, pay a State visit to the United Arab Republic.

The Non-aligned Conference has a large agenda. It would call for consideration of basic issues, such as anti-colonialism neocolonialism, imperialism, racial discrimination, peaceful coexistence and the codification of its principles by the United Nations, and general and complete disarmament.

As the House is aware, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru was the father of the policy of non-alignment. That policy at one time was frowned upon by some big powers but its adherents today form more than half of the membership of the United Nations. It is recognised as the greatest factor in the reduction of international tensions and the preservation of world peace. We intend to play our part in this Conference consistently with our traditions and policies. We feel sure that the deliberations and conclusions of this Conference will have a profound effect for good on world peace and international understanding.

I have tried to present to the House a brief picture of our international relations and of the main international problems with which the world is faced today. The world we live in is a fastchanging world. Old ideas and concepts are disappearing or are being transmuted into new ones. the groupings among nations are undergoing transformation and change. The so-called East and West are not now involved in the deadly cold war, which not only poisoned their relations but had an adverse impact on the entire range of international affairs. In fact, there are signs of rapprochement between the East and the West, particularly between the United States and the Soviet Union. These are welcome trends. On the other hand, China has emerged as a new force whose openly aggressive and bellicose attitudes contrary to the principles of Panchsheel and the principles of the Bandung Declaration are embittering relations between Asian countries and menacing international relations.

Before closing, I would like to assure the House that the Government of India will exercise all the vigilance that they are capable of in order to ensure that India continues to follow a policy of peace, non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, strong enough both diplomatically and otherwise, to withstand any pressure to, which we may be subjected in this fast-changing world.

INDIA USA AFGHANISTAN NEPAL BURMA CHINA SRI LANKA PAKISTAN EGYPT UNITED KINGDOM LAOS VIETNAM SWITZERLAND FRANCE MALAYSIA INDONESIA SOUTH AFRICA MALAWI ZAMBIA MALTA JORDAN ALGERIA MOROCCO TUNISIA CYPRUS GERMANY JAPAN CANADA SLOVAKIA

**Date** : Sep 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Replying to the debate on Foreign Affairs in the Rajya Sabha on September 23, 1964, the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following statement :

I am extremely grateful to the Hon. Members who have given such careful thought to the various aspects of our foreign policy in the course of this debate. If I am right, I think, for the first time, in this august House, the debate on foreign affairs has lasted for the number of hours that it has lasted on this occasion. I am also very happy to say that the general level of debate has been very high. Hon. Members have examined various aspects of our foreign policy. They have commented upon certain general and guiding principles that govern our relations with other countries, and they have also given valuable comments on some of the. immediate problems of more or less national interest in relation to some of the other countries.

#### NON-ALIGNMENT

There is one aspect about which there appears to be near unanimity in this House; that is the policy of non-alignment. I wish I could omit the word 'near' in the expression 'near unanimity' that I use. The only discordant voice in this respect was that of the distinguished Member who spoke on behalf of the Swatantra Party. The way he had started, when he tried to distinguish the policy of non-alignment and tried to say that contra non-alignment is not necessarily alignment. I thought we had succeeded in winning universal support for the policy of non-alignment.

But as has been pointed out by some Hon. Members, he started well and I thought that he was going to put forward some suggestion whereby this policy of non-alignment, without being abandoned, could be Projected in a form which might meet his yardstick also. But unfortunately, he landed us again in alignment. But the fact is he himself saw virtue in sticking to a policy which, according to his own concept, could give us independence of action, could give us the right to function in our best interests, uninhabited by any Pacts or understandings with others and that is really the essence of a policy of non-alignment. wish he had stopped there and not later on

#### 209

stated that we should enter into alliances of a military character or any other character with certain other countries. Non-alignment has stood the test of time.

I can well appreciate that feeling like that can arise when one gets worried and overwhelmed by some immediate problems. But let us not forget that immediate and pressing problems even cannot be satisfactorily tackled unless we stick to correct policies. And the more I think of it, both in the short run as well as in the long-term period, there is no doubt in my mind that the policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence that our country has pursued over the years under the inspiring guidance of our leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, is the only correct policy both from our national point of view as also for preserving peace in the world and for lowering tensions, both of which are very desirable objectives.

In the pursuit of this policy occasions can arise when there might be seeming conflicts and apparent difficulties, when we look at a problem that might be immediately in our hands. I am conscious of that fact and India has had to face such situations on many occasions. But it is a happy thought that undeterred by certain immediate difficulties or complications, India stuck to this policy resolutely and in retrospect one can say with confidence that the pursuit of this policyhas yielded rich dividends both from the point of view of national prestige as also from the point of view of strengthening the forces of peace in the world.

On many occasions India's voice did succeed in preventing the escalation of conflicts and had prevented a conflagration which might have engulfed the world and might have created such a bad situation as would have not only endangered peace amongst the immediate disputants, but could have really taken in its lap the entire world. This is something about which we should be happy.

Let us not forget that it is not merely a satisfaction that the world is saved the rigours and pangs of the tragedy of armed conflicts, though that by itself is a rewarding thing. But it is more real from our own point of view, engaged as we are in this task of advancing our country, economically, engaged as we are in the mighty task of raising the living standards of our people. For us the preservation of peace, the prevention of war, are not merely laudable objectives, but in our own national interests, it is very necessary that there should be peace in the world so that an underdeveloped country like India may be able to pur sue its efforts for economic and industrial advancement and may be able to raise the living standards of our people. All of us and very much so, this House, are conscious of the great and heavy burdens we have to carry in this development and progress of the millions of people whom we have the responsibility and the privilege of serving. It is therefore of immediate interest to us to see that there is peace in the world and that armed conflict is avoided so that the underdeveloped countries might be able to make progress and meet some of the very pressing demands of the millions of people living in those areas.

It is quite interesting that there is criticism of a mild character of this policy which, by and large, is accepted by all sections of the House. And if I may venture a suggestion, some of these mild criticisms from either side have the result of mutually cancelling each other and we are left with the hard core and the substance of the proposition that there is almost complete agreement that this is the policy that we should pursue.

Some of these criticisms mutually answer each other and one gets fortified in the belief that the pursuit of this policy appears to be the correct thing. Having said this, it came to me as a matter of surprise that some Hon. Members should have thought it fit to say that the policy appears to be the correct one, but somehow or other, in the implementation of this policy, we are lagging behind or that we are not coming up to the critics' or commentators' expectations.

I was really hoping to find some concrete mention about where the implementation of that policy did yield results which were not up to the mark. My esteemed friend opposite, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, started his comment somewhat on those lines and the points that he mentioned really are important points which I can separately answer. For instance, the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference was mentioned by him. There are one or two other points also mentioned by him. One may have a difference of opinion about the outcome. of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference or one or two other matters but I fail to see the connection between the result of the Conference or one or two other matterand the policy of non-alignment. Then he said that we should pursue it more vigorously and he also was good enough to assume the role of an examiner and he thought that my paper would entitle me hardly to a third class pass. This was his comment. I have also examined answer books. I do not know whether the Hon. Member has ever done so but if one examines the answer books of the examinees, one is supposed to be very very impartial and we never bring our own predilections in judging the answers that are given. So, I would have gladly accepted his verdict if be had really come forward as a really independent examineer but if the examiner himself has prejudices then howsoever good may be

#### 210

the reply, I can well imagine that I will not get the number of marks that I deserve. But it is some satisfaction that he did not decide to actually fail me. So, that again is something which is good. Even it a prejudiced examiner can give me pass marks then I am sure that an unprejudiced examiner, when he sits down and sees the answer paper with the dispassionate approach that normally an examiner is expected to bring to bear I am sure a few more marks will be ungrudgingly given.

It is true, and I am fully conscious of the fact, that we have in this House always had the great privilege of hearing the exposition on international aspects from such a great leader and such a great authority as the late Jawaharlal Nehru. For anyone on this side, on these benches or on the opposition benches or, if I may add, almost anywhere in the world, to find a statesman, to find a leader and to find a person of that inimitable charm that Jawaharlalji possessed is something which we cannot easily hope for. It is only once in a generation that a person of Jawaharlal's stature is available in any part of the world and all of us have been accustomed to hear from him extempore pronouncements on the most intricate of the world problems. He had lived with most of those problems. He had shaped some of those problems. He had the unique opportunity of coming into contact with the most diverse cross-sections of opinions in the world, in Government and outside the Government. Even before he became the Prime Minister, be threw

light on the international situation in the Congress sessions, and elsewhere. in fact, the policy that he gave to the country after we became independent was the continuation of his philosophy and his thoughts which really had been with him for twentyfive or thirty years when he led the country in the struggle for independence against the British.

Therefore, for any man to pretend that any person can express, with the same lucidity, with the same earnestness and with the same authority and confidence, opinions on world issues will be a futile task. It will be idle for any man to talk like that and futile to pretend that. Therefore, if that is the criticism and if that is the basis on which I was given a third class pass I plead that it will never be my pretension that I can do anything which might even come remotely near that inimitable way in which our late revered leader used to put across these ideas. I have myself watched him here, sometimes sitting on these benches and sometimes even quietly watching from behind the way that he expounded these ideas and it was a pleasure because there was vigour, there was freshness of approach and in almost every speech he broke new, ground. It is for the first time that we are having this debate without that great light which illumined some of the darkest comers and which gave us cheer even when there was depression all-round.

Let us, however, try to adjust our minds to the hard and cruel reality that he is no longer with us. We should try to get maximum guidance and advantage from the guide lines that he had chalked out for us and try to steer a course which keeps us well within the broad policies that he had laid down and should try to pursue them in the best possible manner in our own national interest and also in pursuit of the highest ideals that always prompted the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru.

## COMMONWEALTH CONFERENCE

The Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was mentioned by Hon. Members from the opposition benches and also by my colleagues on this side. I thought that after the very detailed statement that our Prime Minister made on this point there would be no room for any further comment or controversy. And we should not unnecessarily be touchy about things and should not read into the communique any concept which is not really not there. Our participation in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was, I feel, quite effective. Our representative made a full and effective contribution in the discussions in accordance with the policies and programmes of the Government of India. In the review of the world situation, for example, our delegation stressed the significance of developments in the world situation in favour of peace, the relaxation of tension between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., maintenance of world peace and general and complete disarmament as distinguished from the bellicose and aggressive attitude and activities of China. As references have been made by some Prime Ministers in the context of the latter to tensions in South and South East Asia and the need for greater co-operation and understanding between the countries in South and South East Asia including India and Pakistan, the Indian Finance Minister while pointing out in the discussions the importance of maintaining the convention that inter-commonwealth differences should not be discussed stressed India's need for necessary defence preparedness to contain the Chinese threat along India's borders. The Indian Delegation fully supported measures to end the apartheid policies of South Africa, early liquidation of Portuguese colonial domination in African territories, speedy evolution of British colonial territories to independence on the basis of majority rule in Southern Rhodesia as well as in other areas like British Guinea. On this question the leader of the Indian Delegation, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari made a very clear statement on his return to India that the Indo-Pakistan differences were not discussed and that Kashmir was

## 211

not discussed. It has been pointed out by some Hon. Members that some Press representative from the Pakistan Delegation made a statement to the Press coming out of the Conference room where he said that Kashmir had been discussed and that the Kashmir dispute was going to be included in the communique and the objection that is raised is that this remained uncontradicted for three hours.

We must remember that people who want

to use a forum for spreading incorrect news can always choose either a forum or a point of time which may not be known to the other party. Now it is not suggested that there was any Indian present in that gathering who was familiar with what was happening inside and that he did not contradict this then and there. It is not as if this thing was said in the presence of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari or any member of the Delegation and that he failed to contradict that. (interruptions).

The point is a simple one. It is true that an incorrect statement of that nature which, in the very nature of the circumstances is a catchy one, is likely to spread soon unless the other person is present and is able to contradict it there and then if it is not to do any mischief as in this case it has created mischief and we are facing the music every day, simply because this was not contradicted within five or ten minutes but that it took three hours to contradict it. But let us view this in its proper perspective and let us not ignore the sheer mechanics of the thing. If someone taking advantage of the non-presence of the members of the Indian Delegation tries to spread something, what will happen? You can say that the Indian Delegation's representative should have shadowed the Commonwealth spokesman and also the Pakistan spokesman so that whenever anyone of them makes any statement he could then and there say .... (interruptions).

Actually the statement was made at a particular time. It can be asked, when I am speaking here, why is not my Press Attache present in the Central Hall all the time because somebody can make a statement that I am saying this or that. It is a very desirable thing that we should take every step to see that any incorrect news spread by others is scotched at the very beginning. That is the essence of the charge. Now we cannot prevent others from making incorrect statements.

We should definitely take steps to scotch it as early as possible. In this case some mischief was done before it could be scotched, but let us not really wrap our judgment and try to build up an image. Merely because some pressman was not there or some other representative was not there when mother man chose to make an incorrect statement. you should not say that there is any basic departure from our policy. It is not that lack of vigilance, for which this point should be raised again and again. Shortly after, the whole thing had been clarified in a very clear statement that had been made by the Prime Minister.

Now, in substance it has been well established that bilateral disputes between two members of the Commonwealth should not be discussed. The Finance Minister, who was the leader of the Indian Delegation, had made the position absolutely clear and this position was accepted. It is a fact that it was not discussed and let us not try to hammer it again and again. Let us not try to read in the communique all things which do not exist therein and, it I may add, let us not weaken our stand by trying to give an interpretation to it when the authors of the communique themselves say that it is not meant really to convey an impression that Kashmir was discussed there. It is admitted on all hands that it was not discussed. Let us, at the same time, remember that in all these conferences there is little distinction between discussion and reference. For instance, the Prime Minister or the leader of the delegation of any country in his speech on the world situation or other situation can raise many points, just as India did raise many points. Now, all the points that are raised in a speech do not become items for discussion.

When a person is speaking there he can always say that this is indirectly or directly related to an item on the agenda. In the general speeches many points are said which cannot be strictly in accordance with the items on the agenda. These things are mentioned, just as India mentioned many things, which may not all be concerning the items on the agenda. Similarly, other Prime Ministers mentioned many things, which did not conic within the purview of the agenda and it is only the items on the agenda that are considered. (interruptions).

What I am urging is that the point has been amply met and clarified that bilateral disputes are outside the purview of the discussion. We have clarified our position. Now, I would venture to submit to Hon. Members, who may differ from us on many scores, that in a matter like this, let us not, by raising these arguments, weaken our stand. Let us not try by implication to creep in even a suspicion that we have ever placed an interpretation on the course or the trend of these discussions or on the communique as having acquiesed in either the discussions of Kashmir or even a remote mention of it. If we have made our position absolutely clear on that issue, we should not place that construction now. We should not, therefore. go on hammering a point, because by doing that we are weakening our stand and not strengthening it.

## 212

Let us be quite clear on that issue and let us bury this controversy for all time to come.

I am extremely grateful to all sections of the House which have noted with satisfaction the efforts that were made to establish direct contact with our neighbouring countries. I shall be quite frank that I myself was not quite sure that the results that would flow from these visits would be as encouraging as they have turned out to be. Our relations with these countries have always been friendly, but for some time with some of these countries we did not have very direct and intimate touch. I think it has been a very useful experience and the results have been quite encouraging.

## BURMA

Now, with regard to two countries, namely, Burma and Ceylon, some mention has been made. I would like to give very briefly my appreciation of the situation. Now, in regard to Burma I have come back fully convinced that the policies that are being pursued are non-discriminatory. If they have taken any action for socialisation of trade, whether it is an Indian shop or a Pakistani shop or a Burmese shop or a Chinese shop, every shop has been treated ha the same manner. There is no discrimination based on the nationality of the owner of any shop. Secondly, I have assurance from the highest level that those Indians or, in fact, those foreigners who would like to stay on in Burma and would like to play their role in the new social order they are trying to establish, would be most welcome. In fact, I would like to recall the sentences that are contained in the joint communique that was issued. It is clearly mentioned that the Burmese Government would welcome particularly the working class and they would

like them to remain there and function there under normal circumstances. I was assured that they will have not only assurance of safety but also equality of treatment in every way. Sometimes we may be overwhelmed by people who may have better means or who may be well off, but even in Burma I think 90 per cent of the people there are of the working class. There are a large number of families who own land and who are working on land. There are several others who are of the working class category. And it might interest you to know that their interpretation of the expression 'working class' is not so restricted as that some of my friends opposite. For instance, General Ne Win, President of Burma. in one of his remarks is reported to have said that he also is a member of the working class. So, it is not that narrow interpretation which some of us are likely to put on this expression 'working class'. Now I am fully conscious of the fact that there are some difficulties which are being experienced by those who are leaving Burma.

It was agreed that we should appreciate each other's difficulties in this respect and should try to devise a formula which should take note of the mutual difficulties of the two countries in the matter of exchange and should also take note of the difficulties which might be experienced by individuals. So, steps will be taken at the official level to find out a satisfactory way of dealing with this problem,

## CEYLON

In Ceylon I had the opportunity of meeting and discussing this question of Stateless persons, persons of Indian origin, who have not yet got the Ceylonese citizenship. I hope that the House is fully aware that a very vast majority of these persons are in the plantations. They are workers. They have been there for long years and they have played a very important role in the economic development of Ceylon, and they are very useful members of the Ceylonese life. They are, by and large, not unwelcome people. We can sometimes get an exaggerated notion of the state of affairs by reading certain press reports. There are many many difficulties, there are many complexities in the situation, and some sort of correspondence and discussion has been going on between India and Ceylon for quite some time. It

is India's earnest desire to see the viewpoint of Ceylon in this respect, to try to understand what their difficulties are; I am sure that the Government of Ceylon also is moved by similar consideration, and at the next meeting of the two Prime Ministers when Her Excellency the Prime Minister of Cevlon would be coming to Delhi during the fourth week of October, this matter will be discussed further in a spirit of mutual understanding and the difficulties faced by either country, and a solution which might be equitable and honourable, and acceptable to the two countries and the persons concerned. should be evolved. That is the only way how we can try to settle things of this nature where two countries are involved. Let us therefore try to create a proper atmosphere of understanding and cordiality so that the meeting of the two Prime Ministers scheduled to take place during the fourth week of October might yield fruitful results.

## CAIRO NON-ALIGNED CONFERENCE

Members have said many things about the forthcoming Non-aligned Conference. There is general support for India's participation in an effective manner in the forthcoming Non-aligned Conference. As I said yesterday, it is a source of great satisfaction for us to remember that the number of non-aligned countries have over the

## 213

year increased, and a very large number of countries would be participating in the forthcoming Non-aligned Conference to be held in Cairo. The support that the House has unanimously given and the many points that have been urged will be kept in view when we participate in the Conference. There can be a temptation to raise points that might concern us immediately. That is understandable. But in conferences where such a large number of countries attend, we have to give greater attention to bigger issues of international peace and understanding, and there will be many occasions both inside the conference room and outside the conference room where many other issues would be discussed informally. Opportunity would be taken of the presence of the Heads of State and Heads of Government of many countries to exchange views on many important international issues even of a bilateral character, and this will be a useful opportunity when not only we can concentrate on the items

of the agenda which are very important and which are very far-reaching, but we have to give a real content to this concept of non-alignment and we have to give a good look at the various stresses and strains that have developed so that non-alignment may emerge as a force which might be the guiding principle, notwithstanding the various complications or the stresses and strains that might be generated, in view of the constantly changing international situation.

## SINO-INDIAN DISPUTE

About China many Hon. Members have made suggestions. I am particularly unhappy that an Hon. Member from the opposition benches in his speech, which in parts I must say was admirable, tried to create an impression that while dealing with China we are adopting a posture, or that we are taking a line, which has created a misunderstanding in the minds of certain Afro-Asian countries. It is a pity that the Hon. Member should have entertained that feeling I cannot help him if this has caused a feeling in his mind or in the mind of some of the microscopic minority that he represents in the country, but we are in touch with the Afro-Asian countries and we are in touch even with the authors of the Colombo Proposals, and I think that there is no doubt left in the minds of these persons all of whom are not like-minded with us-you know who are the members of these Colombo Powers who evolved these proposals and it is felt that India has gone to the farthest limit to accept the Colombo Proposals.

The last move which was initiated by Shri Jawahalal Nehru that he was prepared to go to the negotiating table if the Chinese withdrew their posts from the demilitarised zone was a concession which, if I may add, is a concession in partial modification even of the Colombo Proposals which had envisaged the establishment of an equal number of posts by both sides. At any rate, that was the stand which we took. In spite of all that, for any person to say, much less for any Indian to say, that India is adopting an attitude which is not conciliatory or is intransigent is to say the least not justified at all and he should not really try to put that onus on us.

Now, we have taken a number of initiatives. If the lion. Member has the confidence of the

Chinese Government, may I ask him what initiative the Chinese have taken in this respect ? If they have taken none, then the onus is ...... cast upon them to take the initiative. (Interruptions) It is not always for me to take the initiative. We have taken all the initiative, and let us be quite clear in our mind that the honour and integrity of our country is a very, very dear thing to us and, no matter what happens, we cannot compromise on that issue. I would appeal to Hon. Members, from whatever political parties they might come, that on this issue let us try to hold on .... (Interruptions).

Whether he is leftist or rightist or centrist Communist, he is an Indian and he is a patriot. And I appeal to his sense of patriotism that on these issues we should take a view which does not embarrass us. May I remind him and certain other critics that their reaction is rather violent if something is said in relation to another country by people whom they do not like?

I am not one of those to be worried whether all these have come from the Hon. Member or from others in relation to Pakistan. Our policy in this respect is clear--I would appeal to them to revolve in their minds, not in the heat of controversy, not because of the temptation to score a debating point, as to what they are doing is in the national interest or not. I am sure that when they give dispassionate thought in a calm moment, they will agree with me that on issues like this we should adopt an attitude which should be above our party considerations and should have the national interest. It is also, I venture to add, in the overall international interest that we should not adopt an attitude which unnecessarily embarrasses us, although I want to take it absolutely clear that our stand will not be weakened by these poles, whether they are in one or the other direction. That does not mean that our effort to strive for finding a satisfactory solution will not continue. Even an Hon. Member has said that the Chinese people are our friends. as people in other countries. There should be a feeling of friendship between countries. There are these differences in which we feel that China is very much in the wrong and, therefore, we have to safeguard our interests, our honour and our national prestige.

#### INDO-PAKISTAN RELATIONS

In relation to Pakistan, I have not got much to add to what I have already said. It is our earnest desire to develop friendly relations so that the people of the two countries might be able to live in a friendly and neighbourly atmosphere. Unfortunately, we have not succeeded in our endeavours to develop the type of relationship that we have always been striving for even after independence. We will continue to follow the policy of settling, whatever may be the irritants between the two countries, whatever may be the points of difference between the two countries, by peaceful means. I know that this is a task which is not very easy but Indo-Pakistan amity is such a desirable objective that the undertaking of even the difficult task which requires a the patience to straighten out the complications that have arisen and the striving for a settlement of whatever may be the points of difference, will continue to be the guiding principle of our policy.

The House may recall that in the course of my talks with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, I had made an offer that India is prepared to enter into a No-War Pact. We have to remember that on many occasions Pakistan has been trying to point India as a country which is arming itself and it is made out as it we have any aggressive designs against anybody. Sometimes I feel amused when such insinuations are made. We have no design against any country. Our relations with most of our neighbours are so cordial and friendly. Even for Pakistan, when we had made this sincere offer that we were prepared to enter into a No-War Pact and we were prepared to settle all our differences whatever they might be, by peaceful means, well, that should really be a complete answer. But any suggestion or insinuation that India is trying to strengthen herself to do harm to any country is completely untrue. Well, that is a necessity and that is a responsibility which we cannot shirk because we have already suffered when the Chinese aggression took place. Therefore, it is very necessary that internally we should be strong economically and, to the best of our capacity, militarily, so that we might be able to defend our country. But that any country should have the slightest suspicion about our attitude is something which is wholly unjustified.

## INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION

An Hon. Member : With regard to the situation in Vietnam, I should like to know from the Hon. Minister as to why the Government is not agreeable to the suggestion that the International Control Commission should go into the allegations that have been made against Americans and others for violating the Geneva Agreement, as I pointed out, under its Article 12; it is quite within the ambit of the International Control Commission to go into this question.

External Affair's Minister: I will answer that very briefly. The International Control Commission is a creature of certain agreements. I will broadly call it a statute of nations, and it functions under those conditions. Now whatever comes within the purview of those agreements and according to the clauses of those agreements will be a matter which will be gone into by the International Control Commission. So it is not for me to give an interpretation as to whether a particular allegation or a particular complaint that is put forward before the Commission by one party or the other is within the purview of the International Control Commission or not. I have no doubt in my mind that undaunted by the conflict of views on this issue, the International Control Commission will continue to function in a very dispassionate manner, and whatever comes within its purview, it will certainly go into it and express its opinion in accordance with the proved facts when they come to light.

## COMMONWEALTH SECRETRAIAT

An Hon. Member: The Hon. Minister has not said anything about the objection to the establishment of a Commonwealth Secretariat. Would he kindly say something about that?

External Affairs Minister: The Commonwealth Secretariat is a matter which was discussed and I would be quite frank that the African countries particularly were very much in support of having some sort of Secretariat. Really a large number of them. That is the position. We are in a very, very preliminary stage. At official level some discussion will take place as to what should be the nature of that Secretariat. But I would like to clarify our own position that we will not like any Secretariat to function in any manner which might create a type of situation which was feared by my esteemed colleague. It will not function in an way either to provide any guide lines or any such thing in relation to this. The Hon. Member also expressed the fear that it might emerge as a bloc. We will see that the Secretariat, if and when it is set up, does not create a situation about which fears have been expressed. We are quite clear in our mind that this is an informal association, a loose-knit Commonwealth, and any attempt to formalise the relationship will not really be, in the long run, even in the interest of the cohesion in the Commonwealth. So we have taken note of the points that were urged and if and when any structure of the Commonwealth Secretariat emerges, we will keep in view the very valuable points that have been urged.

215

# CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA INDIA CHINA PAKISTAN SOUTH AFRICA GUINEA BURMA EGYPT SRI LANKA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND MALI

**Date** : Sep 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha opening the Debate on Foreign Affairs

Opening the debate on foreign affairs in the Lok Sabha on September 25, Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Sir, as this is the first occasion that I have the privilege of moving this motion before this august House, I would like to state at the outset the main elements of our foreign policy which guide and govern us in our relations with other countries, and in the role that we are called upon to play in international affairs generally and in the councils of nations. I can do no better than reiterate what our Prime Minister said in his broadcast to the nation on the 11th of June, 1964, about the basic principles of our foreign policy. These are : (1) we shall continue to seek friendship and develop our relations with all countries, irrespective of ideology of their political systems; (2) non-alignment and peaceful coexistence will continue to be the fundamental basis of our approach to world problems and our relations with other countries; (3) it will be our special endeavour to further strengthen our relations with neighbouring countries; (4) we shall continue to work for freedom of the peoples of Asia and Africa from colonial rule and we shall continue to collaborate with sister nations of Africa and Asia in the common cause of world peace and freedom of the people. As a member of the United Nations, we shall unflinchingly support that organisation for bringing peace and freedom to humanity .....

#### NON-ALIGNMENT

The House will notice that these five principles are those that have been consecrated as foundations of India's foreign policy ever since our independence. The architect of these and of the superstructure of foreign relations that has been built thereon was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It has been stated many times by our Prime Minister, and I would like to repeat it today, that the Government is determined to pursue steadfastly the policies of peace, non-alignment and peaceful co-existence which have been the sheet-anchor of our foreign policy.

These principles are good principles, not only because they accord with the traditions and the heritage of India but because they are based on righteousness and sound practical commonsense. They have stood the test of time and they have proved without any doubt to be best in our national interest.

Sir, the policy of non-alignment, though sematically described as a negative form, is a live and dynamic policy. It inspires and motivates friendly relations with all countries irrespective of their ideologies and social system. It brings nations together instead of dividing them. It acts as the mainspring of international cooperation and many time the active and practicable application of this policy in the United Nations has saved world peace.

In pursuit of our policy of developing friendly relations with all countries irrespective of their social or political systems it is my intention to pay visit to friendly countries in order to establish personal contacts with Heads of Governments of those countries and thus promote better understanding with them. To begin with, I have just completed visits to four of our closest neighbours, namely, Nepal, Afghanistan, Burma and Ceylon. In all these countries I found abundant friendship and warmth of feeling for India. This was immensely heartening and, if I may say so, I found these visits which were my first after my assumption of my responsibility for India's external affairs, most encouraging and instructive. I feel that these visits have contributed to further strengthening of our relations. The development of even closer and more cooperative relations on the basis of mutual understanding and benefit with our neighbours will continue to be our aim.

It is but natural that there should be problems, large and small, between neighbours. Such problems have to be resolved on the basis of mutual understanding. It is in the sense of good neighbourliness that any irritants in our relations with our neighbours, with whom we are bound by age-old historical and cultural ties, should be removed by friendly discussions. We are constantly endeavouring to do so and I believe that my personal contacts with the leaders of Governments of the countries that I have just visited would help to some extent in better understanding of each other's point of view and in the removal of some irritants.

I would not pretend to say that some of the problems which have attracted the attention of Hon. Members of the house have been resolved. I am referring in this connection to the problems faced by Indians departing from Burma or the problems of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon. We have begun earnest discussion in order to reach understanding and mutually satisfactory arrangements and I am hopeful that if we try to understand each other's point of view, we shall find honourable and equitable solutions to these problems.

#### NEPAL

As the House is aware, there is close economic cooperation between Nepal and India. We have been providing some technical assistance to Nepal. The Government of Nepal would wish to see the scope of such assistance further expanded and during my visit I assured them of our anxiety to do the utmost in this matter within the means and resources at our disposal. I further assured them that our technical and economic assistance to Nepal will be continued in the next Plan period.

An agreement for the construction of a road by us in Nepal, a new project, at a cost of Rs. 9.11 crores was sighted during my visit. We also agreed to construct two small roads and transmission lines for electric power. One or two other minor projects were also under consideration. We feel that our association with Nepal in a cooperative endeavour is a matter of privilege for us.

I might add here that we are not only providing to Nepal such assistance as we can, we are also receiving from them such assistance as they are in a position to give us.

#### **BURMA**

In Burma I had the privilege of meeting and having talks with General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Government of the Union of Burma. I was happy to find an excellent understanding of our position on various issues by the Burmese Government. During my visit. discussions were held both at the ministerial and the official level, in regard to the problems faced by Indian nationals who are leaving Burma because of the consequences of the Burmese Government's measures for nationalisation of trade and shops

#### 216

I would like to say here that the Burmese Government has adopted a policy of leading Burma to, what they call, the Burmese way of socialism and are making strenuous efforts to achieve their goal. What we want is that Indian nationals who have nothing useful to do further in Burma and who, because of the consequences of Burmese Government socialisation measures, are unable to continue in Burma should be able to leave in conditions of human dignity and self-respect and that reasonable facilities should be given to them for their departure.

The question of what has to happen to their assets is an important problem. Official discussions were held on this subject and we are hopeful of reasonable arrangements being arrived at. I was assured by the Burmese Government--and I accepted the assurance--with satisfaction-that the socialist measures that they had taken were entirely non-discriminatory.

The rapport that I was able to establish with the Foreign Minister of Burma and other dignitaries and our further meetings in the future will, I am sure, be extremely useful for promoting further understanding between the two countries and helping in the solution of the complicated problems that have arisen in connection with the mass departure of Indians in Burma. The Foreign Minister of Burma accepted my invitation to visit India at an early date and we are looking forward to his visit.

#### AFGHANISTAN

In Afghanistan I found a great friendship for India based on historical, religious and ethnic ties. The Afghan Government is engaged in a tremendous task of national building and economic development. I assured the Afghan Government that in this noble task we shall be very happy to extend our cooperation.

#### CEYLON

In Ceylon I had the privilege of discussing with the Ceylonese Prime Minister, Mr. Bandaranaike, the questions relating to the non-

etc.

aligned conference and other international problems of mutual interest. During these talks, we both agreed that every effort should be made to find an equitable and honourable solution to the problem of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon.

Our talks were followed by preliminary discussions at the official level between the Permanent Secretary of Ceylon and our Commonwealth Secretary on this question. This problem is a complex one and has hitherto defied solution in spite of several meetings between the Prime Ministers of the two countries.

The Prime Minister of Ceylon has done us the honour of agreeing to come to Delhi in the last week of October for talks with our Prime Minister. Her visits to India are always a source of great pleasure to us, and we are looking forward to her visit. We hope that with goodwill and understanding which exist in abundant measure between the Governments

#### 217

and the peoples in the two countries, the meeting between the two Prime Ministers will be successful.

## CHINA

The House would naturally wish to be informed about our relations with the other two of our close neighbours, namely China and Pakistan. I regret to inform the House that there has been no abatement of China's negative and intransigent attitude towards the Colombo proposals and her hostility and propaganda against us. While China pays lip-service to her desire for settlement with India and directs her propaganda towards convincing other countries of this, she continues her misrepresentation and propaganda against India, particularly in Asian and African countries.

The House is aware that there has been some correspondence between the Prime Ministers of Ceylon and India on the question of withdrawal of Chinese posts in the demilitarised area in Ladakh. Our stand on this question is clear and unambiguous. We have said that we are willing to regard the vacation of the seven Chinese posts in this area, should China undertake it, to be substantial compliance with the conditions set forth in the Colombo proposals. If China agrees to this we are willing to enter into negotiations with China in the manner envisaged in the Colombo proposals. We have thus gone to the farthest limit possible within the ambit of the Colombo proposals in order to enable negotiations to take place between the two countries.

The ball is now in China's court. China has to make up her mind and say whether she is agreeable to removing her posts in the demilitarised area in Ladakh.

Although the Prime Minister of Ceylon has preserved in her efforts to see the beginning of negotiations between the two countries under the aegis of the Colombo proposals-and here, I would like to nay a tribute to her sincerity of purpose and for all the efforts she is makinig--there is yet no indication from China of her willingness to withdraw her posts from the demilitarised zone. On the contrary, the officially-controlled Dress in China has taken the stand that it is China's internal affairs to set up civilian posts, and that no one can ask China to withdraw the posts from what they call China's own territory. The House is, of course, aware that what China calls its own territory is the 20 k.m. demilitarised area, which was seized by China during its massive military operations in the autumn of 1962. It is part of the 14.500 sq. miles of Indian territory illegally occupied by China. It was from this very same 20 k.m. belt that the Colombo Conference had asked China to withdraw its troops.

It is clear that the Chinese propaganda that while she is willing to go to the conference table, it is India which is refusing to do so, has no legs to stand upon. The whole history of the last two years is replete with instances of China's strategem of never agreeing to any suggestion and to trying to throw the blame on US.

#### COLOMBO PROPOSALS

I would like to repeat, as had been stated in this House many times over, that in consonance with our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, we are in favour of settling all differences by peaceful negotiations. It is for this reason that we accepted the Colombo proposals though they were not entirely to our liking, and we further accepted its slight modification which was suggested in Mrs. Bandaranaike's letter, namely that instead of an equal number of Indian and Chinese posts in the demilitarised area, the Chinese should remove their seven posts. But we shall not go to the conference table on Chinese terms and we shall never give up our rights in territory which was illegally and by force occupied by China. It is for China to give evidence of her sincerity to seek a settlement which she has singularly failed to do so far.

## PAKISTAN

As regards our relations with Pakistan, the House is no doubt aware of the various developments that have taken place during the last few months, which I need not repeat here. The period since the passing away of Prime Minister Nehru has been notable for public statements by President Ayub of his keen and sincere desire for Indo-Pakistan friendship. These sentiments have been reciprocated by our Prime Minister. It is our earnest desire to settle all our differences with Pakistan by mutual discussions and in a spirit of bourliness.

I feel that I shall be giving an unduly rosy picture if I did not inform the House that although there have been encouraging statements by the President of Pakistan, the Government--controlled press and radio in Pakistan and some Pakistani Government leaders have reverted to their previous propaganda line against India. This to our mind is unfortunate, since it might prevent the creation of an atmosphere in which the discussions between the representatives of the two Governments on various matters should have the maximum chance of success. The resumption of bitter propaganda against India also stands in the

#### 218

way of the calming of the situation which led to the unfortunate disturbances in Pakistan and India some months ago. Even today, an average of nearly 3000 refugees from East Pakistan are coming into India every day. Despite the assurance given by Pakistani leaders, evidently the minorities in Last Pakistan continue to feel a deep sense of insecurity. However, despite the unhelpful attitudes to which I have referred, we do, not wish to deviate from our course. We shall seek every opportunity of rapproachment with Pakistan and of finding solutions to our differences, which in essence are the legacy of the colonial era in our sub-continent.

The meeting of the Home Ministers is expected to be resumed in the later half of next month. As the House is aware, the Home Minister met in April last and had discussions on three issues, namely restoration of communal harmony, the question of refugees from East Pakistan and the question of eviction of Pakistani illicit immigrants and infiltrators from Assam and Tripura. Although the discussions at the April meeting did not lead to agreed conclusions, in our view, they were useful as they helped in understanding of each other's point of view. The meeting was held in a cordial atmosphere and had a calming effect on the communal situation. The meeting of the Home Ministers next month will resume the discussions from where they were left in April. The House will, I am sure, wish these talks success.

In pursuance of our policy of making use of every opportunity for discussions on the problems with Pakistan, with a view to arriving at understandings and agreements, I have accepted an invitation by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Owing to my preoccupations during the next few weeks here and in Cairo at the Non-Aligned Conference, I am not in a position to say when I shall be able to visit Pakistan, but I hope to do so as soon as possible. I hope the Pakistan Foreign Minister will approach the talks and discussions between us in the same spirit as I intend to do. I intend to go over the whole range of Indo-Pakistan discussions. I think our talks would be useful if we could explore ways and means of how to deal with the various problems and try to create a suitable atmosphere for the Summit talks between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India, which are likely to be held in the not too distant future.

The compulsions of geography, a common history and the community of culture demand that India and Pakistan should live as good neighbours. Towards achieving this objective, both India and Pakistan have to work sincerely and patiently. If that objective is kept steadfastly in view, I feel that we can make progress towards improving our relations and towards resolving our problems.

## LAOS AND VIETNAM

Mr. Speaker, Sir it is a matter of great regret to us that the picture of Asia, particularly south-East Asia, today is one of an area torn by conflicts and bitterness among Asian nations. Laos and Vietnam have been the scene of internal conflict for many years. There has been interference with these two countries of various kinds and from various quarters with the result that they have not been allowed to enjoy the fruits of their freedom in peace. The Geneva Agreement of 1954 in the case of Vietnam and of 1962 in the case of Laos were devised to bring internal peace and stability to Vietnam and Laos in an atmosphere of freedom from outside interference. These purposes have not been fulfilled. The International Control Commissions in both countries, of which India is Chairman, have recorded many violations of the agreements. In any case the spirit of agreements has not been observed and today Indo-China presents a grave danger-spot menacing international peace. We stand by the Geneva Agreement of 1962 in the case of Laos of which we were a signatory. We also uphold the Geneva Agreement of 1952 in respect of Vietnam, although we were not participants in the Geneva Conference on Indo-China in 1954. As Chairman of the International Control Commissions in Laos and Vietnam, we have an onerous responsibility. We have discharged the responsibility to the best of our capacity with impartiality and without fear or favour.

In regard to Laos, it is absolutely essential that there should be agreement between three main political factions in Laos. Without such an agreement, which hitherto has not come about there could be no solution of the Laotian problem. We consider that the best chance of sorting out the Laotian situation is to convene the 14-nation conference and as the House is aware, we have strongly supported the convening of such a conference which has been formally proposed by the Soviet Union. We hope that the impediments which still stand in the way of holding such a conference will disappear as a result of the talks that are going on in Paris.

In Vietnam the situation in some ways is much more complicated and dangerous from the point of view of world peace. The people of Vietnam today ate deeply divided. The Governments of North Vietnam and South Vietnam, have not only functioned in the last

#### 219

10 years separately and independently but have been locked in conflict with each other. Various factors--internal and external-have further complicated the situation. The Government of India do not wish to make ex-catherdra pronouncements on how the situation in Vietnam should be resolved. They are of the opinion that eventually political rather than military solutions will have to be found for the problem of Vietnam and we hope that the futility of a continuing conflict in Vietnam and the danger it presents of big power conflict will be realised by all concerned who should orient their thinking and actions towards a patient search for political solutions in Vietnam.

### GULF OF TONKIN

The incidents which took place in the Gulf of Tonkin some six weeks ago caused us deep concern to which we officially gave expression at that time. Fortunately, these have not led to a wider conflict. It is our sincere hope that here will be no escalation of conflict which would be disastrous for the peoples of South-East Asia.

## MALAYSIA

The conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia has greatly distressed us and I should tell the House frankly that like many other Asian countries of this region we are deeply embarrassed since we have had friendly relations with both Indonesia and Malaysia. We do not wish to go into the merits of the specific issues that are dividing Indonesia and Malaysia and to take sides. The differences between Indonesia and Malaysia, whatever they might be, should be settled at the conference table and there should be no resort to military means. Malaysia's solid support to India at the time of the Chinese attack has created a deep feeling of appreciation and gratitude in us.

## AFRICA

India's relations with African countries are based on our historical ties and our common experience of colonialism. We have always stood for the rights of colonial peoples to equality and independence. We have firmly declared this in the past and will continue to do so until the last vestige of colonialism is removed from that great continent. A major portion of Africa is now independent and we have established relations with 28 independent African States.

I would remind the House that there is happily already a great degree of affinity with these States in the pursuit of a common policy of nonalignment, promotion of international peace, anti-colonialism and anti-racialism. We have welcomed the formation of the Organisation of the African People's as a manifestation of the African people's desire for unity. We welcome the declaration by all members of the OAU of their adherence to the policy of nonalignment. It is our earnest desire to continue co-operation with the African nations as a means of promoting Afro-Asian unity.

One of the problems causing concern not only to the African people but indeed to all rightthinking people in the world, and which concern we wholly share, is the racialist policies of the Government of South Africa. The flagrant manner in which South Africa has violated the many United Nations resolutions amounts, as it does to a defiance of world opinion, on the question of apartheid, which policy, if pursued, cannot but escalate into an open conflict. In pursuance of the UN resolutions, we have already taken steps to impose an economic boycott on South Africa. Indeed, India's record has been a proud one in this respect. I would assure the House that we shall continue to support the just demands of the African people in South Africa for their political and economic emancipation.

## ANGOLA AND MOZAMBIQUE

Portuguese colonies in Africa present another problem and we have welcomed and support all that is being done by the Organisation of African Unity, to liberate these areas. The brutal repression of the people of Angola and Mozambique by the Portuguese authorities is a challenge to the conscience and will of the United Nations. It is the inalienable right of these people to freedom and independence. We urge the Portuguese government not to create tension and conflict by suppressing or resisting the just aspirations of these people. We also urge Portugal to respect her obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and direct her action and policy in accordance with the resolutions made by the world Organisation.

## SOUTHERN RHODESIA

The question of Southern Rhodesia was discussed during the recent Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference and it was agreed that an independence conference to which leaders of all parties of Southern Rhodesia may be invited should be convened, so that Southern Rhodesia should proceed to independence within the Commonwealth on the basis of majority rule. It was also agreed that to prepare the way for such a conference the government in Salisbury should release all detained African leaders. During recent talks that have taken place between the Prime Ministers of Britain and of Southern Rhodesia, an assurance has been given that the minority Government of Southern Rhodesia will not

#### 220

take any steps towards a unilateral declaration of independence. We have made it quite clear that India will not recognise any unilateral declaration of independence by the present minority Government of Southern Rhodesia.

Government have been taking active steps to promote economic and cultural ties with the independent African nations by the exchange of visits at all levels. We have demonstrated our readiness to share our experience in nationbuilding activities. Our universities and other educational institutions are open to African students and I am glad to say that a number of students are studying in Indian universities and institutions. It is also our intention to promote trade to our mutual benefit and to foster economic and technical collaboration by making available the services of technicians and experts. A delegation from India is now in Africa to explore possibilities of joint collaboration in the industrial field. I am confident that all these steps will pave the way to closer collaboration and understanding with our African brothers.

## WEST ASIA

India's relations with the Arab world have been close and cordial from historical times. There have been cultural and commercial exchanges between the Arab people and India continuously throughout the centuries. This historical affinity has found a new basis in the modem times, based on a common outlook on secularism and a desire to give economic content to the recently acquired political freedom. In the international field, the countries of West Asia are bound to us by our common policy of positive non-alignment, peaceful (co-existence and a passionate desire for promotion of world peace. We are also cooperating in the noble task of eradication of the remaining vestiges of colonialism and discrimination based on racialism

India has welcomed recent efforts of the Arab States to normalise their relations and to forge Arab unity. We welcomed the first Summit Conference of Arab Kings and Heads of State, held in Cairo in January this year as a right step towards achieveing Arab unity. This has been carried forward at the second Arab Summit Conference held recently in Alexandria.

Hon. Members know that India is in sympathy with the aspirations of the Arab people on the Palestine question. The Jordan waters' issue constitutes a source, of tension and friction in West Asia and it is a matter of concern that the Palestine problem still remains unresolved. In keeping with our traditional ties of friendship with the Arab countries, we haw supported the just claims of the Arab people in respect of the Jordan Waters issue and the rights of the Palestine refugees wishing to return to their homes.

In regard to Aden and the Protectorates of South Arabia, we stand for their independence with the least possible delay.

As a means of strengthening our existing cordial relations with the countries of West Asia frequent exchanges of visits are being promoted from both sides. The visit of our Vice-President to the Maghreb countries a few months ago brought better understanding of India's aims and objectives among the people of that area. The visits of two non-official delegations who made a goodwill tour of selected countries of West Asia and Africa brought home to the people there our secular approach to national and international problems. In this we are in tune with the Arab countries whose approach is also secular in character, as recently demonstrated by their stand on the Cyprus issue.

## NON-ALIGNED CONFERENCE IN CAIRO

The Prime Minister will be paying his first visit to the United Arab Republic in two weeks time. His visit to this friendly non-aligned country would further help to bring better under. standing and forge new bonds of friendship The Prime Minister's participation in the Nonaligned Nations' Conference to be held in Cairo would also be a landmark in demonstrating out adherence to the policy of positive non-alignment, which has contributed so much to strenthen the forces of world peace. The assembly of Heads of State and Government or their representatives from nearly 50 non-aligned nations would be an event of major significant in demonstrating the will of these countries to consolidate peace and to help eliminate causes of friction from the world scene.

## U. S. A.

We have a great deal in common with the United States of America sharing, as we do, out common belief in democratic principles, freedom of the individual and many other principles which have been enshrined in the constitutions of our two countries. Hon. Members will recall the spontaneous support received by India from the U. S. Government at the time of the Chinese attack in October, 1962. The United States continues to be the largest contributor of aid in various forms in India's development effort, More recently, the U.S. Government have rendered valuable assistance to relieve a difficult food situation.

#### U. S. S. R.

The willingness of the Soviet Union to give massive aid to India, necessary for the preserva-

#### 221

tion of our territorial integrity and for our economic and industrial progress, reveals the importance attached by the Soviet Union to friendship with India. The Soviet Government has recognised and endorsed India's efforts towards the maintenance of international peace. The Soviet Union has accepted the possition that the policy of non-alignment, to which India subscribes, is a valuable asset in the cause of world peace. She has given unstinted support to India on the Kashmir question in the United Nations, and has as well deplored Chinese aggression against India in October, 1962. She has upheld India's position on the Sino-Indian conflict and impressed upon China the need for settling the Sino-Indian border dispute in accordance with the Colombo proposals.

## EASTERN EUROPE

Hon. Members would agree with me that if a country or two is hostile to India in spite of our best efforts, we are more than compensated and encouraged by the massive support received from the others. When China suddenly attacked India in October, 1962, the great question arose, will the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, support China for ideological reasons? This was the moment of trial for our policy and before long the correctness of our stand was established. One after the other, the countries of Eastern Europe, Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia passed resolutions at successive party meetings, denouncing the Chinese action against India. These countries with whom we have built up strong trade and cultural ties over the years, stood by India. Our relations with the countries of Eastern Europe are thus important politically and it is a good thing that our policy over the years has come to emphasise increasing trade ties and cultural contacts with the countries of this region. Czechoslovakia has stood by use not only on the Sino-Indian border conflict but on the Kashmir question. With Yugoslavia, which has its historic differences with China and occupies a unique position amongst the socialist countries as well as amongst the non-aligned nations, we have exceedingly friendly relations.

The basic reason for the friendship of these countries for India is their appreciation of India's role in international affairs, which stands for peace and moderation. They have appreciated what late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had told western leaders, much before the events, that there would be a thaw in the cold war as there was genuine and sincere desire amongst the masses, both in the socialist countries as well as in the west, for preventing another war. India took a leading part in the disarmament negotiations and continues to do so, even though we are not a nuclear power. It was, therefore, in the fitness of things that we were one of the first to sign the Partial Test Ban Treaty after the nuclear powers, USA, USSR and Britain.

#### FRANCE

Amongst the western powers, France has come to occupy an increasingly important Position. Under the wise leadership of President deGaulle, France has not only given independence to Algeria, but there has been a miraculous development of French economy. France has been taking keen interest in South-East Asia and China, areas of vital interest to India; therefore, the growth of cordial and friendly relations between India and France is a welcome development.

#### CANADA

Canada is another Western power with which India has come to develop valuable and friendly relations. Canada has distinguished herself in the field of peace keeping operations and International Commissions, where India and Canada have found themselves together. Canadian help to India has been generous and valuable in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy and development projects. At the time of the Chinese aggression, Canada was one of the first countries to offer transport aircraft to India.

## LATIN AMERICA

Similarly, in Latin America, we have developed frinedly ties with Mexico, Bolivia, Chile, Brazil, Argentina and Cuba. There are good prospects of expanding India's trade in this area.

To sum up, therefore, the biggest achievement of our foreign policy is that we are not confined or shackled to one area or one bloc of countries. Basing our policy on certain recognised principles of international conduct, we have found increasing appreciation and support from an ever larger number of countries. We retain our flexibility, as well as strength.

Mr. Speaker, far-reaching changes are taking place in the field of international relations. The differences between the two blocs which had grown during many years, are not so acute now, and a new trend is developing in which many of these differences are losing their validity. Above all, the peoples of the world, no matter where they live, and which bloc they may belong to, are aware that in this age of thermonuclear weapons, outmoded dogmas and postures have little part to play. An encouraging development for world peace is the expanding area of agreement between the USA and the USSR. In the developing raproachement between these two great countries and supper powers lies the

#### 222

best hope of the death of the cold war, increasing mutual co-operation and world peace.

The policy of non-alignment of which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was father, and the efficacy of which had been questioned by many in the past, is new being acclaimed and accepted as a correct policy not only for India, but also for many other countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe. It is in this context that we cannot but view with disappointment, the bellicose attitude of the Government of the People's Republic of China which is bent upon ignoring the mainstream of world opinion and Pursuing a Policy which is fraught with grave danger to peace, Particularly in Asia where she is surrounded by Peaceful neighbours who have clearly no aggressive designs towards her. China has started a new kind of cold war and its advocacy of revolutionary wars in other countries and its near glorification of nuclear war is a most disturbing factor for world peace and understanding. It is my earnest hope that the leaders of China will see the error of their ways and re-shape their policies based on friendship, peace and co-operation.

INDIA USA AFGHANISTAN BURMA NEPAL CHINA PAKISTAN SRI LANKA EGYPT LAOS VIETNAM SWITZERLAND FRANCE MALAYSIA INDONESIA SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE PORTUGAL MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JORDAN CYPRUS BULGARIA HUNGARY NORWAY SLOVAKIA YUGOSLAVIA ALGERIA CANADA BOLIVIA CHILE MEXICO ARGENTINA BRAZIL CUBA **Date**: Sep 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on September 28, 1964, replying to the debate on Foreign Affairs,

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have had the privilege of listening to Hon. Members belonging, to different parties and the valuable criticism and appreciation that they have made about the international situation as also about some of the problems that immediately concern us in relation to our neighbours. If I may say in all humility, it has been a source of great education for me and, to a certain measure, a source of considerable encouragement.

I was entrusted this responsibility of looking after the external affairs of our country only about ten weeks ago. During this period I have been trying to understand the various facets and aspects of the international problem. I have also tried to study more closely some of the problems that face us in relation to our immediate neighbours. There are many Hon. Members here who have had opportunity to study this matter more closely and to be associated with the formulation of policies here as well as in the international forum to a much larger measure and they have got much greater experience. Though to some extent I have also been associated with certain specific issues in relation to some of the important matters that we, as a government, had to tackle during the last ten or twelve years. I did not have the privilege of studying more closely and more intimately some of the bigger international issues. Therefore this has been a very useful debate from my own point of view.

It is doubly so because it has come after some of the efforts that I recntly made in establishing contacts with our immediate neighbours. It is also important because it precedes another important international event, an event about which many Hon. Members from different sections of the House made a reference, namely, the non-aligned conference which is going to take place from the 5th October. Our Prime Minister will be leading the Indian delegation. Therefore it is a source of great satisfaction and encouragement that on both these issues there appeared to be a general consensus of opinion in favour of the steps that have been taken to establish more close relations with our neighbours. Also, the view points that have been expressed with certain different shades of emphasis about the objectives before the non-aligned conference and the part that we should play in that conference are very useful and I have derived very great benefit from these observations.

I had ventured to place a factual position about the international situation and I also put forward my appreciation on certain important aspects in my opening remarks. It is not my intention to go over the entire ground. I would be content to refer in reply to some of the important points that have been raised in the course of the discussion.

## NON-ALIGNMENT

The policy of non-alignment that we have pursued so far and for which there are certain eloquent advocates in almost all the sections of the house is a policy which has been evolved as a result of historical events and developments and it is a cardinal principle which we have followed and there appears to be near unanimity about the correctness of this policy (interruptions).

In reply to an Hon. Member, the External Affairs Minister said: While trying to explain

#### 223

this policy, he said that non-alignment should not mean this and that it should not mean that. It appears that the basic concept is not disputed by him. It is quite interesting that whereas an the one hand he has expressed some satisfaction of our country having received help in economic field as well as for strengthening our defence potential from countries belonging to different power blocs but, on the other, by queer reasoning ultimately he landed himself with this rather strange suggestion that we should enter into some defence alignments with the Western powers. It is hard to imagine that he should advocate that thing knowing fully well that that will be a sheer way of losing our sympathy in many respects of those who might be opposed to that power bloc or that defence alignment.

Let us not forget the help that we have been receiving in the economic field from socialist countries like the Soviet Union and other East European countries, particularly the Soviet Union. Let us not forget even the defence equipment that we got from the Soviet Union when we faced this danger of Chinese aggression. Let us not forget the very solid and consistent support that we have always received on. the question of Kashmir in the United Nations, in the Security Council and elsewhere.

Some Hon. Members there took some exception and wanted to argue that I need not have said that the test of the success of the non-alignment policy is, the happy experience that we have got of getting help from the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Germany and other countries who are regarded as members of one bloc and also from the Soviet Union and other countries. It is true that I should not cite that as the main reason for adopting that policy. But if by adopting a correct policy, you get a result which gives you the sympathy of the people of countries and of big powers who might be opposed to each other, then certainly that a reason which should be a source of satisfaction to us and not lightly brush it aside.

There were several Hon. Members, who, if I may say so, rightly stressed the importance of our own national interests in many respects. I concede that they are of the highest importance, and the ultimate test of any policy that we pursue even in the international field depends upon where it lands us in relation to other people in the world. (Interruptions)

Although this is also the correct policy and the right policy, if it has yielded results which are satisfactory to us and has enabled us to get support, sympathy and actual help from the two blocs, this should be a point which should not be lightly ignored, but we should try to give the correct weight to this important aspect.

It was the pursuit of that policy, I repeat which was the main reason, and the main point, which enabled us to get help from the two blocs, as I mentioned earlier.

#### CAIRO NON-ALIGNED CONFERENCE

As we shall be going to the Non-Aligned Conference, and the House has been generous enough, and all sections of the House have been generous enough to support the Indian Delegation. I would like to state very briefly the concept of non-alignment and the way we propose to tackle the various problems in the Cairo Conference.

We attach the highest importance to the work of the Cairo Conference. We are convinced that it will make a powerful contribution to the promotion of world peace and understanding. No less than 57 countries, according to present indications, will participate in the conference, 11 of them as observers. These countries hail from the continents of Asia, Africa, Europe and South America, and thus the conference will have a global character. The participants will be meeting not on the basis of geographical or regional associations, but on that of commonly held policies and principles. The policy of non-alignment which India was the first country to adopt, and consistently to follow, has won an increasingly large number of adherents. Whereas at the Belgrade Conference held in 1961, there were only 25 participating countries, now there will be 57 representing between them more than half the membership of the United Nations.

The aim of our delegation will be strongly to reaffirm the validity and relevance of the policy of non-alignment, particularly in the light of the changing world situation. We hope also to assist in the codification of the principles of peaceful co-exstence and to devise measures for the promotion of world peace by various means including disarmament and the strengthening of the United Nations Organisation.

We hope that the conference will raise its voice against the continuing evils colonialism and racial discrimination which must be speedily eradicated. The conference will also consider the vital question of economic development and co-operation, both between the developing countries and the more economically advanced countries as well as between the developing countries. We hope to play our due part in facilitating the task of the conference and are confident that the results achieved at Cairo will give a fresh dynamism and sense of purpose to the policy and practice of non-alignment.

### 224

#### COMMONWEALTH CONFERENCE

Having said that, I will now say a few words about some of the other points raised. Many Hon. Members have referred to the communiqe issued after the last Commonwealth conference. Some have even gone to the length of not formally suggesting but hinting that we should review our position and should seriously consider whether we should continue in the Commonwealth or not. (Interruptions)

There is the precedent, you know, of South Africa, which was there, which acted in a particular manner and had found its way out-it was baled out. Similarly any country that does not rise up to the occasion and does not react to the situation may find its continuance very difficult. As to whether if you push out everybody any remnant will be left or not is a matter on which you can form your own opinion....

The Commonwealth today is an expanding commonwealth. Its geographical area and range of different peoples that come within this association have increased from a few countries to 19, and before the end of the year, Zambia will be added to the list--As you know, Zambia will become a free country on the 24th October. We consider our membership of the Commonwealth --the House will recall that we decided on membership after a great deal of consideration in 1949-as a very useful means of contact with important countries in Asia, Africa, Europe and North America. It helps mutual understanding between important countries from different continents, and thus it is an association which promotes internal understanding.

Amongst the most attractive features of the commonwealth is the fact that it is not a bloc of states, nor does it lay down any binding obligation on members who retain their complete freedom of policy and action and their separate entity and individuality. We think in response to the changing times this features of the commonwealth would always be preserved in future.

We remember with gratitude the moral and material support we received from commonwealth countries at the time of the Chinese aggression against us, particularly from Australia, Canada, Malaysia, New Zealand and the UK.

A feature of the commonwealth is the periodic meetings of the Prime Ministers at which Prime Minister of commonwealth countries discuss the international situation and important issues of general commonwealth interest in complete frankness and freedom. These discussions have been found useful in the past. (Interruptions).

You might recall that three years ago a declaration on disarmament issued at the conclusion of the Prime Ministers' Conference was regarded as having made a certain contribution to a consideration of this question in the United Nations.

Specific matters relating to any member of the commonwealth, and any bilateral differences, are by convention barred from discussion at the

#### Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference.

An Hon. Member : Will he suggest that we being the biggest member of the Commonwealth, in future the meetings of the Commonwealth should take place in India ?

External Affairs Minister : It is a good suggestion. It the Commonwealth countries could agree, we will welcome them accordingly; we can even persuade them to do this.

An objection has been taken to a sentence in the communique that was issued. So far as this particular sentence in the communique is concerned, much has been said about this. The Prime Minister made a statement. The Finance Minister gave a press conference after he had returned. We should not, therefore, try unnecessarily to read into this sentence any implication that Kashmir was discussed. We had made the position absolutely clear that bilateral disputes between any member countries of the Commonwealth could not be discussed in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, and this mention of satisfaction about certain statements that had been made by President Ayub and Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri really should not be taken as, by any means, giving in on that principle. We hold strongly to the view that this cannot be discussed. We further made it absolutely clear that it was not actually discussed. Therefore, after that we should not continue unnecessarily to see any danger in this, because I would be quite frank in saying that this type of attitude does weaken our stand with regard to the basic scope of discussion in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference. When we have clearly put across our viewpoint, which is not seriously contradicted by any of the other members of the Commonwealth countries, we should not continue to hammer on this point again and again.

## INDIANS IN BURMA AND CEYLON

With regard to the visits to the neighbouring countries, many Hon. members have quite rightly drawn attention to the difficulties that are being experienced by persons of Indian origin in Burma and in Ceylon. I am fully conscious of the fact that my visit has not resulted in a solution of these problems. I have not claimed that, but what I do claim is that as a result of this, there is willingness on the part of the two Governments, and also on the part of the persons affected. to view the

### 225

problem in the light of the various difficulties and complexities of the situation. And it has also been agreed both between the Government of India and the Government of Ceylon, that this matter would be further discussed, that specific points that might be there would be discussed, and solutions acceptable to both parties and also to the persons concerned would be evolved.

An Hon. Member : This is not the first time that they have said that these matters should be discussed. They have been saying that times, without number, and we have also been saying like that.

External Affairs Minister : I know the Hon. Member can criticise anything but it is very interesting that he has himself not got anything constructive. How do we solve these matters except by discussing it with the Governments concerned ? Maybe, we had tried earlier and had not succeeded. I have myself said in my opening speech that this question has been the subjectmatter of discussion for several years. We have not succeeded in finding a satisfactory solution. That does not mean that we should give up hope. This is the only way of solving the problem. There is no other way. Therefore, we should give earnest consideration to this matter and try to understand the difficulties that might be faced by the country concerned and evolve a solution which may be acceptable to the Government of Ceylon and to the Government of India and also broadly acceptable to the concerned persons. . . (Interruptions).

An Hon. Member : I want to make only one suggestion. Will you please consult the leaders of people of Indian origin before placing your suggestions before Mrs. Bandaranaike ?

External Affairs Minister : I may inform the Hon. member that the leaders of people of Indian origin there did give me the honour of meeting me. They have given their viewpoint. It was a cross-section from the labour movement, the Chamber of Commerce and several other organizations. We will try to remain in touch with those people. I will appeal to the Hon. Members of this House that in a matter like this, let us not view it from any angle of our differences of a political nature amongst us; this is a matter in which all of us are equally interested in finding a satisfactory solution. Any suggestion which the Hon. Members may have would be most welcome to us.

I will be glad to be benefited by their advice in this respect.

My visit to Burma did convince me that the action that they have taken is not discriminatory and is not based on any racial consideration or based on the consideration that the persons concerned are of Indian origin or are Chinese or even Burmese. The steps that the Burmese Government have taken for taking over and nationalising the distributive trade with regard to many commodities is applicable to all traders irrespective of their nationality.

I am not averse to giving the correct picture, to the Hon. Members of the House. I think I will be failing in my duty if, with a desire merely to cater to some strong sentiment or even some wrong ideas that might have been created by unwarranted criticism, I do not explain the position. I intend to persevere to do my duty in giving the correct picture and it is my duty to point outexcept to say to the people who refused to accept anything-that there are many others in the country and also in the House who might have a different picture after knowing the correct state of affairs.

At any rate, there is disagreement on this. The point is that if in the pursuit of a policy which is non-discriminatory, we suffer, and others suffer, I do not mean that that is any mitigation or that is any solace to the people who suffer. That suffering is there, and it is precisely with that objective that we initiated some discussions and they are likely to be pursued. But we must understand the thing correctly and should not get unnecessarily angry or should not at any rate get a picture which is not quite fair. It is not quite fair to say that if I correctly enunciate before the House the policy which is enunciated or followed by other Governments and which runs counter to the sentiments which might be held by any section of the people or any leaders here,--it is very unfair to accuse me I am acting as a public relations officer for another country. In fact, it is the duty of the Foreign Minister to improve the relations between different countries and the relations round him, and to describe those relations correctly. It will be wrong to take a one-sided view in these matters.

An Hon. Member : We have not been told about the exodus of the Chinese from Burma or about the Indian exodus,--their numbers.

External Affairs Minister : It is a very pertinent question. I myself made some enquiries. The number of Chinese establishments that have been hit by this nationalization order is slightly less as compared to the Burmese establishments. Because most of them had been functioning there in private trade-it is very interesting-they want to go to Formosa. The Burmese Government have not got any diplomatic relations with Formosa and they are not sending them back. Some of them have left. The others are still there. But I would like to assure the Hon. Member that their approach to non-Burmese traders-and even Burmese traders-is precisely at par. There is no discrimination between Chinese traders and Indian

#### 226

traders on that score. If I may add-I will be quite frank with the House-that the Indians are coming here because we are prepared to take them in. The Chinese are not going back because they do not want to go to the mainland and Formosa probably is not prepared to take them. This is the hard fact that he should not read racial discrimination into that.

An Hon. Member : What about human rights ? Did we ask them to behave in a human manner towards these people ?

External Affairs Minister: If the Hon. Member has given even a part of his great intelligence to listening to what I said, he would have known that this is exactly the word I have used in my speech that there are human considerations involved and we should highlight them. We did highlight those human considerations. We have to take these human considerations into account in settling this matter. This matter has been approached precisely from that point of view.

## CHINA

In relation to China, I have very little to add to what I have already said. The various viewpoints that have been projected here appear to be more or less in consonance with the approach that we have made to this very vital matter, namely, having accepted the Colombo proposals, we have taken the initiative of creating conditions in which further steps visualised in the Colombo proposals could take place. Some bon. Member quoted a statement from Mr. Felix Bandaranaike. which he is said to have made in the Ceylonese Parliament. I did have occasion to discuss this matter both with the Prime Minister of Ceylon and with Mr. Felix Bandaranaike, when I was in Colombo. I explained our position with regard to that. Even as a result of my talks with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs and Defence, namely, Mr. Felix Bandaranaike, I did not get an impression that the Cevlonese had any evidence in their position to indicate that the Chinese had mentioned to them that they would be willing to withdraw from the seven posts in the Ladakh region. So, there the matter stands. We have taken all the steps that we could reasonably take to create an atmosphere for further steps of negotiation. But there is no response from China.

### PAKISTAN

In relation to Pakistan, several viewpoints have been expressed. On one side of the spectrum is the viewpoint which was put forward by some Hon. Members that we should go all out to effect some settlement with Pakistan. There was the extreme viewpoint presented on the other side that having regard to the way that Pakistan has been acting for quite sometime, there is very little chance of the two countries coming together and that we should adopt some other policy. I can well understand this divergence of opinion. But I think that all sections of the House appear to agree on the desirability of establishing good neighbourly relations between the two countries. Those who have expressed any doubt about this have done so on the premise that the situation is so bad that it is not possible and so it is not worth trying. But I would strongly urge before the House that dificult and complicated as the situation is, we should continue to do our best to improve the relations

between two neighbouring countries which have such common historical ties and common culture. It is true that the recent tendencies of the press there, even of certain Pakistan leaders, are not quite helpful, and sometimes one does get a feeling that the way they are approaching these difficult and complicated problems in a spirit which does not show tolerance and does not show understanding, does not create any confidence in the possibility of a satisfactory solution. But, having taken note of all these complexities, let us be quite clear in our mind that it is in the interest of peace, it is in the interest of both the countries, that we should try to settle, whatever may be the differences between the two countries, in a spirit of mutual goodwill, and to that extent we should try to explore all the possibilities of settling these by peaceful means, by talks and the like, and this is the policy which we intend to pursue.

#### LAOS AND VIETNAM

A mention has been made about Indo-China and South-East Asia. I have nothing much to add to what I have said already. The conference of the Laotian princes in Paris has not been quite a success, but it is hoped they will resume the talks either in Paris or elsewhere. After the Prime Minister Phouma has attended the Cairo conference we hope they will agree and the way will be clear for the 14-nation conference, for which we have always stood, because we feel that the solution of this problem of Laos is a matter which can be solved only by political approach.

The position in South Vietnam and North Vietnam is very very difficult and delicate and we do continue to hope about the outside influence of any type, whether it is pressurisation or physical presence of troops and the like, some method would be found to eliminate these outside influences and the way would be clear for a solution of this problem which is not subjected to pressures and pulls from outside.

## 227

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE JAPAN GERMANY EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA ZAMBIA AUSTRALIA CANADA MALAYSIA NEW ZEALAND UNITED KINGDOM BURMA CHINA SRI LANKA PAKISTAN LAOS VIETNAM

**Date** : Sep 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

#### IRELAND

#### President's speech at the Banquet in Dublin on September 22

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, paid a State visit to Ireland from September 21 to 25, 1964. Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Minister of State for External Affairs, accompanied the President as Minister-in-Waiting. On September 22, President Radhakrishnan gave a banquet in Dublin in honour of the Irish Leaders.

Proposing a toast to President de Valera, Dr. Radhakrishnan said :

Mr. President, Prime Minister and distinguished Friends : I should like to say how much we are indebted to President de Valera and his Government and people for the warm hospitality we have had these two days. There are so many things which bind our two countries past history and our future aspirations. Even the flags point out how very similar they are. There are many of our students who are working here and your Rotunda is famous for its speciality. Many of our students come here and undergo training in that hospital. There are others who are now doing work in your universities. Students in the Trinity College and the other place, the National University, also, you have them there and they profit by the experience and training which they get there and they are of great use when they come back to our country, if they come back. Some of them stay back here. That also happens. Then I should like to say how you are extending your help to us and how you are growing now much more international than hitherto. You want to build a library in the Trinity College and for that you have an Austrian architect. You are building your arts Colleges etc. and you have got a Pole for your architect, That shows that you are getting over all the limitations and working for the

coming thing, an international community, in which all our people make their particular contributions. It is said that Great Britain is famous for literature and politics, France for sculpture, painting, etc., Germany for music and metaphysics and Ireland for religion and monasticism. Tomorrow we are going to have a look at one of the monasteries of this place. Well, each country will contribute to the world's heritage so to say its own speciality, so that we all profit from the experiences of the different countries. When Christianity developed, it was a Jewish faith and entered into Greek and Roman environments. So you have the body which is Roman, the brain which is Greek and the soul which is Jewish. These three contributions give you a great Christian heritage today. The environment has become much wider than in those days. So you will profit from the spiritual environment of the whole world. You will read not only the classics of ancient Greece and Roman and Judaism but also read the classics of China. India and other countries.

So we are going into the stage, of world consciousness, world-mindedness and you are giving signs that you are entering into that stage. We are also getting there, and, therefore, we have much to learn from each other and in years to come our ties will become stronger and we will feel that Ireland and India are not so far apart as the physical distance makes out. But that they are very near to each other in their thought, in their experience and in their life. It is my pleasure now to ask you to drink to the health of President de Valera, the Irish Government and the people of Ireland :

## IRELAND USA AUSTRIA FRANCE GERMANY OMAN GREECE CHINA INDIA **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

IRELAND

REPLY BY IRISH PRIME MINISTER

Replying to the toast, the Irish Prime Minister, Mr. Sean Lemass said :

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : I know that you would all wish me to express again on your behalf as on behalf of the Government and people of this country the great pleasure which the visit of the President of India has given to us all. The President was good enough to refer to the many bonds and friendships which have in the past existed between India and Ireland and I know it will be a matter of satisfaction to him that he by his visit has added to and strengthened these bonds. We hope that down the years the similarities in our history, in our outlook upon life, in the purpose and objects of our political and social endeavour, will ensure that always Ireland and India will be found side by side, fighting the same battles for the same cause. We would like you, Sir, to take back to the Government of India and to all the 450 million people of your great democracy the sincere good wishes of the Irish people, our hopes that, as the years roll by, their problems will become less and that they will be able to fulfil adequately their manifest destiny in the world. I would ask you now, Ladies and Gentlemen, to rise with me for a toast to the President of India and people of India.

#### 228

IRELAND INDIA USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

## IRELAND

President's Speech at the Irish University

The President, Dr. Radhakrishnan was award-

ed an honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws by the National University of Ireland on September 22, 1964.

Replying to the citation read by Dr. Michael Tierney, Vice-Chancellor of the University, the President said :

Mr. Chancellor and Members of the Congregation :

Though it is not customary on such occasions to say anything in response to the conferment of a Degree, I think I owe it to the Chancellor and Members of the Senate to express to them my great gratitude for the honour and the distinction they have conferred on me by admitting me to the academic community of this great University, presided ever by your President. Many of your eminent teachers Eke Barkley, Burke, Bernard Shaw and Yeats made a significant impact on our life and thought. Almost all of them are religious men. Even Bernard Shaw, in spite of his opposition to dogmatic religion is called a healthen mystic believed in the living life force. In other words he did not wish to look upon the supreme as something inaccessible and aloof. In other words, each individual must regard himself as bath a solitary and a social being. He must have social awareness and responsibility. In addition to this, he must have privacy and individuality. The human individual is not to be regarded as a mere object among objects. He is a subject. The creativity springs from- within. He cannot think of himself as a mere item in a series of cosmic happenings. He must regard himself as something superior to these cosmic happenings, with the capacity to mould the environment in the manner in which he chooses to mould it. At a time like this, and we are living in a critical period of human history, the future depends not on cosmic happenings so much, but the way in which human decisions are taken. The free will of man has the capacity to bring about the kind of future which he desires to bring about. In other words, we must recognize the man is a subject. As Scripture says : "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God and the spirit of God dwelleth in you". it is that creative element that has to assert itself today, if the future is to be made safe for humanity. I thank you very much for the distinction you have conferred on me.

Introducing President Radhakrishnan to the distinguished gathering, Dr. Michael Tierney, Vice-Chancellor of the University, said :

It is to me personally, as I am sure to all members of the University, a matter of great pride and joy that we should have the opportunity to add the name of the President of India to the list of our Honorary Graduates. Eight years ago the late Jawaharlal Nehru honoured us by accepting our Honorary Doctorate of Laws. Today's ceremony gives us an opportunity for the renewal of a bond broken by that great Statesman's lamented death. The ties between Ireland and India are both very ancient and very new. Scholars have long been fascinated by certain similarities between the institutions of the Irish Celts and those of the Aryans of India. And of course the kinship between the Celtic and Indo-Aryan languages is well known. In modern times the sympathy between our small nation and the great eastern democracy has sprung from the parallel between their struggles for independence from the same foreign regime. Irish sympathy for India and India's sympathy for Ireland now reach back over the greater part of a century, and their mutual goodwill is no less strong because their object of freedom has in both cases been so far achieved. In the President of India, we, salute a man who has not only been one of his country's most distinguished representatives abroad, but also an eminent teacher and administrator. Dr. Radhakrishnan's name has been familiar in the world of learning since the publication of the first volume of his "Indian Philosophy" in 1920. The great reputation which that book brought him led to his many periods as Lecturer and Professor in the United States and at the University of Oxford where he held the famous spalding Professorship of Eastern Religions from 1936 to 1952. In 1938 he was elected Fellow of the British Academy and was chosen to deliver its annual master mind lecture which was later published under the title Gautama, the Buddha. In 1931 Dr. Radhakrishnan was appointed Vice-Chancellor of Andhra University and in 1939 Vice-Chancellor of Banaras University where he also held the Sir Savaji Rao Chair of Indian Culture and Philosophy. He headed the Indian Delegation to UNESCO from 1946 to 1950, and in 1949 was elected Chairman of that Organisation. In 1948 he relinquished his Vice-Chancellorship to become Chairman of the University Education Commission, and from 1949 to 1952 he served as Indian Ambassador to the Soviet Union. From 1952 to 1957 he was Vice President of India, and from 1957 to 1962 served a second term during which he travelled extensively in Asia, Europe and America. He has been President of India since May 1962. On September 5 last, his seventysixth birthday was celebrated throughout India as Teachers Day. The Prime. Minister. Mr. Shastri, remarked on the appropriateness of this celebration as the birthday of the foremost

### 229

teacher of India. Our Honorary Doctorate is but the latest of many high distinctions which have been conferred upon him in his own and other countries. We all hope that, as an earnest of ancient friendship between our two countries and as a sign of our esteem for his great personal achievements, it may not be the least acceptable.

IRELAND USA INDIA

**Date** : Sep 01, 1964

### Volume No

### 1995

#### IRELAND

President's Television Broadcast

In a broadcast on Telefis Eireann on September 25, 1964 to the people of Ireland, the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan spoke of the strong ties which linked Ireland and India and the deep religious feelings of the people of the two countries.

Paying tributes to the Irish President, Dr. Radhakrishnan said that Dr. De Valera represented the spirit of Ireland. He embodied in himself the struggle and the achievements of freedom. He was a teacher, scholar, strategist, prisoner, Prime Minister and President of the country. He embodied the ethos of Ireland. Political freedom was not entire until it was supported by good economic progress, and Dr. De Valera had done his best to harness the natural resources and apply science and technology to the development of industry and the increase of agricultural output.

Besides these things, the President said, there was also the cultural revival the great representatives of the cultural renaissance of Ireland. Yeats, Bernard Shaw, George Moore and others electrified the people by stirring the souls and capturing the imagination. They gave to the people of Ireland the spirit by which they struggled and sacrificed a great deal for the purpose of obtaining political freedom. History was fitful and fluctuating. There were ups and downs, halting and discouraging moments, frustrations and set-backs, periods of anxiety, gloom and grief, but one had to bear up one's spirit through all these things before it was possible to achieve the goal.

"We are separated by a long distance in space from Ireland," said the Indian President." Yet, we passed through similar experiences, we had our struggle for achieving political freedom. We bad the fortune of being guided by one who was essentially a religious man and who asked us to adopt peaceful methods, avoid deceit, cunning and violence.

"We are also happy that in a large measure we implemented the ideals of our leader, Gandhi, and succeeded in achieving freedom. Now we are engaged in the task of raising the living standards of our people. Our soldiers have been working side by side in the Congo and other places. That also has brought about a kind of solidarity so far as our ideals, practices and aspirations are concerned.

"We have so much in common a community of ideals, memories of the past and hope of the future-these are things which bind our two nations together and I am certain that our relations will grow stronger in days to come.

"There is one point which binds us all-the Irish and the Indian-strong religious feeling. We are a religious minded people and so the Irish.

Religion does not mean merely dogmatic conformity or ceremonial piety. It means a sense of awareness in one's own mind and compassion for the outside world. The pursuit of truth and the practice of love-these are the essential marks of • religious mind".

"It is the religious mind which does not become a slave to circumstances, which is not overpowered by the tyranny of time, which is able to transcend time and at the same time transform time.

"The greatest civilisations of the world were the products of this religious spirit. They have passed away whenever they became enslaved by circumstances, whenever they were overcome by the fear and tyranny of what surrounds them.

"People have spoken about religion in different ways, but the true religion is one where the individual is able to deepen his own sense of awareness and extend the objects of his compassion. If these two things are there, then a man can be regarded as religious.

"There are several factors which have bound the world together today. There is an aspiration for establishing of a community of nationsa community in which small nations and big nations all find some sense of security. The small nations must feel safe and the big nations must feel that they are there to practise justice and generosity so far as other nations are concerned.

"We both are working in the United Nations for the achievement of these great ideals, so whether it is past or future we take into account, there are many things which bind us together, and it is my earnest hope that it will be possible for

### 230

us to work in a larger spirit of cooperation for the unity of mankind. That I hope will bring our two nations together.

"I am glad that myself and the members of my party have had very interesting and memorable experiences in this country in these two days. We will be here for another two days and we have no doubt that we shall enjoy our time and remember for a long time to come what this country has offered us."

### **Volume No**

1995

IRELAND

Joint Communique on President's Visit

The following is the text of a joint communique issued on September 25, 1964, at the conclusion of President Radhakrishnan's visit to Ireland :

At the invitation of the President and the Government of Ireland, the President of the Republic of India Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, accompanied by Mrs. Lakshmi N. Menon, Minister of State for External Affairs, and officials of the Government of India, paid a State visit to Ireland from 21 to 25 September 1964. Dr. Radhakrishnan was the guest of the President and Mrs. De Valera during his stay in Dublin.

The President of Ireland warmly welcomed President Radhakrishnan not only as head of the great Indian people but as a great philosopher and scholar and as one of the closest associates of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru in India's great struggle for freedom. He expressed the sympathy of the Irish people with the people of India in their sorrow at the passing away of Mr. Nehru. The President of India expressed his great pleasure at meeting President De Valera whose services in the cause of freedom have become legendary throughout the world and who is a cherished figure in India.

During his stay in Ireland the President of India had discussions on international problems with the Prime Minister, Mr. Sean Lemass, and the Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Frank Aiken, of Ireland. They welcomed the Agreement partially banning the testing of nuclear weapons signed by both India and Ireland and considered it to be the first step towards bringing about international control of nuclear weapons. They expressed support for the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of world peace and recalled with satisfaction the close co-operation between Indian and Irish contingents in the U.N. operations in the Congo under extremely difficult and trying circumstances. The President of India expressed his appreciation to the Government and people of Ireland for the spontaneous expression of sympathy and support to India at the time of the aggression by China against India in 1962.

In the course of their broad review of the international situation, the leaders touched upon the problem of Indo-Pakistan relations. They welcomed the prospect of direct talks and negotiations at various levels between the representatives of India and Pakistan which are aimed at seeking solutions of their problems and promoting friendly and neighbourly relations. The Prime Minister of Ireland expressed the hope that Indo-Pakistan differences including those on Kashmir would be solved through direct negotiations between India and Pakistan.

Adverting to the recent appointment of Ambassador Warnock as Ireland's first Ambassador to India, it was agreed that the closest possible relations would be maintained and developed between the two countries. In particular it was agreed that trade and cultural relations should be pursued with all possible vigour. It was emphasised that the two countries had a vital interest in co-operating in their common objective of keeping peace in the world and in developing the resources of mankind for the welfare of all peoples. This cooperation springs naturally from the common memories of both countries and their dedication to democracy and the rights of man.

The President of India expressed his appreciation of the warm and cordial reception accorded to him and His party. He extended invitations to the President and Mrs. De Valera, the Prime Minister and Mrs. Lemass, and the Minister for External Affairs and Mrs. Aiken, to visit India. The invitations were accepted and the President, the Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs of Ireland agreed to visit India at a time suitable to both governments.

# IRELAND USA INDIA CONGO CHINA PAKISTAN **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

LEBANON

Indo-Lebanese Air Agreement Signed

An agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Lebanon relating to air services was signed in Beirut on September 19, 1964. Shri I. S. Chopra, Ambassador of India signed on behalf of the-Government of India, and Mr. Fouad Ammoun, Minister of Foreign Affairs, signed on behalf of the Government of Lebanon.

Air-India at present operates 3 services per week through Beirut to London/New York in each direction and Middle East Airlines, the Lebanese airline, operates two services per week to Bombay. The air services by the two airlines which are being operated under temporary authorisations granted by the two Governments would now be placed on a formal basis with the coming into force of the Air Agreement.

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

LEBANON INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### NEPAL

#### Indo-Nepalese Postal Agreements Signed

Three agreements relating to the exchange of letter, insured and parcel post between India and Nepal were signed in New Delhi on September 8, 1964. The agreements will come into force from April 13, 1965, after ratification by the two Governments.

The agreements were signed on behalf of the Government of Nepal by H.E. Shree Yadunath Khanal, Nepalese Ambassador to India, and on behalf of the Government of India by Shri Maheshwar Dayal, Member, P. & T. Board. Negotiations for these agreements began in New Delhi on August 31, 1964. The negotiations concluded on September 8, 1964 in an. atmosphere of great cordiality and friendliness between the two delegations.

Prior to April 1959, when the provisions of the Universal Postal Convention came into force in Nepal, postal services between India and Nepal were regulated under a bilateral agreement of 1936. This agreement provided for the exchange of only unregistered correspondence between the two countries.

From 1959, Nepal has developed her own international letter post service. Other services like insurance and parcel facilities were provided for Nepali citizens by the Indian Embassy Post Office at Kathmandu.

232

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date** : Sep 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

UGANDA

A Memorandum of Agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Uganda on collaboration for the development of sugar industry in Uganda was signed in Kampala on September 18, 1964. Shri D. S. Joshi, Secretary of the Union Ministry of Commerce and leader of the Indian delegation, signed the Agreement on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. A. A. Nekyon, Minister of Planning and Community Development of Uganda, signed on behalf of his country.

The following is the text of the communique issued after the signing of the Agreement

The Government of Uganda and the Government of India today signed the Memorandum of Agreement on collaboration between the two Governments for the development of sugar industry in Uganda. This followed discussions this week between an Indian delegation led by Mr. D. S. Joshi and the Minister of Planning and Community Development, Mr. A. A. Nekyon, the Minister of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Mr. M. M. Ngobi and officials of the Uganda Government- The discussions were held in a spirit of utmost cordiality and mutual understanding. During the talks the Uganda Government having regard to the favourable conditions for sugar production in Uganda and the extent of the potential market both for increased internal consumption and for exports, state their intention of establishing additional sugar manufacturing capacity of about 100,000 tons per annum. The Indian delegation, on behalf of the Government of India, expressed their willingness to collaborate with the Uganda Government in achieving this objective.

Under the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement, Indian participation in the industry will be in the form of sugar machinery manufactured in India and materials for factory building from India. They will also instal machinery and operate factories and estates. A Sugar Development Corporation will be established in Uganda which will directly own these factories and estates. The total investment required will be determined when the precise location of the estates has been decided and also the financial structure of the Sugar Development Corporation. Indian participation in the equity capital of the Corporation will be 45 per cent. The balance of 55 per cent will be shared by the Uganda Government and private Uganda investors in the proportion of 45 : 10. The Board of Directors of the Corporation will be in these proportions.

The Memorandum of Agreement also provides that the Indian side will arrange for training in India of Ugandans for managerial and technical posts in the sugar industry. It is intended that at least ninety per cent of the employees in the industry will be Ugandan with the ultimate objective of having the project wholly staffed by Ugandan nationals. However, in order that the Sugar Development Corporation can draw upon the experience and knowledge of the Indian side, they will continue as General Manager for six years after the commencement of sugar production.

The Indian side will also arrange for such feasibility and project studies of the proposed sites as may now be necessary for the four factories and estates envisaged. Both the parties will meet at frequent intervals to ensure that the project proceeds with all possible speed.

UGANDA USA INDIA RUSSIA

**Date** : Sep 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President's State Visit to Soviet Union

At the invitation of the President of the USSR, the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, visited the Soviet Union from September 11 to September 19, 1964. On September 11, a State banquet was held in his honour by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR at the Kremlin

### 233

Palace, Moscow.

Speaking on the occasion, President Radhakrishnan said :

President Mr. Mikoyan, Chairman of the Council of Ministers Mr. Khrushchev, and friends :

Members of my Party, and I myself, are greatly impressed by the warmth of reception and lavish hospitality of this banquet today. Some of us who have been here previously noted with great satisfaction the developments that are taking place in the life and thought of Soviet people. The enthusiasm of people in the streets today has been immense and the way in which the Soviet people go about in the streets in a fearless manner is itself an indication of the progress that has been achieved in these years. When I was India's Ambassador in 1949-52, your people with great energy and determination were repairing the damage which the Soviet people suffered in the Second World War. This process is still going on. Today I was shown the beautiful Leninski Prospekt and the huge buildings there. AU this is an indication, that the construction work which started then after the Second World War is still in the process of building up cities, factories and farms. And now, perhaps, you are the greatest country in Europe. As your people suffered 20 million casualties and 1/3 of your country was overrun in the Second War, you cannot think without compunction the possibilities of a third war. You are, therefore, addressing yourself to the task of avoiding war and securing peace in the world.

Your great leader Lenin in 1918 said that the hazards of war will bring unheard of calamities to workers and peasants. Therefore, we must approach this problem of war in the most cautious and circumspect manner. He said this at a time when the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb were still not developed, and were not part of the military technology. Today the dangers of war are much greater. It is easy to say that we should avoid war, but we must secure measures that will make for peace. The greatest obstacles to peace are imperialism and racialism. Many empires, Britain, France, Belgium and Netherlands have been liquidated practically. But there are still some others who still think they can continue and are still clinging to the vestigts of imperialism. If they do not listen to the voice history, other forces will take over and will dismantle them. There are still some other States where racial oppression has become the law of the land. Whatever may be the pigment of the skin or the country of our origin, the physical make up and the mental make up, humanity is all the same. East and West must join together and work for the establishment of peace in the world. Even though many nations have been liberated, they are still suffering from general impediments--poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, etc. It is not enough to become free, we must cleanse our-selves of the physical and psychological impediments which thwart our progress. We are all struggling hard to get rid of these inflictions which led to stunted growth and development.

In this process of freeing ourselves, not merely from political subjugation, nut from economic and social backwardness, your example is an inspiring one. Today literacy is widespread here, men and women enjoy equal social status, so much so that even in space travel your women contributed as much as your men. You are rightly proud of your technological achievements and social fabric.

You, Mr. President referred to the works of some Indian writers having been translated into the languages of the Soviet Union. That shows that your horizons are widened and you want to understand the hopes and aspirations of other peoples of the world and their culture. That means you are psychologically preparing to bring about world peace. You referred, Mr. President, to the growing intellectual, cultural and spiritual qualities of the life of the Soviet people. That gives us great satisfaction that you are not merely interested in bringing about material requirements of intellectual people but you are interested in the making of the whole man-his body, mind and spirit. All these things have to be developed.

I am sure, you, Mr. President and Mr. Chairman, can rest assured that our policy in the matter of foreign relations is not one of negative and passive existence but one of active, fruitful and dynamic cooperation among the peoples of the world. We have existed for centuries, we must learn to love and create and not to hate and destroy. Peace is the greatest prize we are to win in our generation and no concession is too great for the achievement of this great ideal. I can assure the Soviet leaders and the Soviet people of the basic friendliness of Indian people and we appreciate friendliness and it is my earnest hope that friendly relations between our two Countries grow stronger and closer. You, Mr. President, and you, Mr. Chairman, will be welcomed any time you choose to visit our country. I can assure you that our policy will remain and continues to remain as it has been in the last many years.

The President then proposed a toast to the health of Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, USSR, Mr. A. I. Mikoyan, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, USSR, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, to Indo-Soviet friendship and to world peace.

### 234

USA RUSSIA INDIA BELGIUM FRANCE **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President's Speech at the Luncheon in Moscow on September 12

The President, Dr. Radhakrishnan made the following speech at the Luncheon he gave in honour of the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, USSR, on September 12, 1964 : President Mr. Mikoyan, Chairman of the Council of Ministers Mr. Khrushchev, and friends :

We are happy to have the Soviet leaders with us today. I have seen with my own eyes how they have the respect and affection of their people and they are not feared but are trusted and loved. One of our ancient writers said : A stable state is where the interests of the rulers and the ruled are one and not different". Here the standards of living have been raised steadily and we can see before us all symbols of the prosperous path which the Soviet State has taken. There are many nations in the world who are suffering from poverty and disease but there is enough in the world to go round if properly channelised and distributed. We are trying to abolish within the State disparity between gross wealth and grinding poverty. Similarly among States there are some very prosperous and some are poor and backward. Those who look upon the world as a single unit consider it as their task --as their international duty and obligation-to help others. This has been realised by more developed countries such as the Soviet Union.

We have received considerable assistance in our industrial and cultural development from you. This is shown by the continued effective assistance which you have extended to us industrially, scientifically and culturally. We are grateful to you for this help and for the assurance about its further continuance. Equal and fair distribution of wealth and opportunities are essential for stability and peace in the world. The problems facing us in this nuclear age is one of survival through happiness and friendliness. The only other alternative is annihilation through nuclear destruction. As there is a biological instinct which makes the individual survive so should there be an instinct to preserve humanity as a whole in this world. Even at considerable discomfort to ourselves we must try to build up a world which will be a home for happy life of the entire humanity.

Our two countries are committed to this. Both of us are interested in preserving peace and seeing a world where people will be happy. This can be achieved as there are all the possibilities and resources for it so long as we take a human approach to the problems facing human beings. We are not so afraid of the destructive forces of nature but more of the nature of man. What we need more is discipline of mind, education of heart and mind. So much binds both of our countries both nationally and internationally, I am sure both will cooperate and work for peace and happiness of humanity. May I request you to drink a toast to the health and happiness of the Soviet leaders and the Soviet people and to Indo-Soviet friendship and peace.

RUSSIA USA

Date : Sep 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President's Speech at Indian Ambassador's Reception

The Indian Ambassador to the USSR, Shri T. N. Kaul, gave a reception in honour of the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, in Moscow on September 17, 1964. The Soviet President, Mr. Mikoyan, and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Mr. Khrushchev, were among those present at the function.

Speaking, on the occasion, the President said:

President Mikoyan, Mr. Khrushchev, Friends.

In the last few days I experienced the warmth of the feelings which the people of Soviet Union have for the Indian people. I was here first in the years 1949-52, then I came in 1956. This is my third visit. I have noticed all through significant changes not only in agriculture, industry, medicine, health and education, but also in the mental climate of the people of Soviet Union. I have seen that a free, easy and relaxed atmosphere prevails here. And these tendencies, T have no doubt, will go on increasing in the years to come. This is because education is a liberator and not an enslaver.

The help which you are giving us in our industrial development is appreciated a great deal and I must say that it is such kind of help that will assist nations which are developing to go faster to their goals.

We are living at a crucial stage in human history when the future of the world is at stake on account of spectacular nuclear developments. The

### 235

world must unite or it will perish. The past history of the world gives us hope that it will be possible for us to reach our goal of unity of mankind.

There was a time when tribes and clans fought with each other and had private armies. They reached a stage when nations developed and power became concentrated in a central authority. The private armies were disbanded.

Nations suffered from internal unrest and turmoil when there was racial and religious persecution and economic disparity. Later, nations combined together and educated their citizens in a community of ideals and purposes so that they had a sense of belonging to one home.

Today there are three things essential for peace throughout the world. First is the centralisation of authority, establishment of law and judiciary and the disbandment of private armies. Second is the removal of sources of unrest due to economic, racial and religious exploitation. Third is the development of a community of ideals and purposes which combine all the citizens together and make them feel that they belong to one home. If an international community, a world community is to be ushered, these things are essential. Each nation will have to surrender a part of its sovereignty for the purpose of this collective sovereignty in the international community itself. Economic distress from which some nations suffer, racial persecution and religious exclusiveness, and fanaticism which prevails in some countries will have to be removed if nations are to cooperate in the furtherance of this world community. And finally, all the nations, by cultural exchanges, by study of the classics of others, will have to develop a corporate sense that all belong to one and are merely limbs of one body, that we are members of a family of free nations. What you are doing in India is by way of assisting us to develop so far as our economy is concerned. By the exchange of cultural relations and also by adhering to that goal of one international community, you are helping us in one small way in one region to become members of this world community.

You, Mr. Khrushchev, by your support of the United Nations, by your resolve that no resort to arms should be taken up for the settlement of border disputes and that there should be a Universal Police Force, are looking into the future, looking for peace to come. Removal of poverty from every part of the world, industrial development and adherence to peace, these are principles which you, Mr. Khrushchev, have advocated. These are the ideals for which we wish to stand. for peace against war, for disarmament against nuclear arms, for tolerance against extreme fanaticism for the avoidance of every kind of extreme in this world which would merely result in a. catastrophe.

We are fortunate that the great Powers have at their head people of moderate views and liberal and human outlook. We must take hold of this opportunity, use all the resources of the nations for the purpose of establishing peace on earth and friendly relations between each other. The Soviet Union and India stand for these ideals. We heartily cooperate with you in the realisation of these great tasks.

INDIA USA RUSSIA PERU **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President's Television Speech in Moscow

The following is the text of a speech made by the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan on the Moscow Television on September 18, 1964 :

Dear friends, I am delighted to be here again. Thanks to the kind invitation of the Soviet authorities, President Mikoyan and Chairman Khrushchev. The members of my party and myself have had very warm reception wherever we went in the country. We had very fruitful talks with the Soviet leaders, especially President Mikoyan and Chairman Khrushchev and we have profited from these discussions. The discussions were fair, friendly and frank.

Change is a characteristic of all living societies and your society has had many changes in its long history, especially in the last 40 and odd years. In restrospect the 1917 Revolution seemed to have an inevitability about it. The Government was absolutist, the Church was corrupt, widespread miseries round about and defeat and devastation in the first world war. All these things brought about disruptive changes in your society. At such a time Lenin appeared on the scene and gave a purpose to your life. But your affairs were not smooth even then. You had a civil war and intervention by foreign nations who tried to strangle the new State at its very birth.

You were attacked in 1941. There was not a family which did not lose a husband, a father or a son. Naturally your People were anxious for peace and wished to avoid war. Your desire for peace and your proposals for disarmament have had the backing of your great leaders.

#### 236

In a series of articles entitled "Can Europe disarm" Engels wrote. It was written 70 years ago. He writes : "It is 25 years already that all Europe has been arming on an unprecedent scale. Each great Power endeavours to outstrip the other country in military might and prepares for war. Germany, France and Russia do their utmost to surpass one another. Is it not stupid to talk of disarmament under such circumstances ?" He says "I maintain that disarmament and thereby a guarantee for peace is possible This is what Engels said 70 years, ago. Lenin, as far back as 1918, pointed out that a world war in which mighty achievements of technology are used with such great energy for the mass extermination of human life, apart from being a major catastrophe can also lead to undermining the very foundation of human society.

All this was said at a time when nuclear weapons were not part of military technology. There were occasions. when we praised war and said that participation in a war was an ennobling experience. Today, the scientists tell us that a thermo-nuclear war will destroy all human civilization. If, by chance, any people are left behind they will be subject to such dreadful diseases that they would rather be dead than alive. In these circumstances war is sheer madness. Many sensible leaders of the world recognise this fact and are doing their very best to prevent war.

The suspicion of the Western nations caused by their intervention in the early years of the Revolution has gradually ceased because of greater knowledge and experience of these nations.

On the 5th August last year 109 States signed the treaty of the partial banning of nuclear tests. On the last day of the last year Mr. Khrushchev proposed that we should renounce war or resort to arms for the settlement of border disputes. He has recently proposed a Universal Peace Force.

The two greatest obstacles to peace in this world happen to be colonialism and racialism and Mr. Khrushchev in the United Nations General Assembly proposed that colonialism should be liquidated as soon as possible. The United Nations has condemned every attempt at racial discrimination. If we are to build a world without arms, a world of peace, fellowship of nations, this can only be on the basis of three fundamental principles-political freedom for all, economic opportunities for all, and creative freedom for all.

Nations are here to help one another. It is selfishness, it is indolence, it is inertia, it is perverse fastidiousness to make nations look upon themselves as close entities. Such a kind of perverse nationalism and chauvinism which makes us look upon neighbours as aliens has no justification. Nothing human is alien.

The Soviet Union, in recent years, is placing great emphasis on intellectual, artistic, and spiritual values. Freedom of thought is the nerve centre, so to say, of every kind of higher life, intellectual and artistic. And as I look around, I find a great intellectual freedom, a greater intellectual cooperation and a greater cultural unification taking place in the Soviet Union and other countries of the world. We must make the world safe for diversity, for peace, for cultural cooperation and for international understanding. The Soviet Union has assisted us in developing our industry and our economy. But more than all this we are united in our pursuit of peace and cooperation among the nations of the world. Our two nations are committed to the great task of building a world order based on the concept of law and the principles of justice. We are convinced that these principles will prevail and the world will enter into a new stage of peaceful cooperation.

### RUSSIA USA FRANCE GERMANY

**Date** : Sep 01, 1964

### Volume No

### 1995

#### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President's Speech at Kremlin Reception

The President Dr. Radhakrishnan made the following Speech at a civic reception held in his honour in the Kremlin on the 18th September, 1964 :

Mr. Mayor. Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, and dear friends,

I am delighted to hear from the representatives of various organisations expressions of goodwill and friendship for India. Moscow city celebrated its 800th anniversary in 1947. Such a city where leaders of the Government, representatives of workers, those connected with international friendship and students of universities get together to talk on these topics of great interest, namely, equality, the dignity of human beings and peace in the world is historic in itself. Would it have been possible to conceive of such a meeting at any time in the previous history of the city of Moscow ? That itself is an indication of the great progress which this city has made. Here are people assembled together, each one feeling pride in his participation in building up a new country, a new city. That is what you have been

### 237

doing. That itself is a matter for congratulations. I give you my very best wishes for the future progress of the city of Moscow and also congratulate you on what you have already accomplished.

Your President of the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship is a great lady who came here and talked about the equality of man and woman. You have established equality between men and women not only on land below but in space above. When your cosmonauts, one of whom is a lady, came to India we were thrilled by the exploits of which they were capable. With the exploits of the cosmonauts, we think that there is nothing that we cannot do if we exercise our minds, to fully use the ability of human beings. One thing that all modern accomplishments demonstrate is that there is no man superior to others. All are equal. Every man and woman must be given proper training and equality of opportunity. That is what we are doing in our country also.

I should like to say in this connection that in our country we are also taking a few steps in advance. So far as our women are concerned we have women Ministers, one of whom is here today. We have women Governors, women Ambassadors. There is no disparity for women; any woman can rise to the top of the profession of politics or public life or industry. That is one thing we have done.

When the second World War ended, we entered into cold war. There were people who were telling us that we must contain each other or repel each other or destroy each other or frighten each other. These stages of deterrence, containment and frightening one another are over. We have come to the conclusion that if mankind is to survive, there is no other way open than the way of peaceful co-existence and friendly cooperation among the nations of the world. That is the conclusion which sensible people in all parts of the world have arrived at. To this development, your Chairman Khrushchev has made great contributions.

Your President in his speech today narrated several problems in the world, several regions of the world, which are torn by strife even by violence. These people are not adopting the same policy of co-existence, of talking to each other, of understanding each other's grievances and trying to come to a peaceful settlement about them. There is violence, there are grievances etc. But my great faith is in the quality of human hope and patience. We should never give room to despair, we should never lose hope or patience. I am sure that your Chairman, Mr. Khrushchev, he will. I have every hope, not give way to deshe will, I have every hope, not give way to despair, he will never lose MM he will never give up patience. He will strive to the utmost of his ability to settle tam problems in as peaceful a mariner as possible.

The very devastating character of nuclear developments which have now become a part of military armory and military strategy is itself the greatest deterrent to war. This is what is preventing us from entering into an abyss. We go to the brink but then we withdraw. We do not enter or lad or slide into the abyss. Why is this 7 because we are ail conscious of the complete destructive nature of nuclear warfare. If thermonuclear weapons are to be used, there will be no We left behind. it is not this nation that wins or that nation, but it is humanity that will be destroyed ultimately. If human nature has any kind of resilience, it will resist this.

When I had the opportunity of speaking to the American Senate, almost 10 years ago, exactly to the day, I said : "Given the healing power of time, the resilience of human nature, the mutability of social mentality to institutions, and above all the good nature of common sense, the will of Providence, so to say, the differences that divide us today will assume a purely academic character in another ten years". I said that in 1954. In 1964 we have come to realise that these differences must be settled at a conference table. We must try to understand each other, try to find out what the difficulties are. After all, the human nature is the same wherever it may be, under whatever skin you may find it. The human nature being the same, the human ambitions, the human aspirations, the human ideals---they are also the same.

When you look at the vast progress of history, when you take into account how much progress we have made since the beginning of history down till today, there was a time when tribes were fighting each other, the time when cities were fighting with each other, times when nations were fighting with each other, we have come to a time when there are two great blocs, so to say, that will turn into one bloc. This is the unification of humanity, that is the one goal towards which the whole world is moving. It is an obvious lesson of history. If we heed to the caution of history, we will never go about saying that the world belongs to me and it does not belong to the other. It belongs to every one of us. The world has enough room for accommodating all people of all pursuasions. When we talk about co-existence, it does not mean that the oppressors and the oppressed should live together. It does not mean that the aggrieved and the aggressors should live together. We will do our utmost, we will do our very best to help the oppressed to redeem themselves from the oppression. We will help them to the best of our ability to get out

#### 238

of political, domination of other peoples, to get out of racial exploitation, to get out of economic exploitation. We will do our utmost to help our brother man and look upon him not as an alien but as a member of the human family. The world is to be regarded as one family and we are striving towards the achievement of that goal.

Once upon a time western civilization was built on Greek thought, Christian faith and Roman organisation. Today the whole world has become our environment. The heritage of each one of us is the cultural heritage of all the people. Here in this country people are studying the classics of the East. In our country we are studying the classics of the West. So the kind of environment that is growing today is an environment where all the classics of all the peoples constitute the common heritage of the common people of all the countries of the world. That is what it is coming to.

The student representing the university reported facts that Indian classics are studied there, Indian films are shown there, Indian students mix with other students. Similarly, a situation will arise when students of other nations will also do it. Here in this ball you have representatives not only of the Republics of the Soviet Union, Union Republics and Autonomous Republics, but also other countries of the world. We learn from one another and there is nothing which we cannot learn from other people. Every one has some genius about him if we are able to understand it. There is no one who deserves to be tossed so to say into the rubbish heap of humanity. There are no such people in this world. You have given dignity to the human being, you have raised him from a kind of position in which he was not treated with sufficient respect. And here the leaders, your political leaders, and the common workers and the common students, and people from the Asian Republics as well as the other once backward Republics are all getting together to work together, to build something up. In a context like this what we should attempt to do is to develop human solidarity, solidarity through mind and heart, through the cultivation of our emotions, through the education of our heart.

Each one of us will have to realise that we are all the same, made of the same stock. Physically, psychologically, morally and spiritually we are the same. We have the same kind of common hunger for food, for intellectual nourishment, desire for beauty and also aspirations to build a better world than the world in which we happen to be. There are these common ideals which bind us together and therefore we must look upon our neighbours, all those who are in need, who require our help, our assistance, as truly our neighbours. There are no aliens at all. In this great spirit your country has been assisting us in our economy, in progress towards the raising of living standards of our masses. The worker representative of the machine-builders, who came and spoke here today, referred to Ranchi and Bhilai and said they were making the instruments, the equipment necessary for our development. Similarly, when I was in Leningrad I was told the generators, electric generators for our country are being produced in Leningrad. In Armenia I was told they were preparing stock for our country's development. In other words, the ties between our two countries are getting closer and they are getting stronger. And I have no doubt that these ties, that are not merely industrial but also cultural in their character, will grow stronger in years to come.

I am assured that your great leaders look upon our troubles, our suffering as their own troubles, as their own sufferings, and they are trying to do their utmost to bring the two nations closer together. For this great help which they are rendering to us we are indebted to them. And I was assured by your leaders during the talks which I have had with them that the help which they have been giving us will continue hereafter also so that our country could depend on the effective material assistance of the Soviet Union and cultural assistance also. It is my earnest hope that our relations might get closer togetherand our two countries might be perpetually bound to each other in bonds of friendship. This is my deep conviction.

# USA RUSSIA INDIA OMAN ARMENIA **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

### Volume No

1995

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Joint Communique

At the conclusion of President Radhakrishnan's State visit to the USSR, the following joint communique was issued in Moscow on September 19, 1964 :

At the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR

Supreme Soviet, the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, visited the Soviet Union from 11 to 19 September 1964.

The President of India was accompanied by the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Mrs. Lakshmi N. Menon, the Secretary to the President, Mr. S. Dutt, and the Director

#### 239

of the Historical Division in the Ministry of External Affairs, Dr, S. Gopal.

During their stay in the Soviet Union, the President of India and his party visited, apart from Moscow, the capital of the USSR, the cities of Leningrad, Yerevan and Yalta, and saw a number of scientific and cultural establishments. They studied various aspects of the life of the great Soviet people and their work and achievements in the fields of economy, science, culture, health and the arts.

In Moscow and other cities of the Soviet Union, the President of India and his party met and talked with workers, scientists and other intellectuals. Everywhere they went they received a most cordial welcome and hospitality and expressions of the sincere friendship and warmth of the Soviet people towards the great Indian people.

The President of India attended a mass rally of Soviet-Indian friendship in the Kremlin. The rally, which was addressed by the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Mr. A. I. Mikoyan, and the President of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, was a striking demonstration of Soviet-Indian friendship.

During his stay in the Soviet Union, the President of India had full and friendly talks with the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev. There were also talks with the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Mr. A. I. Mikoyan.

During the talks which took place in an atmosphere of mutual friendship and cordiality, there was an exchange of views on various important international issues and on matters pertaining to further development of Soviet-Indian relations and mutually advantageous cooperation. The two sides affirmed with satisfaction that, in spite of local conflicts in various parts of the world, there had been a general relaxation of tension in international relations, because of the influence of the forces of peace and democracy. They welcome, in this context the Moscow Treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, the achievement of agreement between the Governments of the USSR and the United States not to place in orbit objects carrying nuclear weapons and the agreed decision to reduce the production of fissionable materials for military purposes.

The two sides felt that the implementation of these measures would facilitate the further improvement of relations between States on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence. They agreed that there exists now a Teat possibility for the solution of international disputes by peaceful means through negotiation.

The talks affirmed that the Soviet Union and India held a similar position on many basic problems facing the world. The development of Soviet-Indian relations on the basis of the principles of equality and mutual benefit and respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty is a striking example of the successful implementation of the policy of peaceful co-existence of State with different political and social systems.

Aware of the pressing need for an active effort for the radical improvement of the international situation and the consolidation of peace, the two sides expressed their firm resolve to spare no effort in the quest for ways to achieve a prompt solution of international issues, eliminate the peril of thermo-nuclear war and guarantee a stable peace.

In this connection the President of India expressed the high appreciation by the Government and people of India of the assiduous efforts of the Soviet Government and its Head, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, in the struggle for the maintenance and consolidation of peace, and in particular of the outstanding role of the Soviet Union in the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty partially banning the testing of nuclear weapons. The two sides reaffirmed their conviction that territorial disputes between States should be solved by peaceful methods. The Indian side welcomed the proposal of Mr. N. S. Khrushchev of 31st December 1963 for the conclusion of an international agreement that States should refrain from the use of force in the solution of their territorial and border disputes, and should pay due regard to historically formed boundaries.

The two sides reaffirmed their unshakable conviction that the policy of peaceful co-existence of States with different political and social systems is today the sole alternative to a devastating thermo-nuclear war. Both sides welcomed the growing recognition in the world of the policy of non-alignment with military blocs, pursued by most of the developing nations in Asia and Africa. They also welcomed the conference of non-aligned countries which is to be held shortly in the expectation that it would help in promoting peaceful and friendly cooperation among nations and in facilitating settlement of international problems.

The two sides gave their support to the forthcoming Afro-Asian conference and hoped that it would lead to strengthening the unity and solidarity of the African and Asian countries in the struggle for peace and for the liquidation of colonialism.

The two sides expressed concern over the fact that such fundamental questions as the problem of general and complete disarmament, a peaceful settlement of the German problem and the problem of the final elimination of the remnants

### 240

of the colonial system, still remain unresolved. The solution of these problems requires the persistent efforts of all peace-loving States and peoples.

An identity of views was re-affirmed by the two sides on the need to implement general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. The two sides declared, in particular that as Members of the 18 Nations Committee for Disarmament, the Governments of India and the Soviet Union will spare no effort to promote in the discussions at Geneva the elaboration of concrete measures which would enable a start to be made on the implementation of disarmament and the release of funds for peaceful construction, including economic aid to the developing nations.

The two sides attach importance to partial agreements which would facilitate and draw nearer the achievement of the paramount goal of general and complete disarmament. These would be, in the first instance, such measures as the withdrawal or at least a considerable reduction of foreign troops on territories of other countries, the dismantling of foreign military bases, the promotion of de-nuclearised zones in various parts of the world and the achievement of agreements banning underground nuclear tests and on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Sincerely striving towards a peaceful settlement of all acute international issues and towards the betterment on that basis of relations between States, the Soviet Union and India believe that in the interests of a stable peace there is a particular need for growing efforts aimed at eliminating the vestiges of the Second World War by the attainment of a peaceful settlement of the German problem. The Soviet side believed that the signing of a German Peace Treaty and the transformation on that basis of West Berlin into a demilitarized free city could, under present conditions, be a turning point in the improvement of the entire international situation. The Indian side reiterated the statement of the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in the Joint Communique issued at Moscow on 11 September 1961 that while tat present the fact of the existence of two German States could not be ignored and any attempt to change the frontiers would have dangerous consequences, there was an imperative need for finding a peaceful solution of the German problem by negotiation among all parties concerned.

The two sides agreed that the United Nations has an important role to play in promoting international cooperation. They reaffirmed the determination of their two countries to continue efforts for the further strengthening of the United Nations with the fuller participation in all its organs of all the countries, particularly of Asia and Africa.

The two sides reaffirmed their loyalty tot the

decisions of the United Nations and other international organisations which envisage the need to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism and imperialism and to grant independence to all countries and peoples under foreign domination with a view to achieving their liberation from all forms of colonialism and imperialism. They expressed their full support for the just struggles for freedom in all parts of the world, particularly in Asia and Africa, and they demand freedom and independence without delay for the peoples of all countries under foreign domination.

The two sides condemned the policy of racial discrimination which is being pursued by the Government of the Republic of South Africa and regard the policy of Apartheid as a crime against humanity. This policy is in complete contradiction of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights. The two sides call upon States that have not yet implemented the United Nations decision with regard to the Republic of South Africa to cease their cooperation with the Government of South Africa in order to compel it to grant legitimate rights to the whole population of that country.

The two sides gave particular consideration to recent developments in South East Asia. They expressed concern at the aggravation of the situation in this area and hoped that the problems of South East Asia would be resolved peacefully in the interests of the peoples of these areas.

The two sides agreed that there should be no interference by foreign powers in the internal affairs of the Congo.

The Soviet side declared its full support of the struggle of the Cuban people for strengthening the independence and sovereignty of their mother-land.

The Soviet side expressed its high appreciation of the desire of the Indian people for peace and of their policy of peaceful co-existence and nonalignment to which the outstanding statesman of our times. the late Prime Minister of India. Jawaharlal Nehru, dedicated so much effort and energy. The Soviet side noted with gratification that India was the first country, after the three initial signatories, to sign the Moscow Treaty partially banning the testing of nuclear weapons. The Soviet side welcomed the fact that the new Government of India continue to pursue the policy of Jawaharlal Nehru. which is the policy of non-alignment and friendship with the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries.

Both sides were happy to note the steady development of friendly relations and the many ties between India and the Soviet Union in economic, cultural, scientific and technical matters,

#### 241

which have greatly benefited the peoples of the two countries and the cause of the consolidation of peace. The development of economic and technical cooperation between India and the Soviet Union, which will complete a decade in 1965, is a matter of particular satisfaction to both sides.

The President of India emphasised the great significance of the comprehensive cooperation of the Soviet Union in the development of the national economy and the building of New India. The Soviet side declared its intention to continue and develop Soviet-Indian cooperation and confirmed its readiness to assist in the construction of the Bokaro metallurgical Plant.

The two sides reaffirmed that meetings and personal contacts between statesmen and public figures are of great importance for the development of friendly relations between India and the Soviet Union. The present visit of the President of India had proved very important in this connection. The Soviet side stated that it looked forward greatly to the visit of the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

The President of India expressed his high appreciation of the friendly reception accorded to him and his party in the Soviet Union and stated that he, the Government and the people of India, would welcome a visit to their country by the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Mr. A. I. Mikoyan, and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev. Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Khrushchev accepted the invitation and promised to visit India at a convenient date.

USA RUSSIA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND GERMANY SOUTH AFRICA

# Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Cultural Contract Signed

In pursuance of the Cultural Exchange Programme between India and the U.S.S.R. for the year 1964-65, a contract was signed in New Delhi on September, 21, 1964 between the Union Ministry of Education and 'Technoexport' for securing the services of 16 Soviet professors in the fields of Engineering and Technology for work in Indian Universities and other Institutions of higher learning.

The contract was signed by Shri R. K. Kapur, Joint Educational Adviser on behalf of the Ministry of Education and by Mr. Pavel S. Besolov, Acting Counsellor for Economic Affairs in the Embassy of the USSR in India, and Mr. Filchenkov on behalf of the 'Technoexport'.

The experts will stay in India for a period of one to three years each.

INDIA USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Agreement for Collaboration in Science and Technology Signed

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on September 7, 1964 between the Governments of India and the U.A.R. for close collaboration between the two countries in the fields of science and technology. Shri M. C. Chagla, Union Minister of Education, signed on behalf of the Government of India and the U.A.R. Minister of Scientific Research, Mr. Ahmed Riad Torky, signed on behalf of the Government of the U.A.R.

A supplement to the Cultural Agreement of 1958, the present agreement provides for exchange of scientists and technologists, their placemerit for research and training and financial obligations of the two Governments on a mutual and reciprocal basis.

The other important provisions of the Agreement include grant of fellowships to scientists and advanced students of technology, import and export of scientific equipment and exchange of literature and publications between scientific documentation centres, libraries and museums in India and the U.A.R.

#### 242

With a view to giving effective shape to the collaboration programme, a Joint Scientific Board would be set up. The Vice-President of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Government of India, and the U.A.R. Minister of Scientific Research will be the presidents of the Board in alternate years. The board, which will meet once a year, will have a limited number of scientists and technologists from both the countries in equal proportion.

# INDIA USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on September 21, 1964 between His Excellency Dr. Abdul Moneim el-Kaissouni, Vice Prime Minister of U.A.R., and Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of Commerce, Government of India, providing for economic, industrial and technical collaboration in certain fields like production of fertilizers and superfine cotton yam, the supply of rock phosphate on a long-term basis from U.A.R., and the export of mining equipment, spinning machinery and steel structurals from India to meet the requirements of Egyptian industries, railways and electrical and other departments.

The two Ministers also agreed on the vast scope for collaboration between India and U.A.R. for jointly establishing industrial projects in other developing countries and for extending joint cooperation in the industrial and developmental projects and in the construction of high-ways, bridges and transport and communication systems in developing countries which would like to have such cooperation. It is expected that separate delegations from U.A.R. and India will examine these proposals shortly.

For the last twelve days, a trade delegation from U.A.R.. led by His Excellency Mr. Hussein Khalid Hamdi, Under Secretary of State, Ministry of Economy-and Foreign Trade, had also been holding talks with an Indian team on the possibilities of expanding the trade between U.A.R. and India and diversification of this trade as well as the possibilities for economic, industrial and technical collaboration between the two countries. The Indian Delegation was led by Shri D.S. Joshi, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, Government of India. The discussions were held in an atmosphere of frankness and cordiality and complete understanding had been reached on all points discussed by the two sides. Letters were exchanged today by the leaders of the two delegations setting out the agreed conclusions reached on the trade plan between the two countries for the years 1966-67.

The letters exchanged contain agreed trade proposals envisaging a total turnover of about Rs. 450 million between the two countries in the current wear. i.e. Rs. 225 million each way. Besides tea and jute goods, numerous engineering and chemical products and new items Re cotton yarn, coco-cola concentrates, tissue paper and reinforced steel bars have found a place in the list of goods to be exported by India to U.A.R. Likewise, besides Egyptian cotton, rice and rockphosphate, new products like fertilizers, mazout, flax and printing paper will be exported by U.A.R. to India. Both sides have agreed to examine the possibility of introducing more new items and have accordingly left sufficient scope for the same in the agreement reached.

The volume of trade between India and U.A.R. was of the value of Rs. 250 million in 1963-64 i.e. Rs. 125 million each way. As a result of the agreement signed today, the trade will go up to Rs. 225 million each way in the current year. Actual trade targets for the year 1965-66 will be determined in December this year.

243

INDIA USA EGYPT **Date** : Sep 01, 1964

# October

# Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs RecordOct 01, 1964Vol. XOCTOBERNo. 10

CONTENTS

PAGE

CAIRO CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED NATIONS Prime Minister's Speech at the Working Session 245 Prime Minister's Speech at the Closing Session 248 Cairo Declaration 249 CEYLON Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Mrs. Bandaranaike 261 Reply by Mrs. Bandaranaike 261 Joint Communique 261 Agreement on Future of Persons of Indian Origin in Ceylon 263 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY Agreement on Capital Investments Signed 265 HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation on National Solidarity Day 265 Prime Minister's Message to the Armed Forces on National Solidarity Day 267 INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS President's U. N. Day Broadcast 267 **UNESCO** Shri M. C. Chagla's Address to the General Conference 269 UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC Joint Communique on Prime Minister's Visit to Cairo 272 MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA EGYPT INDIA GERMANY

**Date** : Oct 01, 1964

# Volume No

## CAIRO CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED NATIONS

#### Prime Minister's Speech at the Working Session

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following speech at the Non-aligned Nations Conference in Cairo on October 7, 1964 :

Mr. Chairman, Your Majesties, Your Excellencies and Friends,

We are meeting in this celebrated capital of a historic land. It is our esteemed friend, President Gamal Abdel Nasser, who, together with President Tito and Prime Minister Sirimavo Bandaranaike, took the welcome initiative which has brought us all to Cairo from the four corners of the globe. May 1, Sir, express our grateful thanks to President Nasser for the excellence of the arrangements and the warm and generous hospitality extended to us. In my own case I have had the honour of being a guest of the U.A.R. Government for three days prior to the Conference and I have been deeply moved and touched by the warmth and friendliness shown by the people of this country.

Many of my distinguished colleagues have referred feelingly to the passing away of one of the founding fathers of non-aligned movement, namely, our late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. His departure has left an aching void in the hearts of not only his own countrymen but also in those of all peace-loving peoples of the world. There is perhaps not one of us who does not miss his presence in this Conference, to whose aims and aspirations he had contributed so much.. His voice, alas, is silent, but his message will continue to inspire all those striving for peace, international understanding, and freedom and dignity of man.

Mr. Chairman, being for the first time on African soil I cannot but recall that it was at the southern end of this vast continent that our great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, first developed his philosophy and technique of non-violent struggle which he first deployed against racialism in South Africa. He perfected this later in his own country into a vast non-violent national movement against imperialism. And, finally, when communal passions ran high in the cruel aftermath of partition, by his martyrdom at the hands of a coreligionist in the cause of his Muslim brethren, he upheld with his very life the ideal of secularism.

With his departure, Jawaharlal Nehru took up the thread and as the Prime Minister of India strove to the end to apply these ideals on still wider plane. He sought democracy and a new social order and the promotion and maintenance of peace not only for his own country but for the whole world. Though Jawaharlalji is no longer with us, the Government and people of India stand dedicated to freedom and peace, to the principle of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence, and to the eradication of racialism and colonialism.

Even in the days of our own freedom struggle, Jawaharlal Nehru had raised the question of the freedom of the African peoples. He had said about a quarter of a century ago that Africa would emerge one day as a new force on the world scene. How truly that prophecy has been fulfilled. Africa which had been kept in bondage for more than a century is on the march, determined to fulfil its destiny. We have no doubt that whatever remnants of colonialism remain would soon disappear.

It is indeed a unique gathering that we have here. What unites us and brings us together is not any pact, not any alliance, not even a common allegiance to any particular dogma or doctrine. By being non-aligned, we have asserted and proclaimed the right to think for ourselves and to speak for ourselves. Our voice is not an echo. it is the authentic voice of the people we represent and for whom we speak. And we and our people share and agree upon certain ideal-, and certain objectives. First and foremost, we believe in peace in the settlement of all disputes through peaceful means, in the abolition of war, and, more particularly, nuclear war. Secondly, we believe in freedom. freedom for the people of each country to follow their destiny without external interference. And, above all, we believe in the dignity of man as an individual whatever

his race, colour or creed, and his right to better. fuller and richer life.

## 245

The Non-aligned nations have the supreme task to chalk out in the light of the latest developments in the world, a programme of action which should be followed in the pursuit of their common objectives. Time has now come to formulate positive programme in the furtherance of peace. The main elements in the programme, in our view, should be the following five points; (1) Nuclear Disarmament; (2) Peaceful settlement of border disputes; (3) Freedom from foreign domination, aggression, subversion and racial discrimination; (4) Acceleration of economic development through international cooperation; (5) Full support for United Nations and its programmes for peace and development.

First and foremost, there is the programme of nuclear disarmament. We note with satisfaction that there has been a measure of agreement, however limited, at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. When the conference resumes its sessions, we would all hope and wish for a further progress and we, the non-aligned countries, should continue to play a helpful role in promoting agreement, towards total nuclear disarmament. It is important to realise that mere limitation of tests, proclamation of certain areas as being free from nuclear weapons, and any other limited measures of this character, will not and cannot suffice to protect humanity from the horrors of a nuclear war. Nuclear disarmament must be total and complete and it is in that direction that we must move.

We cannot but express our serious concern at the fact that not all powers have agreed to subscribe to the partial Test Ban Treaty. Nonaligned nations must take clear and forthright attitude in calling upon all the nations of the world to accept the ban on nuclear tests and our full moral force must be brought to bear on those countries which refuse to subscribe to the partial nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Many of those assembled here might recall how strongly the first Non-aligned Nations Conference at Belgrade felt on the subject of nuclear tests and how separate missions were sent to the U.S.A. and to the U.S.S.R. to persuade them to desist from further tests. With this background in mind this Conference should consider the recent disturbing indications which suggest that China is about to explode nuclear device. I would propose that we might consider sending a special mission to persuade China to desist from developing nuclear weapons. I say this not because India and China have their differences today. These differences must sooner or later be resolved. But the threat to humanity from one more country having nuclear weapons at its disposal is a far more serious matter. We in India stand committed to the use of nuclear power only for peaceful purposes and, even though in purely technical and scientific sense, we have capability of developing nuclear weapons, our scientists and technicians are under firm orders not to make a single experiment, not to perfect a single device which is not needed for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Despite all our differences, may I venture to take this opportunity of appealing through this Conference to China to accept a similar discipline.

My second point relates to the peaceful settlement of border disputes. While the cold war had abated somewhat, yet all too often fighting breaks out in different parts of the world because neighbours have boundary disputes. We should welcome the proposals made by Chairman Khrusbchev and other Heads of Government on the renunciation of the use of force for solving territorial disputes or questions of frontiers. At the recent meeting of the Organisation of African Unity, African States have pledged themselves to respect borders existing on their achievement of national independence. This is a positive lead which must be followed and the principle should be made universal.

It is obvious that if this principle is to be successful we must evolve other methods of settling such differences and disputes. Direct negotiations between parties concerned would be an ideal solution. As the late President Kennedy has so fittingly said while we should never negotiate out of fear we should never fear to negotiate.

Quite often commencement of negotiations is hampered by one party or the other, seeking to impose certain conditions. Negotiations to be real and fruitful must be free from all preconditions. Their basis must be the customary or the traditional boundaries which may be in existence and not any new boundaries that may have been created by force of any kind. Non-aligned nations should declare their strong opposition to any changes brought about by open use of force as well as by quiet penetration of borders or subversion of one kind or another. In this context, it would be relevant to recall the famous words used by Jawaharlal Nehru, more than a decade ago, "Where freedom is menaced or justice is threatened or where aggression takes place we cannot be and shall not be neutral".

Thirdly, both because of our past history and our own freedom struggle, we stand unequivocally for the emancipation of colonies and dependent countries. We strongly believe in theory as well as in practice in giving equal opportunities to all regardless of race, caste, creed or sex. We are entirely opposed to the doctrine of racialism, wheresoever and in whatsoever form it may be practised.

On this continent of Africa, there unhappily continue quite a few areas which are still under

## 246

the shackles of colonial rule. The Portuguese oppression is continuing in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea. In Southern Rhodesia the white minority Government seeks to impose its will on the majority. Over South West Africa, illegal and alien rule of South Africa continues in defiance of world public opinion. We greet the freedom fighters from Angola and other oppressed territories and offer them our full support for the success of their heroic struggle for independence.

While we stand pledged to the right of selfdetermination for dependent territories under colonial rule, I would like to sound a note of caution. Self-determination is the right of any country that is dominated by another. But there can be no self-determination for different areas and regions within a sovereign and independent country, for this would lead only to fragmentation and disruption and no country's integrity would be safe. The hateful policies of apartheid and racial discrimination of the Union of South Africa are an affront to mankind. India severed her trade relations completely with South Africa at a considerable loss to us, in purely economic terms, in 1946, and she has adhered firmly to this policy through all these years. How we wish more countries were able to observe and implement this policy. In fact, strict economic sanctions must be applied and effective ban on supply particularly of arms and oil imposed. The struggle for the defence of human values in South Africa must continue until it is crowned with success.

While racialism has to be strongly condemned, whether it is of South African variety or any other, may I suggest to the Non-aligned Nations that sometimes it becomes essential to look within. May I in that context say that we also have to make sure that no form of racialism is allowed to operate amongst citizens of member countries. Discriminatory action against residents of certain racial origin can also be harmful. Sometimes economic considerations are at the back of such steps and certainly exploitation of any sort by any class or community of another is to be deplored. But care must be taken that any action initiated on economic grounds does not end in racial bias or discrimination. If any State or Government faces special difficulties on account of persons living there, who were originally from another country, then it is best that these are tackled after mutual discussion and consultation.

The programme for economic development through international cooperation, which is my fourth point, is not, let me emphasise at the outset, a programme for seeking more aid. It is basically a programme of greater effort on the part of each developing country to mobilise its own resources. We want to stand on our own feet. If we are unable to do so straightaway, it is mainly because of long period of political subjection which has sapped our resources and stifled our initiative. We therefore, need help but the hell we seek should be the minimum and not the, maximum and it should be directed towards making us independent of aid. In such a programme, we developing nations, must help ourselves and help each other even before we seek assistance from outside. Although we may be individually deficient in different things, through cooperation amongst ourselves we can do a great deal for each other. We in India are trying our best to muster our technical and material resources to participate in a programme of economic cooperation with other developing countries to whom we can be of assistance.

We are now in the middle of what is called United Nations Development Decade. We have had a Conference on Trade and Development in Geneva earlier this year. May I say that while these are important steps in the right direction, we are not satisfied with what has been done or promised so far.

The target of economic growth which was set for the Development Decade by United Nations is in need of upward revision. The work done at Geneva needs to be carried forward. Mean while, all States must agree to implement the recommendations embodied in the final act. The most important of these is bringing into being of new international institutions which have been envisaged. Unless developing countries can expand and diversify their export trade, unless transfer of capital from developed to developing countries on satisfactory terms, can be accelerated economic progress will not attain a pace, compatible with peace and freedom.

My fifth and last point relates to the support which all of us must give to the United Nations in the pursuit of the policies to which I have just referred. We are all members of the United Nations and if we meet and confer apart, we do so only with a view to strengthen the United Nations as an organization and to carry its objectives forward. The United Nations has been moving steadily in the direction of universality of membership. The major exception is China which is still not a member. Although we have our differences with China, we have always supported and still support her admission to the United Nations. Furthermore, as the countries. which are still under colonial regimes of one kind or other, attain their independence, we would hope to see every part of the globe represented through a government of its own choice in the United Nations.

The United Nations as a whole has given support to the policies and programmes of peace, freedom and progerss, which have been engaging our attention here. We should support it not

## 247

merely in, words but in action. It is an the nonaligned nations that the brunt of supplying forces for the peace keeping operations falls. India has on many occasions placid her armed forces at the disposal of the United Nations for keeping the peace. It is, therefore, for the non-aligned nations to take the greatest interest in how these operations are entered into, organized, financed and manned.

Despite the progress which has been made, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that ail is not well with the world. In South and South East Asia, there is an atmosphere of conflict and tension. The long travail of Vietnam and Laos continues. Cyprus has not yet been freed from its sufferings. The situation in Congo remains uncertain and unstable. In the Carribean area, there are tensions and frictions. On our own northern borders, despite our acceptance of the proposals made by the Non-aligned Powers assembled at Colombo, we have been unable to get friendly response from China. But we must continue to strive for peace, to resolve all differences through peaceful methods by conciliation as distinct from confrontation, and by trust instead of suspicion.

Mr. Chairman, while we all subscribe to these lofty ideals, we do not for a moment claim that we have attained the ideal for ourselves. We often err and we often fail. We should be ready to apply to ourselves and to each other the same criteria, the same principles, that we advise others to follow and adopt. I have put these thoughts before this august body in all humility and yet in doing so I know that I am only spelling out the spiritual message of Gandhi.

Mr. Chairman, in addressing this august gathering today I have felt both proud and humble, proud as an Indian knowing how much influence Jawaharlal Nehru has had in shaping the policies and programmes of the non-aligned nations, and humble as an individual who is a new comer to this Conference. My only strength is that I speak on behalf of 460 million human beings who subscribe to many religions and speak many languages, and yet are united as a nation in their devotion to liberty and social justice at home and peace and goodwill amongst nations abroad.

# EGYPT USA INDIA SWITZERLAND YUGOSLAVIA CHINA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LAOS VIETNAM CYPRUS CONGO SRI LANKA

## **Date** : Oct 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## CAIRO CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Speech at the Closing Session

The following is the text of the speech made by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri at the closing session of the Non-aligned Conference on October 10, 1964 :

We, Heads of State or Government, at the conference of the Non-aligned Nations have today come to the end of our deliberations and have adopted a declaration to which we have all unanimously subscribed. The key note of that historic document is, as its title proclaims, a programme for peace and international co-operation. In this world of ours, where distance has shrunk, where inter-dependence and not exclusiveness is the key to progress and where the welfare of each is the concern of all, it is appropriate that we should have laboured together to promote, by joint action, goals of peace and international co-operation.

We, at this conference, come from four continents and many countries. We belong to different cultures and political systems and speak different languages. But there is a fundamental unity in our outlook and approach and we have spoken with the same voice on the great problems that face the world today. It is this factor of common adherence to certain principles and policies that binds us together for in our unity lies our strength. United we can help to shape the future and to ensure a more just and equitable world order in which peace and progress would prevail for the benefit of all mankind.

Of course, all our countries have their different problems and their different interests. But we have met here to reconcile our particular interests for the promotion of general good. Our discussions have been frank and friendly and, as is evident from the results, we have achieved a remarkable success in defining our attitude to the burning issues of the day.

The policy of peaceful co-existence underlines our broad approach to international relations and we have proclaimed admirable principles which should govern the conduct of States in order to promote and to ensure world peace and security. We want a world where peace prevails and where there is freedom from fear of nuclear annihilation. We have issued a call to the Powers that have not vet signed the Moscow Treaty to do so and have further called on them to refrain from the acquisition or production of nuclear weapons. We have strongly urged peaceful settlement of disputes ineluding border disputes and have proclaimed ourselves resolutely against the threat or the use of force and for the non-recognition of situations brought about by force. We have also raised our voice firmly and in unison against the evils of colonialism and of racial discrimination. We wish

## 248

to lend our combined strength to the United Nations to enable it to fulfil more effectively its principles and purposes. And we wish to plan and work for an era of closer international co-operation in all fields of human endeavour with particular emphasis on economic development.

I have been deeply touched by the sincere and moving tributes paid from this rostrum to my illustrious predecessor, Jawaharlal Nehru, whose devotion to the principles of non-alignment, and to the causes which all of us hold dear has been a source of inspiration to all of us. I wish to express my grateful thanks to all those friends who have joined together in honouring the hallowed memory of Jawaharlal Nehru.

Finally, it is with great pleasure that I extend to our esteemed host, President Gamal Abdel Nasser, our warmest thanks for the cordial and generous hospitality that he has accorded us. During my short stay in this beautiful city I have been greatly moved by spontaneous expressions of friendship and brotherhood on the part of the leaders and the people of this great country. It has been for me a rich and heart-warming experience to meet at the Conference and outside the great leaders and statesmen from so many fraternal countries. On behalf of the Government and the people of India, I offer our warmest greetings to all of them and to their countries and peoples. May high principles which have inspired our work at this Conference continue to guide our labours and to govern our actions in the service of our people and for the welfare of all mankind.

EGYPT USA RUSSIA INDIA

**Date** : Oct 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## CAIRO CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED NATIONS

Cairo Declaration

The following is the text of the Final Communique issued at the conclusion of the Conference of Non-aligned Nations in Cairo on October 10, 1964:

## Introduction

The Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of the following non-aligned countries: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Burma, Burundi, Camboida, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Repubic, United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia was held in Cario from 5 October, to 10 October, 1964.

The following countries : Argentine, Bolivia,

Brazil, Chile, Finland, Jamaica, Mexico, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela were represented by observers.

The Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity and the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States were present as observers.

The Conference undertook an analysis of the international situation with a view to making an effective contribution to the solution of the major problems which are of concern. to mankind in view of their effects on peace and security in the world.

To this end, and on the basis of the principles embodied in the Belgrade Declaration of September 1961, the Heads of State or Government of the above-mentioned countries proceeded, in an amicable, frank and fraternal atmosphere, to hold detailed discussions and an exchange of views on the present state of international relations and the predominant trends in the modern world. The Heads of State or Government of the participating countries note with satisfaction that nearly half of the independent countries of the world have participated in this Second non-aligned conference.

The Conference also notes with satisfaction the growing interest and confidence displayed by peoples still under foreign domination, and by those whose rights and sovereignty are being violated by imperialism and neocolonialism, in the highly positive role which the non-aligned countries are called upon to play in the settlement of international problems or disputes.

The Conference expresses satisfaction at the favourable reactions throughout the world to this second meeting of non-aligned countries. This emphasises the rightness, efficacy and vigour of the policy of non-alignment, and its constructive role in the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security.

The principles of non-alignment, thanks to the confidence they inspire in the world, are becoming an increasingly dynamic and powerful force for the promotion of peace and the welfare of mankind.

The participating Heads of State or Government note with satisfaction that, thanks to the combined efforts of the forces of freedom, peace and progress, this second Non-Aligned Conference is

## 249

being held at a time when the international situation has improved as compared with that which existed between the two power blocs at the time of the historic Belgrade Conference. The Heads of State or Government of the Non-aligned Countries are well aware, however, that, despite the present improvement in international relations, and notwithstanding the conclusion and signature of the Treaty of Moscow, sources of tension still exist in many parts of the world.

This situation shows that the forces of imperialism are still powerful and that they do not hesitate to resort to the use of force to defend their interests and maintain their privileges.

This policy, if not firmly resisted by the forces of freedom and peace, is likely to jeopardise the improvement in the international situation and the lessening of tension which has occurred, and to constitute a threat to world peace.

The policy of active peaceful co-existence is an indivisible whole. It cannot be applied partially, in accordance with special interests and criteria.

Important changes have also taken place within the Eastern and Western blocs, and this new phenomenon should be taken into account in the objective assessment of the current international situation.

The Conference notes with satisfaction that the movements of national liberation are engaged in different regions of the world, in a heroic struggle against neo-colonialism, and the practices of apartheid and racial discrimination. This struggle forms part of the common striving towards freedom, justice and peace.

The Conference reaffirms that interference by economically developed foreign States in the internal affairs of newly independent, developing countries and the existence of territories which are still dependent constitute a standing threat to peace and security.

The Heads of State or Government of the nonaligned countries, while appreciative of the efforts which resulted in the holding of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and mindful of the results of that Conference, nevertheless note that much ground still remains to be covered to eliminate existing inequalities in the relationships between industrialized and developing countries.

The Heads of State or Government of the nonaligned countries, while declaring their determination to contribute towards the establishment of just and lasting peace in the world, affirm that the preservation of peace and the promotion of the well-being of peoples are a collective responsibility deriving from the natural aspirations of mankind to live in a better world.

The Heads of State or Government have arrived in their deliberations at a common understanding of the various problems with which the world is now faced, and a common approach to them. Reaffirming the basic principles of the Declaration of Belgrade, they express their agreement upon the following points

CONCERTED ACTION FOR THE LIBERA-TION OF THE COUNTRIES STILL DEPEN-DENT; ELIMINATION OF COLONIALISM, NEO-COLONIALISM AND IMPERIALISM.

The Heads of State or Government of the Nonaligned Countries declare that lasting world peace cannot be realised so long as unjust conditions prevail and peoples under foreign domination continue to be deprived of their fundamental right to freedom, independence and self-determination.

Imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism constitute a basic source of international tension and conflict because they endanger world peace and security. The participants in the Conference deplore that the Declaration of the United Nations on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples has not been implemented everywhere and call for the unconditional complete and final abolition of colonialism now.

At present a particular cause of concern is the military or other assistance extended to certain countries to enable them to perpetuate by force colonialist and neo-colonialist situations which are contrary to the spirit of the Charter of the

## United Nations.

The exploitation by colonialist forces of the difficulties and problems of recently liberated or developing countries, interference in the internal affairs of these States, and colonialist attempts to maintain unequal relationships, particularly in the economic field, constitute serious dangers to these young countries. Colonialism and neo-colonialism have many forms and manifestations.

Imperialism uses many devices to impose its will on independent nations. Economic pressure and domination, interference, racial discrimination, subversion, intervention and the, threat of force are neo-colonialist devices against which the newly independent nations have to defend themselves. The Conference condemns all colonialist, neo-colonialist and imperialist policies applied in various parts of the world.

Deeply concerned at the rapidly deteriorating situation in the Congo, the participants:

(1) support all the efforts being made by the Organisation of African Unity to bring peace and harmony speedily to that country;

#### 250

(2) urge the Ad Hoc Commission of the Organisation of African Unity to shirk no effort in the attempt to achieve national reconciliation in the Congo, and to eliminate the existing tension between that country and the Republic of Congo (Brazzaville) and the Kingdom of Burundi;

(3) appeal to the Congolese Government and to all combatants to cease hostilities immediately and to seek, with the help of the Organisation of African Unity, a solution permitting of national reconciliation and the restoration of order and peace;

(4) urgently appeal to all foreign powers at present interferring in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, praticularly those engaged in military intervention in that country, to cease such interference, which infringes the interests and sovereignty of the Congolese people and constitutes a threat to neighbouring countries;

(5) affirm their full support for the efforts being made to this end by the Organisation of African Unity's Ad Hoc Commission of good offices in the Congo.

(6) call upon the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to discontinue the recruitment of mercenaries immediately and to expel all mercenaries, of whatever origin who are already in the Congo, in order to facilitate an African solution.

The newly independent countries have, like all other countries, the right of sovereign disposal in regard to their natural resources, and the right to utilise these resources as they deem appropriate in the interest of their peoples, without outside interference.

The process of liberation is irresistable and irreversible. Colonized peoples may legitimately resort to arms to secure the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence if the colonial powers persist in opposing their natural aspirations.

The participants in the Conference undertake to work unremittingly to eradicate all vestiges of colonialism, and to combine all their efforts to render all necessary aid and support, whether moral, political or material, to the peoples struggling against colonialism and neocolonialism. The participating countries recognize the nationalist movements of the peoples which are struggling to free themselves from colonial domination as being authentic representatives of the colonial peoples, and urgently call upon the colonial powers to negotiate with their leaders.

Portugal continues to hold in bondage by repression, persecution and force, in Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea and the other Portuguese colonies in Africa and Asia, millions of people who have been suffering far too long under the foreign yoke. The Conference declares its determination to ensure that the peoples of these territories accede immediately to independence without any conditions or reservations.

The Conference condemns the government of Portugal for its obstinate refusal to recognize the inalienable right of the peoples of those territories to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

The Conference :

(1) urges the participating countries to afford all necessary material supportfinancial and military-to the Freedom Fighters in the territories under Portuguese colonial rule;

(2) takes the view that support should be given to the Revolutionary Government of Angola in exile and to the nationalist movements struggling for the independence of the Portuguese colonies and assistance to the Special Bureau set up by the OAU in regard to the application of sanctions against Portugal;

(3) calls upon all participating States to break off diplomatic and consular relations with the government of Portugal and to take effective measures to suspend all trade and economic relations with Portugal;

(4) calls upon the participating countries to take all measures to compel Portugal to carry out the decisions of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

(5) addresses an urgent appeal to the Powers which are extending military aid and assistance to Portugal to withdraw such aid and assistance.

The countries participating in the Conference condemn the policy of the racist minority regime in Southern Rhodesia, which continues to defy the Charter and the Resolutions of the United Nations in that it denies fundamental freedoms to the people by acts of repression and terror.

The participating countries urge all States not

to recognize the independence of Southern Rhodesia if proclaimed under the rule of the racist minority, and instead to give favourable consideration to according recognition to an African nationalist government in exile, should such a government be set up. To this effect, the Conference states its opposition to the sham consultation through tribal chiefs envisaged by the present Minority Government of Southern Rhodesia.

#### 251

The Conference deplores the British Government's failure to implement the various resolutions of the United Nations relating to Southern Rhodesia and calls upon the United Kingdom to convene immediately a Constitutional Conference, to which all political groups in Southern Rhodesia would be invited, for the purpose of preparing a new constitution based on the "one man, one vote" principle, instituting universal suffrage, and ensuring majority rule.

The Conference urges the Government of the United Kingdom to call for the immediate release of all political prisoners and detainees in Southern Rhodesia.

The Conference reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of South West Africa to self-determination and independence and condemns the Government of South Africa for its persistent refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in the implementation of the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly.

It urges all States to refrain from supplying in any mariner or form any arms or military equipment or petroleum products to South Africa, and to implement the Resolutions of the United Nations.

The Conference recommends that the United Nations should guarantee the territorial integrity of Swaziland, Basutoland and Bechuanaland and should take measures for their speedy accession to independence and for the subsequent safeguarding of their sovereignty.

The participants in the Conference call upon the French Government to take the necessary steps to enable French Somaliland to become free and independent in accordance with paragraph 5 of Resolution 1514 (XV) of the United Nations. The Conference appeals to all participating countries to lend support and assistance to the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity.

The Conference condemns the imperialistic policy pursued in the Middle East and, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, decides to :

(1) endorse the full restoration of all the rights of the Arab people of Palestine to their homeland, and their inalienable right to self-determination;

(2) declare their full support to the Arab people of Palestine, in their struggle, for liberation from colonialism and racism.

The Conference condemns the continued refusal of the United Kingdom Government to implement the United Nations Resolution on Aden and the Protectorates, providing for the free exercise by the peoples of the territory of their right to self-determination and calling for the liquidation of the British military base in Aden and the withdrawal of British troops from the territory.

The Conference fully supports the struggle of the people of Aden and the Protectorates and urges the immediate implementation of the Resolutions of the United Nations which are based on the expressed wishes of the people of the territory.

The countries participating in the Conference condemn the continued armed action waged by British Colonalism against the people of Oman who are fighting to attain their freedom.

The Conference recommends that all necessary political, moral and material assistance be rendered to the liberation movements of these territories in their struggle against colonial rule.

The Conference condemns the manifestations of colonialism and neocolonialism in Latin America and declares itself in favour of the implementation in that region of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

Basing itself on this principle, the Conference deplores the-delay in granting full independence, to British Guiana and requests the United Kingdom to grant independence speedily to that country. It notes with regret that Martinique, Guadloupe, and other Caribbean Islands are still not selfgoverning. It draws the attention of the Ad hoc Decolonization Commission of the United Nations to the Case of Puerto Rico and calls upon that commission to consider the situation of these territories in the light of Resolution 1514 (XV) of the United Nations.

## Π

## RESPECT FOR THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND CONDEMNA-TION OF THE USE OF FORCE AGAINST THE EXERCISE OF THIS RIGHT

The Conference solemnly reaffirms the right of peoples to self-determination and to make their own destiny.

It stresses that this right constitutes one of the essential principles of the United Nations Charter, that it was laid down also in the Charter of the Organisation of African Unity, and that the Conferences of Bandung and Belgrade demanded that it should be respected, and in particular insisted that it should be effectively exercised.

The Conference notes that this right is still violated or its exercise denied in many regions of the world and results in a continued increase of tension and the extension of the areas of war.

The Conference denounces the attitude of those Powers which oppose the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination.

It condemns the use of force, and all forms of intimidation, interference and intervention which are aimed at preventing the exercise of this right.

## 252

## III RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AND THE POLICY OF APARTHEID

The Heads of State or Government declare that racial discrimination-and particularly its most odious manifestation, apartheid---constitutes a violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Right, and of the principle of the equality of peopies. Accordingly, all governments still persisting in the practice of racial discrimination should be completely ostracized until they have abandoned their unjust and inhuman policies. In particular the governments and peoples represented at this Conference have decided that they will not tolerate much longer the presence of the Republic of South Africa in the comity of Nations. The inhuman racial policies of South Africa constitute a threat to international peace and security. All countries interested in peace must therefore do everything in their power to ensure that liberty and fundamental freedoms are secured to the people of South Africa.

The Heads of State or Government solemnly affirms their absolute respect for the right of ethnic or religious minorities to protection in particular against the crimes of genocide or any other violation of a fundamental human right ?

Sanctions against the Republic of South Africa

(1) The Conference regrets to note that the Pretoria Government's obstinacy in defying the conscience of 'mankind has been strengthened by the refusal of its friends and allies, particularly sonic major powers, to implement United Nations resolutions concerning sanctions against South Africa.

(2) The Conference therefore

(a) calls upon all States to boycott all South African goods and to refrain from exporting goods, especially arms, ammunition, oil and minerals to South Africa;

(b) calls upon all States which have not yet done so to break off diplomatic, consular and other relations with South Africa;

(c) requests the Governments represented at this conference to deny airport and overflying facilities to aircraft and port facilities to ships proceeding to and from South Africa, and to discontinue all road or railway traffic with that country; (d) demands the release of all persons, imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions on account of their opposition to the policy of apartheid;

(e) invites all countries to give their Support to the special bureau se up by the Organisation of African Unity for the application of sanctions against South Africa.

## IV PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE AND THE (CODIFICATION OF ITS PRINCIPLES BY THE UNITED NATIONS

Considering the Principles proclaimed at Bandung in 1955, Resolution 1514 (XV) adopted by the United Nations in 1960, the Declaration of the Belgrade Conference, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, and numerous joint declarations by Heads of State or Government on peaceful co-existence;

Reaffirming their deep conviction that, in present circumstances, mankind must regard peaceful co-existence as the only way to strengthen world peace, which must be based on freedom, equality and justice between peoples within a new framework of peaceful and harmonious relations between the States and nations of the world;

Considering the fact that the principle of peaceful co-existence is based on the right of all peoples to be free and to choose their own political. economic and social systems according to their own national identity and their ideals, and is opposed to any form of foreign domination;

Convinced also that peaceful co-existence cannot be fully achieved throughout the world without the abolition of imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism;

Deeply convinced that the aboslute prohibition of the threat or use of force, direct or disguised, the renunciation of all forms of coercion in international relations, the abolition of relations of inequality and the promotion of international cooperation with a view to accelerating economic, social and cultural development, are necessary conditions for safeguarding peace and achieving the general advancement of mankind.

The Heads of State or Government solemnly proclaim the following fundamental principles of peaceful co-existence :

(1) The right to complete independence, which is an inalienable right, must be recognized immediately and unconditionally as, pertaining to all peoples, in conformity with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly; it is incumbent upon all States to respect this right and facilitate its exercise.

(2) The right to self-determination, which is an inalienable right, must be recognized as pertaining to all peoples. accordingly, all nations and peoples have the right to determine their political

#### 253

status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development without intimidation or hindrance.

(3) Peaceful co-existence between States with differing social and political systems is both possible and necessary; it favours the creation of good-neighbourly relations between States with a view to the establishment of lasting peace and general well-being, free from domination and exploitation.

(4) The sovereign equality of States must be recognised and respected. It includes the right of all peoples to the free exploitation of their natural resources.

(5) States must abstain from all use of threat or force directed against the territorial integrity and political independence of other States; a situation brought about by the threat or use of force shall not be recognised, and in particular the established frontiers of States shall be inviolable. Accordingly, every State must abstain from interfering in the affairs of other States, whether openly, or insidiously, or by means of subversion and the various forms of political, economic and military pressure.

Frontier disputes shall be settled by peaceful means.

(6) All States shall respect the fundamental rights and freedom of the human person and the equality of all nations and races.

(7) All international conflicts must be settled by peaceful means, in a spirit of mutual understanding and on the basis of equality and sovereignty, in such a manner that justice and legitimate rights are not impaired, all States must apply themselves to promoting and strengthening measures designed to diminish international tension and achieve general and complete disarmament.

(8) All States must co-operate with a view to accelerating economic development in the world, and particularly in the developing countries. This co-operation, which must be aimed at narrowing the gap, at present widening, between the levels of living in the developing and developed countries respectively, is essential to the maintenance of a lasting peace.

(9) States shall meet their international obligations in good faith in conformity with the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

The Conference recommends to the General Assembly of the United Nations to adopt, on the occasion or its twentieth anniversary, a declaration on the principles of peaceful co-existence. This declaration will constitute an important step towards the codification of these principles.

#### V

## RESPECT FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY OF STATES AND THEIR TERRITORIAL INTE-GRITY: PROBLEMS OF DIVIDED NATIONS

(1) The Conference of Heads of State or Government proclaims its full adherence to the fundamental principle of international relations, in accordance with which the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, great and small, are inviolable and must be respected.

(2) The countries participating in the Conference, having for the most part achieved their national independence after years of struggle, reaffirm their determination to oppose by every means in their power any attempt to compromise their sovereignty or violate their territorial integrity. They pledge themselves to respect frontiers as they existed when the States gained independence; nevertheless, parts of territories taken away by occupying powers or converted into autonomous bases for their own benefit at the time of independence must be given back to the country concerned.

(3) The Conference solemnly reaffirms the right of all peoples to adopt the form of government they consider best suited to their development.

(4) The Conference considers that one of the causes of international tension lies in the problem of divided nations. It expresses its entire sympathy with the peoples of such countries and upholds their desire to achieve unity. It exhorts the countries concerned to seek a just and lasting solution in order to achieve the unification of their territories by peaceful methods without outside interference or pressure. It considers that the resort to threat or force can lead to no satisfactory settlement, cannot do otherwise than jeopardize international security.

Concerned by the situation existing with regard to Cyprus, the Conference calls upon all States in conformity with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular under Article 2, paragraph 4, to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus and to refrain from any threat or use of force or intervention directed against Cyprus and from any efforts to impose upon Cyprus unjust solutions unacceptable to the people of Cyprus.

Cyprus, as an equal member of the United Nations, is entitled to and should enjoy unrestricted and unfettered sovereignty and independence, and allowing its people to determine freely, and

## 254

without any foreign intervention or interference, the political future of the country, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

The Conference, considering that foreign pressure and intervention to impose changes in the political, economic and social system chosen by a country are contrary to the principles of international law and peaceful co-existence, requests the Government of United States of America to lift the commercial and economic blockade applied against Cuba.

The Conference takes note of the readiness of the Cuban Government to settle its difference with the United States on an equal footing, and invites these two Governments to enter into negotiations to this end and in conformity with the principles of peaceful co-existence and international co-operation.

Taking into account the principles set forth above and with a view to restoring peace and stability in the Indo-China Peninsula, the Conference appeals to the Powers which participated in the Geneva Conference of 1954 and 1962 :

(1) to abstain from any action likely to aggravate the situation which is already tense in the Peninsula;

(2) to terminate all foreign interference in the internal affairs of the countries of that region;

(3) to convene urgently a new Geneva Conference on Indo-China with a view to seeking a satisfactory political solution for the peaceful settlement of the problems arising in that part of the world, namely :

(a) ensuring the strict application of the 1962 agreements on Laos;

(b) recognizing and guaranteeing the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia;

(c) ensuring the strict application of the 1954 Geneva Agreement on

Vietnam, and finding a political solution to the problem in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the Vietnamese people to freedom, peace and independence.

VI

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES WITHOUT THREAT OR USE OF FORCE IN ACCORD-ANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

1) As the use of force may take a number of forms, military, political and economic, the participating countries deem it essential to reaffirm the principles that all States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or Political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

(2) They consider that disputes between States should be settled by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter on the bases of sovereign equality and justice.

(3) The participating countries are convinced of the necessity of exerting all international efforts to- find solutions to all situations which threaten international peace or impair friendly relations among nations.

(4) The participating countries gave special attention to the problems of frontiers which may threaten international peace or disturb friendly relations among States, and are convinced that in order to settle such problems, all States should resort to negotiation, mediation or arbitration or other peaceful means set forth in the United Nations Charter in conformity with the legitimate rights of all peoples.

(5) The Conference considers that disputes between neighbouring States must be settled peacefully in a spirit of mutual understanding, without foreign intervention or interference.

## VII

GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMA-MENT; PEACEFUL USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY, PROHIBITION OF ALL NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS, ESTABLISHMENT OF NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES, PREVENTION OF DISSEMINATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND ABOLITION OF ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The Conference emphasises the paramount importance of disarmament as one of the basic problems of the contemporary world, and stresses the necessity of reaching immediate and practical solutions which would free mankind from the danger of war and from a sense of insecurity.

The Conference notes with concern that the continuing arms race and the tremendous advances that have been made in the production of weapons of mass destruction and their stockpiling threaten the world with armed conflict and annihilation. The Conference urges the great Powers to take new and urgent steps towards achieving general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

### 255

The Conference regrets that despite the efforts of the members of the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament, and in particular those of the nonaligned countries, the results have not been satisfactory. It urges the great Powers, in collaboration with the other members of that Committee, to renew their efforts with determination with a view to the rapid conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

The Conference calls upon all States to accede to the Moscow treaty partially banning the testing of nuclear weapons, and to abide by its provisions in the interests of peace and the welfare of humanity.

The Conference urges the extension of the Moscow Treaty so as to include underground tests, and the discontinuance of such tests pending the extension of the agreement.

The Conference urges the speedy conclusion

of agreements on various other-partial and collateral measures of disarmament proposed by the members of the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

The Conference appeals to the Great Powers to take the lead in giving effect to decisive and immediate measures which would make possible substantial reductions in their military budgets. The Conference requests the Great Powers to abstain from all policies conducive to the dissemination of nuclear weapons and their by-products among those States which do not at present possess them. It underlines the great danger in the dissemination of nuclear weapons and urges all States, particularly those possessing nuclear weapons, to conclude non-dissemination agreements and to agree on measures providing for the gradual liquidation of the existing stock-piles of nuclear weapons.

As part of these efforts, the Heads of State or Government declare their own readiness not to produce, acquire or test any nuclear weapons, and call on all countries including those who have not subscribed to the Moscow Treaty to enter into a similar undertaking and to take the necessary steps to prevent their territories, ports and airfields from being used by nuclear powers for the deployment or disposition of nuclear weapons. This undertaking should be the subject of a treaty to be concluded in an international Conference convened under the auspices of the United Nations and open to accession by all States. The Conference further calls upon all nuclear Powers to observe the spirit of this declaration.

The Conference welcomes the agreement of the Great Powers not to orbit in outer space nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction and expresses its conviction that it is necessary to conclude an international treaty prohibiting the utilisation of outer space for military purposes. The Conference urges, full international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

The Conference requests those States which have succeeded in exploring outer space, to exchange and disseminate information related to the research they have carried out in this field, so that scientific progress for the peaceful utilization of outer space be of common benefit to all. The Conference is of the view that for this purpose an. international conference should be convened at an appropriate time.

The Conference considers that the declaration by African States regarding the denuclearization of Africa, the aspirations of the Latin American countries to denuclearize their continent and the various proposals pertaining to the denuclearization of areas in Europe and Asia are steps in the right direction, because they assist in consolidating international peace and security and lessening international tensions.

The Conference recommends the establishment of denuclearized zones covering these and other areas and the oceans of the world, particularly those which have been hitherto free from nuclear weapons, in accordance with the desires expressed by the States and peoples concerned.

The Conference also requests the nuclear Powers to respect these denuclearized zones.

The Conference is convinced that the convening of a world disarmament conference under the auspices of the United Nations to which all countries would be invited, would provide powerful support to the efforts which are being made to set in motion the process of disarmament and for securing the further and steady development of this process.

The Conference therefore urges the participating countries to take, at the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations, all the necessary steps for the holding of such a conference and of any other special conference for the, conclusion of special agreements on certain measures of disarmament.

The Conference urges all nations to join in the cooperative development of the peaceful use of atomic energy for the benefit of all mankind; and in particular to study the development of atomic power and other technical aspects in which international cooperation might be most effectively accomplished through the free flow of such scientific information.

## VIII MILITARY PACTS, FOREIGN TROOPS AND BASES

The Conference reiterates its conviction that

the existence of military blocs, Great Power alliances and pacts arising therefrom has accentuated

## 256

the cold war and heightened international tensions. The Non-aligned countries are therefore opposed to taking part in such pacts and alliances.

The Conference considers the maintenance or future establishment of foreign military bases and the stationing of foreign troops on the territories of other countries, against the expressed will of those countries, as a gross violation of the sovereignty of States, and as a threat to freedom and international peace. It furthermore considers as particularly indefensible the existence or future establishment of bases in dependent, territories which could be used for the maintenance of colonialism or for other purposes.

Noting with concern that foreign military bases are in practice a means of bringing pressure on nations and retarding their emancipation and development, based on their own ideological, political, economic and cultural ideas, the Conference declares its full support to the countries which are seeking to secure the evacuation of foreign bases on their territory and calls upon all States maintaining troops and bases in other countries to remove them forthwith.

The Conference considers that the maintenance at Guantanamo (Cuba) of a military base of the United States of America, in defiance of the will of the Government and people of Cuba and in defiance of the provisions embodied in the Declaration of the Belgrade Conference, constitutes a violation of Cuba's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Noting that the Cuban Government expresses its readiness to settle its dispute over the base of Guantanamo with the United States on an equal footing, the Conference urges the United States Government to negotiate the evacuation of this base with the Cuban Government.

The Conference condemns the expressed intention of imperialist powers to establish bases in the Indian Ocean, as a calculated attempt to intimidate the emerging countries of Africa and Asia and an unwarranted extension of the policy of neocolonialism and imperialism.

The Conference also recommends the elimination of the foreign bases in Cyprus and the withdrawal of foreign troops from this country, except for those stationed there by virtue of United Nations resolutions.

#### IX

## THE UNITED NATIONS: ITS ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, IMPLEMEN-TATION OF ITS RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENT OF ITS CHARTER

The participating countries declare:

The United Nations Organisation was established to promote international peace and security, to develop international understanding and cooperation, to safeguard human rights and fundamental freedom and to achieve all the purposes of the Charter. In order to be an effective instrument, the United Nations organization must be open to all the States of the world. It is particularly necessary that countries still under colonial domination should attain independence without delay and take their rightful place in the community of nations.

It is essential for the effective functioning of the United Nations that all nations should observe its fundamental principles of peaceful coexistence, co-operation, renunciation of the threat or the use of force, freedom and equality without discrimination on grounds of race, sex, language or religion.

The influence and effectiveness of the United Nations also depends, upon equitable representation of different geographical regions in the various organs of the United Nations and in the service of the United Nations.

The Conference notes with satisfaction that with Resolution 1991 (XVIII), the General Assembly has taken the initial positive step towards transformation of the structure of the United Nations in keeping with its increased membership and the necessity to ensure a broader participation of States in the work of its Organs. It appeals to all Members of the United Nations to ratify as speedily as possible the amendents to the Charter adopted at the XVIIIth Session of the General Assembly.

The Conference recognises the paramount importance of the United Nations and the necessity of enabling it to carry out the functions entrusted to it to preserve international cooperation among States.

To this end, the Non-aligned countries should consult one another at the Foreign Minister or Head of Delegation level at each session of the United Nations.

The Conference stresses the need to adapt the charter to the dynamic changes and evolution of international conditions.

The Conference expresses the hope that the Heads of State or Government of the States Members of the United Nations will attend the regular Session of the General Assembly on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Organisation.

Recalling the recommendation of the Belgrade Conference, to Conference asks the General Assembly of the United Nations to restore the rights of the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China in the United Nations.

#### 257

The Conference recommends to the States Members of the United Nations to respect the resolutions of the United Nations and to render all assistance necessary for the Organization to fulfil its role in maintaining international peace and security.

# ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION

The Heads of State or Government participating in this Conference,

CONVINCED that peace most rest, on a sound and solid economic foundation,

that the persistence of poverty poses a threat

to world peace and prosperity,

that economic emancipation is an essential element in the struggle for the elimination of political domination,

that respect for the right of peoples and nations to control and dispose freely of their national wealth and resources is vital for their economic development;

CONSCIOUS that participating States have a special responsibility to do their utmost to break through the barrier of underdevelopment;

BELIEVING that economic development is an obligation of the whole international community,

that it is the duty of all countries to contribute to the rapid evolution of a new and just economic order under which all nations can live without fear or want or despair and rise to their full stature in the Family of Nations,

that the structure of world economy and the existing international institutions of international trade and development have failed either to reduce the disparity in the per capita income of the peoples in developing and developed countries or to promote international action to rectify serious and growing imbalances between developed and developing countries;

EMPHASIZING the imperative need to amplify and intensify international co-operation based on equality, and consistent with the needs of accelerated economic development;

NOTING that as a result of the proposals adopted at Belgrade in 1961 and elaborated in Cairo in 1962, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development met in Geneva in 1964;

CONSIDERING that while the Geneva Conference marks the first step in the evolution of a new international economic policy for development and offers a sound basis for progress in the future, the results achieved were neither adequate for, nor commensurate with, the essential requirements of developing countries. SUPPORT the Joint Declaration of the "Seventy-Seven" developing countries made at the conclusion of that Conference, and PLEDGE the co-operation of the participating States to the strengthening of their solidarity;

URGE upon all States to implement on an urgent basis the recommendations contained in the Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and in particular to cooperate in bringing into existence as early as possible the new international institutions proposed therein, so that the problems of trade and economic development may be more effectively and speedily resolved;

CONSIDER that democratic procedures, which afford no position of privilege, are as essential in the economic as in the political sphere;

that a new international division of labour is needed to hasten the industrialization of developing countries and the modernization of their agriculture, so as to enable them to strengthen their domestic economies and diversify their export trade,

that discriminatory measures of any kind taken against developing countries on the grounds of different socioeconomic systems are contrary to the spirit of the United Nations Charter and constitute a threat to the free flow of trade and to peace and should be eliminated;

Affirm that the practice of the inhuman policy of apartheid or racial discrimination in any part of the world should be eliminated by every possible means, including economic sanctions;

RECOMMEND that the target of economic growth set for the development Decade by the United Nations should be revised upwards.

that the amount of capital transferred to developing countries and the terms and conditions governing the transfer should be extended and improved without political commitments, so as to reinforce the efforts of these countries to build self-reliant economics,

that a programme of action should be developed to increase the income in foreign exchange of developing countries and, in particular, to provide access for primary products from developing countries to the markets of industrialized countries, on an equitable basis and for manufactured goods from developing countries on a preferential basis,

that the establishment of a Specialized Agency for industrial development should be expedited,

that members of regional economic groupings should do their utmost to ensure that economic

#### 258

integration helps to promote the increase of imports from the developing countries either individually or collectively,

that the recommendation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to convene a conference of plenipotentiaries to adopt an International Convention to ensure the right of landlocked countries to free transit and access to the sea be implemented by the United Nations early next year, and that the principles of economic co-operation adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in relation to the transit trade of landlocked countries be given consideration;

CALL upon participating countries to concert measures to bring about closer economic relations among the developing countries on a basis of equality, mutual benefit and mutual assistance, hearing in mind the obligations of all developing countries. to accord favourable consideration to the expansion of their reciprocal trade, to unite against all forms of economic exploitation and to strengthen mutual consultation;

CALL upon the members of the "Seventy-Seven" developing countries, who worked closely together at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development of 1964 in Geneva to consult together during the next session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in order to consolidate their efforts and harmonize their policies in time for the next Conference on Trade and Development in 1966.

CONVINCED that progress towards disarmament increase the resources available for economic development;

SUPPORT proposals for the diversion of resources now employed on armaments to the development of under developed parts of the world and to the promotion of the prosperity of mankind.

XI

## CULTURAL, SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCA\_ TIONAL COOPERATION AND CONSOLI-DATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WORKING FOR THIS PURPOSE

The Heads of State or Government participating in the Conference :

CONSIDERING that the political, economic, social and cultural problems of mankind are so interrelated as to demand concerted action;

CONSIDERING that co-operation in the fields of culture, education and science is necessary for the deepening of human understanding, for the consolidation of freedom, justice and peace, and for progress and development;

BEARING IN MIND that political liberation, social emancipation and scientific advancement have effected fundamental changes in the minds and lives of men.

RECOGNISING that culture helps to widen the mind and enrich life : that all human cultures have their special values and can contribute to the general progress; that many cultures were suppressed and cultural relations interrupted under colonial domination; that international understanding and progress require a revival and rehabilitation of these cultures, a free expression of their identity and national character, and a deeper mutual appreciation of their values so as to enrich the common cultural heritage of man;

CONSIDERING that education is a basic need for the advancement of humanity and that science not only adds to the wealth and welfare of nations but also adds new values to civilisation;

APPRECIATING the work of the international and regional organisations in the promotion of educational, scientific and cultural co-operation among nations;

BELIEVING that such cooperation among nations in the educational, scientific and cultural fields should be strengthened and expanded;

RECOMMEND that international co-operation in education should be promoted in order to secure a fair opportunity for education to every person in every part of the world, to extend educational assistance to develop mutual understanding and appreciation of the different cultures and ways of life through the proper teaching of civics, and to promote international understanding through the teaching of the principles of the United Nations at various levels of education;

PROPOSE that a free and more systematic exchange of scientific information be encouraged and intensified and, in particular, call on the advanced countries to share with developing countries their scientific knowledge and technical knowledge so that the advantages of scientific and technological advance can be applied to the promotion of economic development.

URGE all states to adopt in their legislation the principles embodied in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

AGREE that participating countries should adopt measures to strengthen their ties with one another in the fields of education, science and culture.

EXPRESS their determination to help, consolidate and strengthen the international and regional organisations working in this direction.

## 259

## SPECIAL RESOLUTION

## Ι

The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned countries meeting in Cario from 5 to 10 October 1964;

Considering their common will to work for understanding between peoples and for international cooperation; Reaffirming their solidarity with the African States fighting for the consolidation of their independence and the total emancipation of their continent, through concerted action and close co-operation;

Noting with satisfiction that in that historic document the Charter of Addis Ababa, adopted on 29 May 1963, and in subsequent decisions, the African States members of the Organisation of African Unity have unreservedly adhered to the positive policy of non-alignment in relation to all great blocs;

Firmly resolved to unite their efforts and actions to fight colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism by all appropriate means;

Considering the outstanding work for peace and harmony which the Organisation of African Unity has accomplished, since its recent creation, in the interest of both the African Continent and the international community as a whole;

EXPRESS their conviction that the establishment of the Organisation of African Unity is an important contribution to the strengthening of world peace, the triumph of the policy of nonalignment, and the fundamental values laid down by this policy.

DECIDE to coordinate and concert their efforts with those of the Organisation of African Unity, with a view to safeguarding their joint interests in economic, social and cultural development and in international cooperation.

# SPECIAL RESOLUTION II

The Heads of State or Government attending the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Countries are happy to express their warmest appreciation to the brave people, the Government and the distinguished President of the United Arab Republic, His Excellency Gamal Abdel Nasser, for the superb way in which they organized this Conference, both materially and morally, and for the generous and most brotherly hospitality extended to all delegations.

They wish to say how deeply satisfied they are with the astounding success of the Conference,

which opens up new prospects for positive action and general advancement towards mutual understanding, active solidarity and the strengthening of cooperation between nations dedicated to freedom, peace and justice.

## NOTE

The following reservations to specific parts of the Declaration were made by the delegations as indicated below:

Chapter I :

Malawi on the paragraphs relating to Portugal. BURMA & NEPAL on the paragraphs relating to Palestine. NIGERIA & TUNISIA on the paragraphs relating to the ad hoc Commission of the OAU on Congo.

Chapter II :

INDIA on the ground that any definition of this right which proposed to give it application to a sovereign State or to part of a sovereign State or to a section of a people or nation was unacceptable.

Chapters IV & V:

AFGHANISTAN, SOMALIA, MOROCCO, SYRIA, CAMBO-DIA, SAUDI ARABIA AND JORDAN on the references to the inviolability of established frontiers and respect for frontiers existing when the States gained independence.

Chapter VII :

CAMBODIA on the call to all States to adhere to the Treaty of Moscow on the partial banning of nuclear tests.

Chapter IX :

JORDAN, SAUDI ARABIA, LEBANON, LIBYA, AND KUWAIT on the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

260

EGYPT USA AFGHANISTAN ALGERIA ANGOLA BURMA BURUNDI CAMEROON CHAD CONGO CUBA CYPRUS ETHIOPIA GHANA GUINEA INDIA INDONESIA IRAQ JORDAN KENYA KUWAIT LAOS MAURITANIA LEBANON LIBERIA LIBYA MALAWI MALI MOROCCO NEPAL NIGER NIGERIA SAUDI ARABIA SENEGAL SOMALIA SUDAN SYRIA TUNISIA UGANDA YEMEN YUGOSLAVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ZAMBIA BOLIVIA BRAZIL CHILE FINLAND JAMAICA MEXICO URUGUAY

# VENEZUELA RUSSIA PORTUGAL MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA SWAZILAND OMAN CHINA SWITZERLAND CAMBODIA VIETNAM

**Date** : Oct 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## CEYLON

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Mrs. Bandaranaike

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following speech at a dinner given by him in honour of the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Her Excellency Mrs. Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike at Rashtrapati Bhavan on October 22, 1964:

Madam Prime Minister, Hon'ble Minister of the Ceylon Government, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Your visit, Madam Prime Minister, is an event of immense pleasure to us. Ceylon is so close to us geographically and also to our hearts. We have had the honour of welcoming you here previously. You took the trouble of being here last at the time of the passing away of my great and eminent predecessor Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It was so gracious of you to have come on that occasion and sympathised with us in our national loss and bereavement. I know how friendly Jawaharlalji was to Ceylon Government and to the Ceylonese people. Long before India and Ceylon got their independence, Jawaharlalji had visited Colombo and as a fighter for freedom he was given a great welcome in your country. Everyone of us knows how close and near he was to your distinguished husband Mr. Bandaranaike. We cherish our friendship with Ceylon and it is our earnest hope that the bonds of unity will become stronger in future and that we will try to be helpful to each other. I deem it a great privilege to welcome you, Madam Prime Minister, to our country and I wish to convey to you personally and to your distinguished colleagues our happiness at your being with us.

It is very good of you, Madam Prime Minister, to have decided to visit India at this time. We have a small problem between our two countries and I know both of us believe that it should be possible to settle it. It is not unoften that problems arise between the neighbouring countries but they should also be settled in a friendly manner. I do not want to go into any details as we will be having a series of discussions during the next few days. However, both you and we have to make earnest efforts towards bringing about a settlement. If we agree in principle on the important aspects of the problem, the details could perhaps be easily worked out.

Our thinking on many vital problems in the international field has been common and we have worked together in cooperation in the United Nations and other international gatherings. Recently I have had the good fortune of meeting you in Cairo at the time of the Non-Aligned Conference. There was a general agreement in our approach and the conference arrived at many important and vital decisions.

Many revolutionary developments have taken place in the world since that Conference ended. The recent explosion of an atom bomb by China has created a stir which is undoubtedly a matter of concern for all of us. However, we have always held the view that the use of nuclear weapons should be banned by agreement and all nations in the world should unite to save the humanity from destruction. I feel also that those countries who do not possess nuclear weapons, in Europe, Asia, Africa, etc. should unite and make a concerted effort to build up necessary public opinion. This should have an impact on the countries which are in possession of nuclear weapons. I must admit that we are passing through a most difficult period in international relations and we have to act wisely and as far as possible in co-operation with each other.

I must, however, say that for our countries which have recently attained their freedom, it is most important that they should develop economically. We have to deal with the problems of poverty and unemployment, of industrial and agricultural development. I know, Madam Prime Minister, you fully believe in it and are already engaged in this task. our problems here in India are enormous, but we are trying to tackle them as effectively as we can. We believe in a planned economy and we are in the midst of our Third Five Year Plan. It is our earnest effort that through the completion of our plans, we should be able to give a better and prosperous life to our men, women and children. To me sometimes, many other things pale into insignificance, when I realise that the difficulties of the 460 million people have to be successfully and effectively tackled. Let us hope that we will be able to wage war against poverty and unemployment and build up a new social order to give real relief to our people. It is also essential that the underdeveloped countries should try to help and cooperate with each other for improving the standard of living of their people. I know you feel equally strongly on the question of peace and of economic development of Asian and African countries. We all wish you well.

## 261

May I, Madam Prime Minister, once again convey to you and to your colleagues our deep personal regards and our best wishes for the progress and prosperity of the people of Ceylon.

Excellencies, Ladies and gentlemen, may I request you to rise and wish the best of health to the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mrs. Bandara-naike, and prosperity and happiness to the people of Ceylon.

USA INDIA SRI LANKA EGYPT CHINA

**Date** : Oct 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Reply by Mrs. Bandaranaike

Replying to the toast, the Prime Minister of

Ceylon, Mrs. Bandaranaike said : I am grateful to you for the kind welcome you have accorded us today, for the friendly sentiments which you have expressed and the generous hospitality extended to us this evening. A visit to Delhi has always been an occasion to look forward to. You have received me here on my first visit abroad shortly after I assumed office. I came here again in January 1962, with the proposals of the Six Non-aligned countries on the Border Dispute. Every time I have been received with the utmost cordiality and my recollections of Delhi have always been recollections of charm, of kindness and of extraordinary hospitality. We are aware, Mr. Prime Minister, and you have left us in no doubt, that we are among friends.

Mr. Prime Minister as you would know, I was here on yet another time-in May this year for a sadder purpose-to be present at the obsequies of your great leader Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. With his death India has lost one of her greatest sons land all of us in Asia are the poorer for the loss of a statesman and leader whose visions and ideals have left an enduring imprint on the history of our times.

I had the good fortune to meet you, even though somewhat briefly, during the Conference of Non-aligned countries in Cairo earlier this month. There, I was re-assured that our two countries have much in common on most of the problems and issues which yet confront especially the countries of Asia and Africa and also the wider world. I am hopeful that in the next few days we shall have other opportunities of coming to know you Mr. Prime Minister and also your distinguished colleagues.

Besides a more informal exchange of views on such problems as occupied us in Cairo, I have come to Delhi this time mainly for the purpose of seeking a settlement of a problem which has exercised the minds of our two countries for almost 25 years. This problem, Mr. Prime Minister-the problem of the status of people of Indian origin in Ceylon-is perhaps the only one on which we have held differing views.

I am confident Mr. Prime Minister that if, during the conversations, which we shall have in the next few days, we approach the problem with the same understanding and spirit of friendship which has always influenced the relations between our two countries, a mutually acceptable solution will be within our reach.

We have too much in common in our history, our tradition, our culture and our outlook for the future to allow any problem to affect these far more abiding ties.

## USA INDIA EGYPT

**Date** : Oct 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## CEYLON

Joint Communique

The following is the text of a joint communique issued at New Delhi on October 30, 1964, at the conclusion of the talks between the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike:

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Her Excellency Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, visited Delhi from the 22nd to the 29th October, 1964. The Prime Minister of Ceylon was accompanied by His Excellency Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne, Minister of Internal & External Trade & Supply, His Excellency Mr Felix Dias Bandaranaike, Minister of Agriculture, Food & Fisheries and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs, Mr. N. Q. Dias, Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs, and other officials of the Government of Ceylon.

The Prime Minister of Ceylon assisted by His Excellency Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne, His Excellency Mr. Felix Dias Bandaranaike, the High Commissioner for Ceylon in India, His Excellency Mr. H. S. Amernsinhe, and Mr. N. Q. Dias, and other officials of the Government of Ceylon, and the Prime Minister of India assisted by the Minister

## 262

of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, the Minister of Works in the Government of Madras, Shri V. Ramaiah, the Commonwealth Secretary, Shri C. S. Jha, the High Commissioner for India in Ceylon, His Excellency Shri B. K. Kapur, and other officials, held discussions on the outstanding issues relating to the problem of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon.

The talks were frank and friendly and were held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding. The discussions were characterised by a sincere desire on the part of both Prime Ministers to arrive at a mutually satisfactory equitable and honourable settlement of the problem, without prejudice to their respective earlier positions.

In their search for a solution to the problem the two Prime Ministers agreed to a fresh approach to the problem. They reached agreement to the effect that out of 975,000 persons Ceylon will accept as Ceylon citizens 300,000 and India 525,000 persons. The status of the remaining 150,000 persons of Indian origin in Ceylon was. left for determination at a subsequent meeting of the Prime Ministers in Ceylon at an early date. It was agreed that the admission to Ceylon citizenship of the 300,000 persons and the repatriation of the 525,000 persons should be spread over a period of 15 years and that the two processes should keep pace with each other. The text of the Agreement in the form of exchange of letters between the two Prime Ministers is being released separately.

During the visit, opportunity was taken by the two Prime Ministers to make a general survey of the international situation in the light of recent developments and their possible consequences on the situation in Asia and on the problems of peace and disarmament.

The Prime Minister of Ceylon conveyed to the Prime Minister of India her warm appreciation of the friendly welcome and hospitality extended to her and members of her delegation. The Prime Minister of India expressed the great pleasures of the people and the Government of India at the Prime Minister of Ceylon's visit to India.

INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Agreement on Future of Persons of Indian Origin in Ceylon

An agreement between the Governments of India and Ceylon was signed in New Delhi on October 30, 1964, on the status and future of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon. The agreement was signed in the form of letters exchanged between the two Prime Ministers.

The following is the text of Mrs. Bandaranaike's letter :

Your Excellency,

I have the honour to refer to the discussions which we have had from the 24th to the 30th October 1964 regarding the status and future of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon and to refer to the main heads of agreement between us which are as follows :

(1) The declared objective of this agreement is that all persons of Indian origin in Ceylon who have not been recognised either as citizens of Ceylon or as citizens of India should become citizens either of Ceylon or of India.

(2) The number of such persons is approximately 975,000 as of date. This figure does not include illicit immigrants and Indian passport holders.

(3) 300,000 of these persons together with

the natural increase in that number will be granted Ceylon citizenship by the Government of Ceylon; the Government of India will accept repatriation to India of 525,000 of these persons together with the natural increase in that number. The Government of India will confer citizenship on these persons.

(4) The status and future of the remaining 150,000 of these persons will be the subject matter of a separate agreement between the two Governments.

(5) The Government of India will accept repatriation of the persons to be repatriated within a period of 15 years from the date of this Agreement according to a programme as evenly phased as possible.

(6) The grant of Ceylon citizenship under paragraph 3 and the process of repatriation under paragraph 5 shall both be phased over the period of I 5 years and shall, as far as possible, keep pace with each other in proportion to the relative numbers to be granted citizenship and to be repatriated respectively.

(7) The Government of Ceylon will grant to the persons to be repatriated to India during the period of their residence in Ceylon the same facilities as are enjoyed by. citizens of other States (except facilities for remittances) and normal facilities for their continued residence, including free visas. The Government of Ceylon agrees

## 263

that such of these persons as are gainfully employed on the date of this Agreement shall continue in their employment until the date of their repatriation in accordance with the requirements of the phased programme or until they attain the age of 55 years, whichever is earlier.

(8) Subject to the Exchange Control Regulations for the time being in force which. will not be discriminatory against the persons to be repatriated to India, the Government of Ceylon agrees to permit these persons to repatriate, at the time of their final departure for India, all their assets including their Provident Fund and gratuity amounts. The Government of Ceylon agrees that the maximum amount of assets which any family shall be permitted to repatriate shall not be reduced to less than Rs. 4,000.

(9) Two registers will be prepared as early as possible, one containing the names of persons who will be granted Ceylon citizenship, the other containing the names of persons to be repatriated to India. The completion of these registers, however, is not a condition precedent to the commencement of the grant of Ceylon citizenship and the process of repatriation.

(10) This Agreement shall come into force with effect from the date hereof and the, two Governments shall proceed with all despatch to implement this Agreement and, to that end, the officials of the two Governments shall meet as soon as possible to establish joint machinery and to formulate the appropriate procedures for the implementation of this agreement.

I have the honour to propose that the above sets out correctly the Agreement reached between us. My letter and your reply thereto shall constitute an Agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Ceylon.

The following is the text of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's letter

Your Excellency,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter No. CIT/ICP/62 of date, which reads as follows :-

I have the honour to refer to the discussions which we have bad from the 24th to the 30th October 1964 regarding the status and future of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon and to refer to the main beads of agreement between us which are as fallows :-

(1) The declared objective of this agreement is that all persons of Indian origin in Ceylon who have not been recognised either as citizens of Ceylon or as citizens of India should become citizens either of Ceylon or-of India.

(2) The number of such persons is approximately 975,000 as of date. This figure does not include illicit immigrants and Indian passport holders.

(3) 300,000 of these persons together with the natural increase in that number will be granted Ceylon citizenship by the Government of Ceylon; the Government of India will accept repatriation to India of 525,000 of these persons together with the natural increase in that number. The Government of India will confer citizenship on these persons.

(4) The status and future of the remaining 150,000 of these persons will be the subject matter of a separate agreement between the two Governments.

(5) The Government of India will accept repatriation of the persons to be repatriated within a period of 15 years from the date of this agreement according to a programme as evenly phased as possible.

(6) The grant of Ceylon citizenship under paragraph 3 and the process of repatriation under paragraph 5 shall both be phased over the period of 15 years and shall, as far as possible, keep pace with each other in proportion to the relative numbers to be granted citizenship and to be repatriated respectively.

(7) The Government of Ceylon will grant to the persons to be repatriated to India during the period of their residence in Ceylon the same facilities as are enjoyed by citizens of other States (except facilities for remmittances) and normal facilities for their continued residence, including free visas. The Government of Ceylon agrees that such of these persons as are gainfully employed on the date of this agreement shall continue in their employment until the date of their repatriation in accordance with the requirements of the phased programme or until, they attain the age of 55 years, whichever is earlier.

(8) Subject to the Exchange Control Regulations for the time being in force which will not be discriminatory against the persons to be repatriated to India, the Government of Ceylon agrees to permit these persons to repatriate, at the time of their final departure for India, all their assets including their Provident Fund and gratuity amounts. The Government of Ceylon agrees that the maximum amount of assets which any family shall

#### 264

be permitted to repatriate shall not be reduced to less than Rs. 4,000.

(9) Two registers will be prepared as early as possible, one containing the names of persons who will be granted Ceylon citizenship, the other containing the names of persons to be repatriated to India. The completion of these registers, however, is not a condition precedent to the commencement of the grant of Ceylon citizenship and the process of repatriation.

(10) This Agreement shall come into force with effect from the date hereof and the two Governments shall proceed with all despatch - to implement this Agreement and, to that. end, the officials of the two Governments shall meet as soon as possible to establish joint machinery and to formulate the appropriate procedures for the implementation of this Agreement.

Accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration".

I have the honour to confirm that the above correctly sets Out the Agreement reached between us. Your letter and my reply thereto shall constitute. an agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Ceylon.

INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

## FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Agreement on Capital Investment Signed

The Governments of India and the Federal Republic of Germany signed on October 15, 1964, in Bonn an agreement regarding protection of German capital investment in India.

The agreement, which comes into immediate effect, reiterates Government of India's policy on foreign investment in India. It provides fair compensation for investments in case of nationalisation and adequate facilities for remittance of profits, dividends and capital in case of liquidation and expropriation. The agreement, it is hoped, will give further impetus to German industry to invest in India.

GERMANY INDIA USA **Date** : Oct 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation on National Solidarity Day

On the eve of the National Solidarity Day, (October 20), the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, broadcast a message to the nation on October 19, 1964. The following is the full text of the broadcast:

Tomorrow the country will observe the National Solidarity Day. It was exactly two years ago that our northern borders were attacked. This was a surprise sprung on us so suddenly. But in this hour of peril, we saw throughout the country an upsurge of patriotic feelings. The differences between the States, caste, creed or language which often seemed superficially to divide us disappeared in a moment. It was a visible demonstration of the fundamental unity of our people which had preserved the integrity of India over the ages. The farmer in the field, the worker in the factory and indeed the people from all walks of life came forward to make their own contribution in order to defend the country's freedom. On the borders our soldiers fought with valour and with determination. So many of them made the supreme sacrifice and gave their lives so that the

#### 265

country may live. The whole nation remembers them with feelings of admiration and gratitude.

We have, however, to remember that we should not think of what happened in the past and thus suffer from a sense of undue self-satisfaction. We have also to realise that the preservation of freedom and the territorial integrity of the motherland calls for incessant efforts, vigilance and alertness. The problems that we face today are serious indeed. As I said the other day, the Chinese are trying to build up a mighty war machine and thus to create a fear in the minds of all. China has gone a step further and has recently exploded an Atom Bomb. We are thus confronted with a nuclear menace in Asia, something new for this peace-loving continent. These are serious developments and we must take due notice of them. Even otherwise, in recent days, we have seen events of greater significance happening in other parts of the world.

Within the country we are going through a period of difficulties. The production of food is still inadequate. Harvesting of rice has begun and the new paddy and rice will be coming into the market. This will ease the situation in respect of rice for the present. The farmers are aware that Government is very particular that they should get reasonable and remunerative prices for their paddy. I hope they are aware of the fact that the producers' prices have already been fixed and announced. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to expect that the kisans will come forward to sell their paddy or rice to Government at the fixed prices. I hope they will surely resist the temptation to sell it quietly to others in order to get a higher price. This will only cause misery to their own kith and kin. The farmers have always fed the country and in the present situation specially their responsibility is supreme. I am sure they will go all out to cooperate in the vital task of feeding the people.

The sowing of the Rabi crop will soon start and let us try to produce much more of wheat than we did in the year 1962, as 1963 was a lean year. It is essential that the district administration should help in the supply of adequate seeds, manure and similar other facilities. Water for irrigation purposes is the most important item.

The problem of water-logging has greatly increased in recent years. Every effort should be made to see that areas liable to water-logging are provided with necessary drains. Besides major irrigation projects, minor and medium schemes should also be taken in hand. All tanks and ponds should be deepened. At present digging of tanks is out of fashion. In fact an Act should be promulgated for the purpose of deepening of old tanks and digging of new ones. If possible, the present Irrigation Department may be split up into two Departments-one of Chief Engineer. Major and Medium irrigation Works and the other of Chief Engineer, Minor irrigation & Drainage. The new department should take over responsibility for the development of all drainage and minor irrigation works with which the rural people are really concerned. The construction of State tube-wells should not be taken up except in areas where the water level is less than 30 to 35 feet. I am told that the construction of tube-wells sometimes diverts attention from the existing irrigation works and even leads to avoidable duplication. It should always be borne in mind that new investment in tube-wells should not make the older investment infructuous nor should it result in the neglect of the existing works. These are some of the reasons why the irrigated areas in number of States has not appreciably increased in spite of considerable investment.

The District Administration has to be much more alert and active to give all encouragement and assistance to the kisans towards increased production of Rabi crop. While wheat is in no way less important, there must be greater production of pulses also. The shortage of pulses has considerably added to our present difficulties. I know we all understand and fully realise that the solution of all our present day food difficulties lies in increased production. It is therefore essential that Government officials in the districts and others at the State or Central level as also the farmers should work hand in hand to produce a much better result. Let us show to the country that we can tackle our problems effectively by our own efforts and preservance.

The question of distribution has also assumed great importance. The Cooperatives and the Fairprice shops have helped to a considerable extent in the present situation. With improved methods and with more effective supervision they can do still better. Moreover, if consumer cooperatives can be organised by local initiative, they can be of much assistance in ensuring supplies to the consumers at steady prices. I am sorry to say that grain dealers do not seem to have fully realised the gravity of the situation. This has led me to serious thinking and it now seems essential that Government must make some radical changes in the present system of distribution. I don't say that the alternative system will be hundred per cent good. It has, however, become essential to ensure by all possible means that every man gets the necessary quantum of food and at a reasonable price. We may, therefore, have to take new measures. However, I would not like to take any new steps till we have consulted the Chief Ministers. Luckily they will be here in the last week of this month and I propose to have a full discussion with them.

Let me assure my countrymen that I would be the last person to create any feeling of depression in them. Our food position, as I said earlier, will

#### 266

surely improve on account of new paddy and some other crops. Besides that, we will be continuosly getting imported wheat from the United States of America. We will also try to get it from other countries. We will, therefore, not be short of stocks so far as essential supplies to our countrymen are concerned. I am, however, keen that in the coming few months, while we should try to produce more, we must necessarily build up a better machinery for proper and equitable distribution.

In the long run, the economic conditions of the country will improve only if we plan our economy in a rational and scientific manner. We are in the midst of preparing our Fourth Five Year Plan. Agriculture is bound to get a high priority. Industry is equally important and the combination of industry and agriculture alone will take the country out of the morass we are in and present a cheering picture before our people. This is thus a period of travail and of hard labour. We have to make a determined endeavour as a people to raise ourselves above poverty and misery.

It may be obvious, but often we seem to forget that it is not the endeavour of a few people but the hard work of the many that makes the country great and prosperous. We are passing through a new and revolutionary phase in our history and all the People, should stand united as one man as they did Wore in the hour of peril. Let us then resolve this day to meet the challenge of our time with fortitude and determination and with a sense of national unity and national purpose.

While we must be prepared to meet any situation or to deal with any eventuality, we must not allow our faith in peace and peaceful methods to be dimmed. In fact, peace is of fundamental importance to a country like India that is trying to build herself up economically. But peace is of even greater importance from the point of view of humanity at large. We cannot ignore the real truth that War has ceased to be an event between one country and another; war hereafter will engulf the whole world. Some days ago, I was in Cairo attending the Non-aligned Nations Conference. The basic theme of that Conference also was peace and peaceful co-existence and there we did our best to promote these noble objectives.

On this day I invite you all my countrymen to join together as brothers and sisters in this great challenging task of building up a new, awakened and strong India. I ask you to pledge yourselves anew to the dedicated service of our motherland.

## Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Message to the Armed Forces on National Solidarity Day

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri broadcast the following message to the Armed Forces on the occasion of the National Solidarity Day, October 20, 1964:

October 20 has come to acquire a special significance for us all. It was on this date two years ago that our northern neighbours whom we had treated as a friend, launched an attack on our borders. During the weeks that followed this fateful day, the world witnessed a most heart-warming demonstration of the basic unity and solidarity of the Indian people.

The observance of the National Solidarity Day is an annual reminder of this fundamental unity. On this day, the thoughts of the whole nation turn to our Armed Forces who gallantly guard our extensive borders and who have, throughout history, been famous for their courage and stamina.

We believe in peace and peaceful development not only for ourselves, but for people all over the world. Our main preoccupation is with economic and social development at home and peace and friendship abroad. To our Armed Forces, who have been guarding our frontiers, facing the rigours of winter in the mountains; who have been taking part in peace-keeping programmes either under the auspices of the U.N. or the Geneva Agreements on Indo-China; whose sense of discipline, unity and loyalty inspires the whole nation, I send my greetings on National Solidarity Day. The whole nation remembers them today with gratitude, affection and admiration.

## Volume No

1995

## INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

## President's U.N. Day Broadcast

On the eve of the United Nations Day, (October 24), the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, broadcast the following message to the nation on October 23, 1964 :

## Friends,

Tomorrow is the U.N. Day. There is also the 'Freedom from Hunger' Week. I wish to say a few words on both these topics.

#### 267

Man is for ever on the make. He is not only moulding his environment but remaking himself. Today he is trying to adjust himself to the new international society. In many parts of the world man has largely freed himself already from superstition and ignorance and has accelerated his political economic and social accomplishments. He has to free himself today from narrow national bigotry and develop loyality to the world community.

The world is now recognising the significance of nuclear developments. Nuclear weapons can destroy in a few moments fellow human beings and the works of art and culture which they have produced down the centuries through hard and imaginative effort. The usual methods of defending national interests by military might have now become outmoded. If nuclear weapons; are used for the purpose of defending national interests, nations themselves will be wiped out. Our enemy is war; not this or that nation. Nuclear power, though by itself it is not a frightening thing and may be used for peaceful purposes, when used for military objectives, spells disaster. So we should work for complete nuclear disarmament. It is, therefore, most unfortunate that China should have exploded a nuclear device recently.

The United States and the United Kingdom have prepared a draft treaty for banning the spread of nuclear weapons and information. We may hope that the other nuclear powers will agree, after discussion and adjustment wherever necessary, to these proposals for the sake of frightened humanity.

It is necessary for the United Nations to have more universality than at present. If China is brought into the United Nations, the proposals for the banning of nuclear weapons and information might have some effect on it. That is why, even after our trouble with China in 1962, we have been pleading for the admission of China into the United Nations. If a large State like China is excluded from the deliberations of the U.N., the resolutions of the U.N. would have no binding character on China and thus will not have much practical utility. The increase in understanding between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers-which is a major contribution to peace-is an illustration of the breaking down of the prejudices that held these regions. The recent non-aligned nations conference at Cairo stood up for peaceful co-operation of States adopting different social and political systems. This mutual cooperation does not mean interference. subversion or aggression by one State on another.

United Nations must develop the strength and the confidence to respond to any situation that may produce international conflicts. In the past decade or so, it has prevented collision between the great powers; at least the great superpowers. From Korea through the Middle East to the Congo and Cyprus, a pattern has developed of bringing together an international force under the U.N. flag to keep the peace. Whatever may be the imperfections or shortcomings of the U.N., this is an idea which must be pursued and put on a sound footing.

Hitherto U.N. peace operations have not had

the universal support expected and I hope in the near future such support will be forthcoming. If all the nations agree to participate in the maintenance of a universal peace force, the strength of the U.N. will increase and it will be able to respond to the demands made on it in crises which arise from international disputes. We should decline to be persuaded by any defeat in this struggle for peace. Obstacles to progress are within ourselves. In our relations with other countries we suffer from cowardice, egotism, pride and lack of honesty. These obstacles require to be removed by greater discipline of mind and education of the heart.

The aim of every revolution is freedom for the individual. If the individual is to be afforded the possibility of self-development, his elementary needs of food, clothing and shelter require to be fulfilled. Unfortunately, in our country today, man is still the victim of nature. In some parts of our country rain is too much in other parts it is too little. In spite of our scientific progress we have not all these years been able to take adequate measures for flood control or increase our food output so as to reach self-sufficiency. Let us not give way to despair and lose faith in ourselves. The Government, I dare say, are aware of the deep concern and even resentment of the common people at the rising prices of commodities needed for daily use. I hope they are giving the highest priority to the problems of food scarcity and high prices. It is essential for us to renew faith in ourselves and in our future. We cannot travel backward in time. We must develop adequate knowledge and apply it to our agriculture and industrial development. A deep sense of patriotism and pride in the building-up of our country should enthuse our people. When all is said and done, there is no substitute for integrity, for character. The tendency to put our self-interest higher than national good requires to be curbed and all anti-social activities will have to be dealt with sternly. Let us not be lethargic in this matter.

In an international society which we envisage, each nation must attain the capacity to satisfy the minimum needs of comfort and order. All nations may not achieve an economy of abundance but they should all aim at an economy of

## minimum comfort for every citizen. This is the meaning of our socialist reconstruction. Both the Government and the people will have to work with discipline and determination to promote social health and stability. In the new order based on justice, the difference between the rich and the poor nations requires to be diminished. It is the international obligation of advanced countries to help the developing ones. We should break down barriers, close up gulfs, recognize all as the children of the one Supreme. An alliance of common purpose should bring nations nearer one another.

## INDIA USA CHINA EGYPT KOREA CONGO CYPRUS CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

## **Date** : Oct 01, 1964

# Volume No 1995 UNESCO Shri M. C. Chagla's Address to the General Conference

Shri M. C. Chagla, Union Minister for Education and Leader of the Indian Delegation, delivered the following address to the Thirteenth Session of the UNESCO General Conference held in Paris on October 22, 1964 :

Let me in the first place congratulate you (M. Nerain Sissakian, Academician of the U.S.S.R.) on your election as President of this Organisation. Your election is not only an attribute to your personal qualities but also to the cause of science which you represent with such great distinction. As a distinguished Academician, you will be able to impress upon the Organisation as a whole and upon each individual member the important role that science and technology can play in the progress towards peace and prosperity which we all desire.

268

UNESCO appeals to the mind and the spirit of man. In the history of mankind-a varied and chequered history, full of resplendent chapters and also dark and gruesome episodesthe most outstanding phenomenon has been the triumph of the human spirit over innumerable obstacles. It has transcended the barriers of space, of climate, the prejudices of colour and race and is today exploring the outer space and almost knocking at the gate of the moon.

The human spirit has always expressed itself for and through the individual. UNESCO has not and should not have any ideology. But no institution can be great unless it has a faith and a credo; and the faith of UNESCO must be that every individual is unique, that every individual has his own integrity, dignity. value and worth and it is only through the development of the individual personality that the progress of society can be measured and the supremacy of the spirit can be established.

The human spirit cannot flourish under regimentation or in an atmosphere of slavery or subservience or in conditions in which race or colour are discriminated against. It is precisely because of this that the General Conference has emphasized the role of UNESCO in contributing to the attainment of independence by colonial countries and peoples and has also underlined the fact that UNESCO must fight all forms of discrimination.

## SOUTH AFRICA AND PORTUGAL 'QUARANTINED'

It is not surprising, therefore, if a large majority of members of this organisation have refused to sit down at the same table as South Africa and Portugal. These two countries are suffering from a pathological disease and it is a disease which may prove contagious because apart from these two countries there are still vestiges left of racial pride and arrogance in other parts of the world.

In the interest, therefore, of international hygiene and sanity, it is necessary to quarantine these two countries and cut off all contacts with them. It is only when they are outside the pale of society that they may come to realise some day, I hope sooner than later, that unless they cure themselves of this fell malady, they will be looked upon by international society as nations who have persisted in being sick have even glorified in their sickness and have refused to adopt any curative measures which might restore them to normal health.

## INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

With regard to the human mind, although it is a complex and intricate piece of mechanism, it is capable of infinite adaptation. Great human achievements, amazing scientific discoveries and also cruel and horrible deeds are all conceived of and emanate from the human mind.

## 269

Therefore, the primary objective of UNESCO should be to cultivate the human mind, to remove from it all thoughts of war and violence and impregnate it with ideas of peace and international understanding.

Tolerance, understanding, compassion are qualities which proper education must engender and when we still see in this world intolerance, cruelty and prejudice, it is a sure sign that either there has not been sufficient education or that there is something basically wrong with our system of education.

Moreover, this unbelievable things is still true of this world that two-thirds of the human population are illiterate and therefore, to my mind it seems idle to speak of culture and art and literature when we have not as yet provided millions of our fellow human beings with even the glimmerings of knowledge and the capacity to acquire knowledge.

#### DEVELOPMENT DECADE

We are about to begin the Development Decade which the United Nations had declared to be a period for an all-out effort to improve the standards of living of developing countries and it seems to me that we in UNESCO should play our part in making our contributions to make this Decade a worthy chapter in the history of human development.

One of the most fruitful causes of tension and conflict is not so much ideological differences

between countries and people as the imbalance in economic and industrial development between nations. In a world sharply divided between the rich and the poor, between the developed and the underdeveloped groups, between the scientifically and technologically advanced and the backward agricultural societies, there is bound to be a sense of frustration and insecurity which are the potential sources of the overthrow of established societies.

I would like to make the following suggestions for what UNESCO can do as its own contribution in making the Development Decade a success:-

(1) A massive programme for the eradication of illiteracy. It may be difficult to make tens and hundreds of millions of illiterate people literate in the formal sense. But with the modern mass media like radio, television and the film, knowledge can be imparted to these people. In my opinion, knowledge that can be derived through the eyes and the ears is sometimes more lasting than the knowledge which one obtains through the written word.

(2) If education is to make progress, there has to be a large programme of teacher-training. The problem of most under developed countries is not the lack of students-millions want to attain the light of knowledge-but what impedes the progress of education and slows it down and often undermines its quality is the tremendous lack of trained teachers.

## TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIETY

(3) Education has not merely to impart knowledge and information, it should be a means for transformation of society itself. It has to change a backward society into a modem forward-looking one and I am firmly of the opinion that this can only be done through an intensive study of science. There is nothing more important that UNESCO can do than to help the under-developed countries in the teachin of science in schools. The teaching of science should not be postponed to the university stage. Children should be made science-minded and this requires an intensive preparation of science curriculum, of science teachers and of school laboratories. We are living in a scientific and technological age and economic and industrial development is only possible provided we learn to derive full benefit from what science and technology can contribute to the welfare of mankind. UNESCO should also serve as a clearing house for scientific research all over the world. Never before in history science has progressed at such a tremendous pace and it is essential that all countries and particularly the tinder-developed countries should know what is happening in other parts of the scientific world. Apart from acting as a clearing house, UNESCO can also play the role of bringing about greater collaboration in important scientific work between eminent scientists from different parts of the world. There is no reason now why with such quick and easy methods of communication, scientists should work in isolation. Laboratories should become international centres of scientific research and the more exchanges we have of scientists, both professors and students, the more and better served will be the cause of human progress.

There is a noticeable intellectual ferment in the world of education. New ideas and new techniques are under consideration and scrutiny and experiments are being constantly carried out to review and revise old methods of teaching and imparting knowledge. We ourselves have set up recently an Education Commission to take stock- of what we have achieved in 17 years of independence in all spheres of education. Although it is a national commission, we have invited and have received collaboration of eminent educationists from all over the world. In this connection. I wish to thank the Director-General of UNESCO for his cooperation and assis-

270

tance. I have every hope that the report of this Commission will be of interest not only to my country but to educationists everywhere.

## INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE

From this point of view, I welcome the proposal of UNESCO to set up an International Institute. This will be concerned with a serious and constant effort, to discover and promote new techniques and new tools of education. The developing countries have problems in, education which are different both in quality and in magnitude from the problems of the developed countries and this Institute, therefore. should largely devote its activities to tackling the problems that concern the newly independent countries-problems like the eradication of illiteracy, of improvement in quality of education. of introducing new methods revealed by progress in science and technology.

I would also suggest the setting up of an International Institute of Correspondence Courses under the auspices of UNESCO. This Institute could have regional branches in different countries. To meet the large demands for education in developing countries this organisation can institute correspondence courses assisted and augmented by radio and television and by other audio-visual methods. These courses could bring within the reach of every one educational and professional courses of the highest standard at a comparatively low cost. A unique feature of the correspondence course system is that its efficiency and quality increases with the increasing number of people who take advantage of this mode of training. In the constant struggle for the maintenance and improvement of standards while at the same time coping with the rapid expansion of numbers of students at all levels of education, the developing countries must necessarily make the fullest use of the system of Correspondence Courses. In perfecting this system lies a great opportunity for international action in the field of education.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

I think the primary duty of UNESCO is to reiterate and re-emphasise the fact that education is primarily a human right and although it is a pre-requisite for economic and industrial growth, it is its importance for peace and international goodwill that a body like this should constantly bear in mind. Education in its best sense should teach how to live. This is the individual aspect of education which is of paramount importance to the human being.

But true education should also teach how people of different races, colours and communities should learn to live together. That is the international aspect of education and UNESCO's function is to promote education, both because it will be satisfying the most important human needs and also promote the cause of peace and international understanding.

Fellow delegates, these are some of the observations and suggestions which I wish to make at this stage of our general discussions. My delegation will have the opportunity of offering other comments and proposals to the various organs of the Conference. I would like to congratulate the Director-General and his colleagues on the achievements of the organisation as described in the reports. May this session of the Conference advance further the noble ideals of UNESCO, the ideals of truth, freedom and justice which serve the human spirit.

# INDIA FRANCE USA PERU PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Oct 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Joint Communique on Prime Minister's visit to Cario

The following is the text of a joint communique issued on October 6, 1964 on the conclusion of the talks in Cairo between the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and the President of the U.A.R. Gamal Abdel Nasser :

His Excellency Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister of India, paid a State visit to the U.A.R. at the invitation of the Government of the U.A.R. from 2 to 4 October, 1964. He was accompanied by His Excellency Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, and high ranking officials of the Government of India. The Prime Minister was accorded a very warm and cordial welcome by the Government and the people of the U.A.R. and was deeply touched by it. During his visit, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri had full and frank exchange of views

#### 271

with President Gamal Abdel Nasser, first Vice-President Field Marshal Abdel Hakim Amer, Prime Minister Ali Sabry and other leading personalities, on matters of mutual interest and concern to the two countries. These talks were held in an atmosphere of frankness and great cordiality. Both the countries are linked together by historical ties of friendship and understanding and by their common objective of world peace and of raising the standard of living of their peoples. The friendly discussions were characteristic of the close relations existing between the two Governments and the peoples and revealed a broad identity of views and interests.

The President and the Prime Minister reaffirmed their faith in the policy of positive non-alignment and in the principles of peaceful coexistence and reiterated their conviction that nations should respect each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

The President and the Prime Minister welcomed the convening of the Conference of Nonaligned nations in Cairo as a positive step towards further lessening of world tensions and strengthening the forces of peace.

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri welcomed the great advance made by the Arab nations in all directions and especially towards the unity of the Arab people which is a positive step towards strengthening international peace and security. He agreed that the Palestine problem and the Jordan waters issue constitute a source of tension and threat to peace in West Asia. In this context, he reiterated the support given by India to the just claims of the Arab countries to the waters of river Jordan and to the rights of the Palestinian refugees.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser and Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri reviewed developments in the Sino-Indian border dispute. The Prime Minister pointed out that India had accepted the Colombo proposals. President Gamal Abdel Nasser expressed his concern that it had not been possible for negotiations to take place. He hoped that further efforts would be made by friendly countries in the interest of a peaceful settlement.

The President and the Prime Minister expressed their conviction that border disputes should in all cases be resolved by negotiations and not by resort to force of arms.

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri welcomed the emergence of free states of Africa and the recent positive steps towards unity and collaboration in the continent.

The President and the Prime Minister reaffirmed their conviction that general and complete disarmament under effective international control was vitally important for the survival of humanity and peace and progress of mankind. The partial Test-Ban Treaty, which was signed by over 100 nations, is a signal achievement. It is, however, a matter of regret that some powers have not yet subscribed to it and the President and the Prime Minister expressed the hope that in the interest of lasting peace they would also do so immediately.

The President and the Prime Minister considered it highly important that the partial Test-Ban Treaty should be extended to underground tests as well. They noted with satisfaction the close cooperation between the delegates of the U.A.R. and India in the efforts being made at the disarmament talks in Geneva to achieve progress towards a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

With the background of their own freedom struggles the U.A.R. and India are in full sympathy with the aspirations for independence of the people whose territories are still under colonial rule. Both the countries reiterated their full support for the forces of nationalism in Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Aden, South Arabia and other countries still to attain their freedom.

President Nasser expressed the hope that differences between India and Pakistan, which are such close neighbours, would be resolved peacefully by direct negotiations between the two parties without any external interference. The President and the Prime Minister reaffirmed their firm resolve to continue and enlarge the existing close cooperation between the U.A.R. and India in all fields of inter-state activity. They welcomed the steps, recently taken to enlarge trade and economic relations and to promote cooperation in cultural, scientific, technical and other fields. They expressed the hope that these growing exchanges and mutual cooperation and assistance will continue to guide the future relations of the two countries to their mutual benefits.

President Nasser expressed admiration for the progress India had made over a decade of planned development.

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri extended a cordial invitation to President Gamal Abdel Nasser and Prime Minister Ali Sabry to visit India at their convenience, which they accepted with pleasure.

272

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA EGYPT INDIA JORDAN SRI LANKA SWITZERLAND ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA PAKISTAN

**Date** : Oct 01, 1964

## November

## Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record Nov 01, 1964 Vol. X NOVEMBER No. 11

## CONTENTS

## PAGE

## CANADA

Agreement on Kundah Hydro-electric Project Signed 273

## HUNGARY

Agreement on Korba Aluminium Project Signed 273

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha opening the Debate on Foreign Affairs

274

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 279

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha on International Developmen

ts 286

## KUWAIT

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of the Crown Prince 288 Reply by the Crown Prince 289 Joint Communique on Crown Prince's Visit to India 289

## NEPAL

Indo-Nepal Air Agreement Signed 290

## SEMINAR OF ASIAN PRESS COOPERATION

Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech at his Luncheon to Delegates 291

## UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Letters embodying Trade Arrangements Exchanged 292

## UNITED KINGDOM

Shri Y. B. Chavan's Statement in Lok Sabha on Defence Aid 293
Indo-British Defence Agreement Signed 295
Press Communique on Defence Talks 296

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Indo-U.S. Loan Agreements Signed 296

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

CANADA HUNGARY KUWAIT INDIA NEPAL USA

Date : Nov 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## CANADA

Agreement on Kundah Hydro-Electric Project Signed

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on November 2, 1964 between the Governments of India and Canada concerning the construction of Stage III of the Kundah Hydro-Electric Project in Madras. Under this agreement the Government of Canada contributes a sum not exceeding \$22.2 million (Canadian) to meet the external costs of the construction of three additional Power Houses with a total installed capacity of 190,000 kilowatts, the addition of an extra generating unit in each of the two existing power houses to increase their combined capacity by 55,000 kilowatts, the construction of additional storage and diversion works in the Kundah River and its tributaries, and the erection of transmission lines and sub-stations.

In 1956, the Government of Canada assisted in construction of Stages I and II of this project and contributed a sum of \$22 million (Canadian) to meet the external costs.

The Government of Canada have also agreed to the use of rupee counterpart funds generated by the sale of commodities received from Canada under the Colombo Plan to the extent of \$5 million for the first two stages and \$25 million for the third stage of the project.

The agreement was signed by Shri P. Govindan Nair, Additional Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, on behalf of the Government of India and by The Rt. Honourable Roland Michener, High Commissioner for Canada, on behalf of the Government of Canada.

CANADA INDIA USA SRI LANKA **Date :** Nov 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Agreement on Korba Aluminium Project Signed

The representatives of the Governments of Hungary and India signed an agreement in New Delhi on November 17, 1964 for the preparation of a project report by the Hungarian experts for the proposed integrated aluminium project at Korba in Madhya Pradesh.

The agreement was signed by Dr. P. Szakal, Director, Chemokomlex, and Mr. J. Madaras, Commercial Director. Chemokomlex, on behalf of the Hungarian Government and by Shri R. N. Vasudeva, Joint Secretary, Department of Mines and Metals, on behalf of India.

The project report will be prepared in two stages. The first part of the report, which will include the economic assessment of the resources, will be presented in 10 months. On the basis of this report the Government of India will take a final decision about the scope and the capacity of the project. The final report will be presented in 18 months from the date the agreement on the project report becomes effective.

A team of Hungarian experts is expected in India by the middle of January to conduct investigations for preparation of the first stage of the project report. The National Industrial Development Corporation will act as the Technical Consultancy Bureau for the Government of India and the executing agency for the project.

### 273

The proposed project at Korba will have a capacity to manufacture 1,20,000 tonnes of alumina per annum and 30,000 tonnes per annum of aluminium metal supported by facilities to manufacture aluminium semis.

The Hungarian Government has already offered credit to cover the foreign exchange component of the project.

Arrangements for manufacture of aluminium metal from alumina and aluminium semis are to be made separately after finalising the arrangements for the first stage up to alumina with the Hungarians.

## HUNGARY INDIA USA RUSSIA

**Date** : Nov 01, 1964

## Volume No

#### 1995

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha opening the Debate on Foreign Affairs

Initiating the debate on Foreign Affairs in the Lok Sabha on November 23, 1964, Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement:

Sir, I beg to move :

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Sir, on the 17th of this month I made a statement in the House bringing to the attention of hon. Members of the House a brief review of some of the important international events that took place during the period that elapsed between the last session of the Lok Sabha and the present session. If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, very significant events of very great international importance have taken place during this period. There was the conference of non-aligned countries attended by Heads of government or State of a large number of countries from Africa, Asia, Europe and the American continent too.

There was change in the governmental setup in two important countries of Europe. There has been the change of leadership in the Soviet Union after the retirement of Premier Khrushchev. Another government has come into power but the same party continues. Whatever may be the reasons, those are not important. We have to see the change rather than carry on research into the modalities of that change.

At the same time, as a result of a general election in the U.K. the Labour Party has been voted into power and they are already in position.

### U.S.S.R.

With regard to these two changes we have the assurance which I mentioned this morning while replying to certain supplementary questions. We have got the assurance from the new leadership in the Soviet Union that the policies that had been pursued by the Government headed by Premier Khrushchev--the policies of peaceful co-existence, support of the concept of non-alignment, friendship and close relations with Indiawill continue. This is a matter of satisfaction for us.

### UNITED KINGDOM

In the U.K. the Labour Party has assumed power and is running the government now. They have taken some steps internally and have moved vigorously in the pursuit of certain objectives that they had placed before the country before the elections. nose are essentially internal matters. So far as we are concerned, our Defence Minister was there in the U.K. and has returned only the other day after a successful visit and after discussions and consultations with the leaders of Government there. I have it from him that before long he will share the information with this hon. House and will let the House know of the work that be has done there, the various arrangements that have either been renewed or strengthened or fresh arrangements that have been entered into. Our relations with U.K. have been friendly and there has been understanding on major matters and the change of Government there, if anything, should really still further strengthen the friendly relations that exist between our two countries.

274

U.S.A.

There has been in this interval fresh Presidential elections in the United States of America.

The election of President Johnson with an overwhelming majority is a significant event and demonstrates the determination of the people of the United States of America to pursue the policies of peace and of increasing cooperation amongst the friendly countries and it is really a vote against forces of extremism or forces of taking rigid attitudes in important international events. All these events are of significance. Nearer home, Mr. Speaker, the House has been rightly exercised and has shown concern over the explosion of a nuclear device by China. All these matters have been mentioned by me very briefly in my statement which I made before this House some days ago. It is not my intention to go over all this ground and I would prefer to reserve my observations or comments after I have had the benefit of hearing the views of the hon. Members. There are only a few points which I would like to elaborate further before the hon. Members start the discussion on international situation.

### CAIRO CONFERENCE

The Cairo Conference of non-aligned countries showed that notwithstanding the forces which unfortunately do continue to exist in the world, forces of confrontation, forces of conflict, the overwhelming trend was in favour of conciliation rather than confrontation. The five important principles that emerged as a result of the deliberations of the non-aligned Conference at Cairo may be described thus :

- (1) Non-alignment;
- (2) Peaceful co-existence;
- (3) Settlement of differences between States by peaceful means;
- (4) Inviolability of the frontiers of States as they existed at the time of Independence; and
- (5) General and complete disarmament and their determination that steps might be energetically pursued to bring about full disarmament.

An hon. Member: Why do you call them new five principles which emerged out of that conference ? I think these are well-established principles, the Panch Sheel.

External Affairs Minister: The principles (if Panch Sheel need not really be based in that tone. These are matters which are the result of the discussions and they are embodied in the declaration that was issued at the end of the Cairo Conference. Whatever name you might give them, these are important principles and even my colleague opposite will readily agree irrespective of the nomenclature that he gives to these principles, Panch Sheel or whatever name he wants to give. These are Principles which are the embodiment of good international behaviour and which hold out a hope for the world to be saved from conflict and disaster; and the continued adherence by a large number of countries to these principles, notwithstanding the occasional lapses that might take place, is the only hope for the emergence for a world which is free from conflict and is free from all troubles and difficulties.

### PAKISTAN

With your permission, I would now like to say a few things about our present relationship with Pakistan which is a matter of interest to hon. Members, as was evident from the large number of questions even this morning during the Question Hour. For instance, I would like to give a brief review of the present situation about our relations with Pakistan. I have repeatedly affirmed the Government's policy in regard to our relations with Pakistan, which is that we shall strive sincerely for the improvement of our relations and for the creation of an atmosphere in which the various differences between India and Pakistan can be resolved peacefully and honourably. In this spirit, it has been our endeavour to initiate the Processes of discussions and consultations with Pakistan at various levels.

As the House is aware, there was a friendly meeting between the Prime Minister and the Presdent of Pakistan in Karachi, when the Prime Minister was returning from the Cairo Conference of Non-aligned nations in Cairo. In the joint communique issued after his meeting, both Heads of Government affirmed their desire for the development of a friendly relations and co-operation between the two countries. Unfortunately, however, there have been certain developments in Pakistan in recent weeks which threaten to reverse the trends towards betterment of the relations between India and Pakistan. There have been increasing violations by Pakistan of the ceasefire line in Kashmir. In some sectors of our eastern border between Assam and Tripura and Pakistan, trigger-happy Pakistani armed persons frequently fired on the villagers and our border police in violation of existing status quo agreements. The increasing seriousness of the incidents and attacks from the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line in Jammu and Kashmir have been a source of much concern to us. With a view to reaching a gentlemen's agreement for avoiding incidents and provocations along the cease-fire line, we proposed to Pakistan in July last year that there should be a meeting between the representatives of the two countries to find ways and means of eliminating needless conflict and loss

#### 275

of life on both sides which only tended to heighten an atmosphere of tension and further to embitter relations between the two countries. In September, the Pakistan Government replied, agreeing to our suggestion, and after mutual consultations through diplomatic channels, it was arranged that a delegation from India should visit Karachi for talks on the 2nd November, 1964, with the representatives of the Pakistan Government on the restoration of tranquillity along the cease-fire line and along the international boundaries between India and Pakistan. However, on the eve of the talks, the meeting had to be postponed at Pakistan's request. After weeks of diplomatic consultations, the Pakistan Government had suggested a date after the 22nd November for talks in Rawalpindi between the Home Ministers of the two countries. He agreed to have these talks in Rawalpindi from the 23rd November, 1964, that is, from today, for two days. The Indian Delegation was announced and necessary preparations had been undertaken for the meeting. But, again, the Pakistan Government a few days ago asked for a postponement of the meeting.

Thus, these two important conferences which we had hoped might result in agreements between the two countries, however limited, have not materialized. This has been a source of disappointment to us. However, we hope that the postponed meetings will be held in the near future. Our policy of seeking a detente with Pakistan remains.

The Government of India have been greatly surprised to see that in recent weeks, an attempt has been made in Pakistan to inject an anti-Indian campaign in their election propaganda. Not only in the press and radio but in the statements of Government members and leaders of the Government party, all sorts of allegations are being made against India of interference in Pakistan elections, of favouring Opposition Parties etc. Isolated critical or analytical comments appearing in Indian newspapers have been highlighted through newspaper advertisements. It is very interesting that certain newspaper reports published in India were reproduced in the Pakistan press in the form of an advertisement.

The allegations are, of course, preposterous. Neither the people nor the Government of India have any interest in the outcome of the elections in Pakistan other than the natural interest and curiosity of a neighbouring country on such occasions. Not only are the allegations baseless, but they must be deplored; they can only cause ill-will and further vitiate the atmosphere between the two countries which we on our part have been striving to improve. It is a pity that responsible members of Government like the Home Minister and Information Minister of Pakistan should have allowed themselves to make such allegations. We have protested to the Government of Pakistan against these. We hope that whatever may be their own internal troubles or requirements, we shall greatly welcome the outcome, but we can be spared this unnecessary resort to whipping up a campaign which can well be described as Hate-India campaign. We wish them well, whatever may be the result of their elections; it is an internal matter, but we feel greatly concerned that such an occasion is used to whip up feelings against India, when we on our side are doing our best to improve relations with Pakistan, and our Prime Minister on his way back from Cairo stopped in Karachi for some time to be able to establish personal contact with the President of Pakistan; and the joint communique that was issued after the meeting of our Prime Minister with the President of Pakistan jointly expressed the common desire of the two leaders to improve the relations between the two Governments and also to take steps which might create the proper atmosphere for resolving whatever may be the differences in a peaceful, friendly and co-operative manner.

Pakistan is our neighbour, and we have always endeavoured to have the best of friendly relations with them, but this is a matter in which for us to succeed and for the two countries to be able to improve their relations, it is necessary that there should be the requisite reciprocity from Pakistan leaders.

### INDO-CEYLON AGREEMENT

There is one other matter about which with your permission I should like to say a few words, and that is about the recent agreement between the Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of Ceylon about the future of the persons of Indian origin who are in Ceylon. I had made a brief mention of this in the statement that I had already made. I want to mention only one or two important aspects of this agreement so that the House might be able to appreciate the real import and implication of this agreement.

As the House is no doubt aware, we have agreed to take 5,25,000 persons of Indian origin to India spread over a period of 15 years. About 1,30,000 persons of Indian origin have already been granted Ceylonese citizenship after an earlier agreement. So about four and halt lakh people, if we take into consideration the increase of population over the years, would be taken over by Ceylon and about 5,25,000 would be repatriated to India over a period of 15 years.

There are two important features of the agreement which I would like hon. Members to keep in mind. One is that this is spread over a period of 15 years.

### 276

I was mentioning that there are two important features of this agreement, one that the repatriation is to take place over a period of 15 years, and two, that the Government of Ceylon will provide the necessary foreign exchange to enable these repatriates to bring their assets with them when they come over to India.

An hon. Member: I wanted to know whether in the opinion of the Government of India, these people were naturalised citizens of Ceylon or did this Government consider them to be citizens of India yet ?

External Affairs Minister: On the legal status of these persons of Indian origin, there has been a long controversy between the two Governments. The Government of India's case was that those people who had gone there and had settled there, were not Indian citizens; they could be described as persons who could be stateless. That was our case. (Interruptions). There can be a difference of opinion about the wisdom of the agreement, as to whether it is good or bad. Let us be quite correct about the factual position. I am giving the factual position. The factual position so far as the status in relation to citizenship is concerned is this. These people had not been given Ceylonese citizenship. Whether it is just or not, I am stating the exact position as it was.

The point is that there was in 1954 or 1955 a legislative measure passed by the Ceylon Parliament which authorised the Government of Ceylon to confer Ceylonese citizenship rights on persons of Indian and Pakistan origin. This is an important fact. In response to certain provisions contained in that legislative measure, large numbers of applications were being made by persons of Indian origin asking for the conferment of the right of Ceylonese citizenship on them. Therefore, to suggest or to argue that they were already Ceylonese citizens and hence by some process of law or some constitutional provision they had become Ceylonese citizens is factually not correct and is not borne out by the facts (Interruptions).

I was saying that in response to a provision in the India and Pakistan Citizenship Act adopted by the Ceylonese Parliament. applications were invited for grant of citizenship rights, for conferring citizenship rights upon persons of Indian origin and persons of Pakistani origin. A very large number of applications were made, something to the tune of seven to eight lakhs. It is quite evident that if these persons were already Ceylon citizens and if this was our case, then there was no point in making applications asking for the grant of Cevlonese citizenship by them. We may have other reasons that these are people who have settled there, who have been living there for a long time, and therefore they should not be disrupted. The validity of that is something which can- be considered, and we claim that we did give due consideration to that aspect, but about the legal implications of the position that we took there should be no doubt in our mind, and we should not adopt an attitude which may appear to be convenient to us, but it will be very wrong really on the facts to take up a position which is not correct.

In the various stages of the talks which took place on earlier occasions-and these talks have taken place several times during the last 20 to 25 years; even before independence there were talks about the future.

During all these discussions, the contention of the Ceylon Government consistently has been that these persons, notwithstanding their residence in Ceylon, are Indian citizens .... So far as we are concerned, we had said that persons of Indian origin who had gone to Ceylon and who have become domiciled there, and who are there, some of them for generations, they are people who have made Ceylon their home. You cannot compel another country to give them the citizenship right, because that is a matter within the sovereign right of any country, and it is decided by the laws of that country, just as we in our country are masters of this question of granting Indian citizenship rights to any person who comes and settles here. There are laws on that, and we can make laws, we can modify laws in that respect. So, this is the sovereign right of any country to grant citizenship right according to the various provisions that they might make. according to their Constitution, according to their law.

So, it is a fact that these people had not been given Ceylonese citizenship right. It is important, therefore, to consider this, that there is this mass of people whose future is uncertain. They were not Ceylonese citizens, they were not on their electoral rolls, they did not participate as full citizens in the scheme of their civic and political life. Therefore, it was a matter of great concern for us also that the future of these people of Indian origin should not remain in this uncertain condition; there must be some clear idea about their future.

We had all along pressed that it was a human problem. It is a problem where people who are settled there, who have made their homes there. should not be disturbed against their wishes. If anybody wants to come, well, consistent with the traditions that we have followed, though we may not like it, we have never closed our doors, because of certain conditions prevailing in a country, because of political or economic conditions, people who find life in other countries not quite palatable or quite comfortable, might like to come back. There are many people who are

#### 277

coming back. We have to make a distinction between those people who are abroad on our travel documents and want to come back, and others of this type, i.e., people in Ceylon originally are of Indian origin, who had gone there mostly as labour on tea estates. They had not been given Ceylonese citizenship rights, except the 1,30,000 persons about whom I made mention a moment ago. The others were there.

Even with regard to these others, ever since we started our discussions with the Ceylon Government, it was not our case that they were Ceylon citizens. At no stage during these talks have we taken up this position that they have acquired citizenship rights. So, this is the factual position.

In this background, we had to take a decision. The contention of the Ceylon Government throughout has been that these people, although domiciled by their physical presence in Ceylon, continue to be Indian citizens, whereas we had said that by virtue of this domicile there, they were not Indian citizens. If Indian citizenship is to be conferred, they will have to apply for it; if they come and comply with our laws and regulations, then India can grant Indian citizenship rights. This is the factual position as had obtained.

In this background, we had to take a decision, in view of the Ceylon Government's own policies of increasing employment opportunities for their own people and various other considerations, as to whether these people should continue to be in this uncertain position there, or whether something should be done which would be acceptable to the two Governments and which would establish friendly relations between the two countries, and which should also be broadly acceptable to the persons concerned.

When I went to Ceylon, I did have consultations with the leaders of persons of Indian origin there. It is a fact that, whatever may be the reason, there is a good percentage amongst our people who are settled there, who want to return to India. It is a hard fact, may not be a convenient or pleasant, but it is a fact (Interruption).

I do not say that all the 5,35,000 people are willing to come. What I am saying is that there is a good percentage of these people, who want to come, whatever may be the consideration, and their number runs into lakhs, I may say. There is no doubt about it. and this is evident from the approaches that have been made to our High Commission for granting travel facilities for coming over to India and for arranging their repatriation. Let there be no doubt on that score.

So, we had to take a position, we had to enter into an agreement whereby these people come in an orderly manner, in a phased manner, and a situation is not created where we are just offloaded with a large number of people, who for various reasons find it not quite comfortable or congenial to stay on and then to come even without any assets. So, a choice had to be made between that sort of situation and an agreement had been reached so that this could be done in an orderly manner. There could be a difference of opinion as to why we should have taken 5 lakhs or 4 lakhs.....

When an agreement of that type has to be enunciated and finalised it has to be done in a spirit of give and take. We have also to look to the difficulties of a neighbouring and friendly country who have got their own problems and should not take up an attitude of intransigence ...... (Interruptions). I am not giving in. Therefore, we took this position and I repeat that the actual repatriation is spread over a period of fifteen years and that they can bring their assets or things.

There is a subsequent development about which certain questions have been put, namely, the proposal mentioned in Ceylon Parliament of placing them on a separate register. I would like to make it absolutely clear that this was a matter which was never mentioned by the Ceylon delegation during the talks .... I was elaborating the point that this question of whether these persons to be given Ceylonese citizenship are to be placed on a separate electoral register was not mentioned in the course of the discussions.

I was saying that the separate electoral register was not raised in the course of the talks. Secondly, I had already informed the House that 1.30 lakhs or more of persons of Indian origin had already been given Ceylonese citizenship rights, some eight or nine years ago and all these years these people were in the normal electoral register. It was not a matter which would occur to us and we had assumed that the same nondiscriminatory treatment that had been accorded earlier to those who had been granted citizenship rights would be given to the others also. Therefore, there was nothing to excite any attention, suspicion or any doubt in our mind and we presumed that this will be the normal thing. Now that this has come to our notice, our Prime Minister has already conveyed our concern about this, and our Prime Minister is taking this matter up with the Prime Minister of Ceylon, and we intend to put forward our viewpoint. To be

fair to the Government of Ceylon, they. are taking this position that. this is an internal matter for them. But in a matter like this, where there has been an agreement between two countries to confer citizenship right. if that citizenship right is to be of a type different from the normal Citizenship right, then, it is a matter which is

### 278

very relevant and is very pertinent to the agree.:, ment which has been entered upon by the two Governments. These are the aspect; which I wanted to mention before the House relating to the Indo-Ceylon agreement.

### AFRICA

I shall refer to a few things more before I finish, and they are some salient things about Africa. The emergence of the Republic of Zambia as an independent State and member of the Commonwealth has been a source of satisfaction to us. We have welcomed the election of that wise statesman, Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, as the first President of the Republic of Zambia. We also welcome the independence of Malawi and Malta as equal members of the Commonwealth.

As the hon. Members are aware, the manifestations of colonialism in its worst forms are found in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and in the Portuguese colonies. The situation in Southern Rhodesia created by the likelihood of the White minority Government in Salisbury declaring the independence of the country unilaterally has been the cause of much concern to the Government of India. Our thinking has been in tune with the aspirations of the African people, and the Government of India have reiterated its stand in categorical terms that no recognition will be given to a unilateral declaration of independence. We continue to advocate the release of all African political leaders and the holding of a general election on the basis of one man one vote. The Government's stand received support not only from all African Governments but from most progressive Governments of the world. We welcome the public warning given by the new British Government to Mr. Ian Smith that a unilateral declaration of independence would amount to a betraval and treason and would have disastrous political and economic consequences for

the country. As a result of pressure exerted from various quarters, the White minority Government has deferred decision on a unilateral declaration of independence. This is to be welcomed as far as it goes and we hope that wiser counsels will prevail in bringing about a satisfactory solution to the problem in Southern Rhodesia with the consent of the African majority.

We welcome the declaration made by the United Kingdom Government a few days ago, imposing an embargo on further arms supply to South Africa. This declaration of the United Kingdom, which brings it in line with the resolution of the United Nations, is sure to have a very good impact throughout the world and we hope that other countries, which are still supplying arms to South Africa, will also act likewise and in consonance with the resolutions of the United Nations.

# INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM CHINA EGYPT PAKISTAN ZAMBIA MALAWI MALTA SOUTH AFRICA

**Date** : Nov 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Replying to the debate on foreign affairs in the Lok Sabha on November 25, 1964, the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, said :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate has lasted for two days and we had the benefit of considered opinions from all sections of the House. A large number of hon. Members have participated in the debate. If I may say, the level of debate has been high and important issues have been raised.

My task has been greatly lightened by the inter-

vention of the Prime Minister because be has replied to the debate so far as the one important issue, namely, the explosion of nuclear device by China and our attitude thereto is concerned. That has been replied to in detail by the Prime Minister. He also touched upon some other general points and I will. therefore, confine myself, in my reply, to some of the specific points which have been raised on the floor of the House.

An hon. Member in his speech has raised a very important question, namely the difficulty that is being experienced at the moment in the international world about the non-payment of dues and the effect thereof on the voting right of the defaulting countries. I entirely agree with the hon. Member that this is a very important issue, and I would like, therefore, to acquaint the House with the correct position.

### U.N. PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

Besides the continuing major problems of disarmament, decolonisation, apartheid and economic development, the General Assembly will be faced with the delicate problem of financing of U.N. peace-keeping operations. Since the adoption of the Uniting for Peace Resolution in November, 1950, under which the General Assembly assumed the powers to make recommendations for collective measures including the use of military force for the maintenance of international peace and security in cases where the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent Members, was unable to act, there has been sharp controversy and disagreement between the two major powers, namely the

#### 279

United states and the Soviet Union over this issue. Meanwhile, the United Nations has undertaken a number of peace-keeping operations at considerable expense to the members. Some member-countries nave paid for them while others have not. These financial difficulties need to be resolved.

The Soviet Union has declared U.N. peacekeeping operations not spacifically authorised by the Security Council as unauthorised and irregular and, therefore, not a financial liability of member-States. On the other hand, the United States and some other countries considered these expenses as obligatory. Those who have not paid their dues and have fallen into heavy arrears are threatened with the loss of voting rights in the General Assembly.

Thus, the whole issue is assuming a menacing aspect, which is not in the best interests of the U.N. which according to its Charter has to be a centre for harmonising the actions of members in the attainment of its common ends. We do not consider this issue to be impossible of settlement, given a spirit of mutual accommodation and goodwill and a determination on all sides to preserve the universality and integrity of the United Nations.

It may be recalled that the year 1965 has been designated by the U.N. as the International Cooperation Year. The House may recall that the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, while addressing the U.N. had made a fervent appeal that an international co-operation year might be celebrated and the things that were common between various countries should be highlighted rather than differences. Accordingly, the year 1965 has been designated as the year for international cooperation, by the United Nations. It would be really sad and paradoxical if the year of co-operation should begin with acts of disruption of the United Nations. We have always taken the stand that this issue has got two important facets. One is the legal aspect, and the other is the political aspect. Both these aspects are important, and it is necessary that all the countries should strive to find a satisfactory solution and they should work for saving the United Nations from the split that it faces, because the continuance of United Nations is more important than any other consideration, and a satisfactory solution of this difficult and thorny problem should be attempted.

I have some reason to hope, in view of certain discussions that have already taken place between the representatives of the two superpower, namely the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., that neither of the two countries is anxious to force a show-down on this issue, and there is hope that a solution satisfactory to both the parties and in the interests of the continuance of the United Nations as the rallying point for maintaining peace would be found.

An hon. Member: Has not India given her opinion already about it? The Permanent Representative of India at the U.N. has already questioned the compulsory nature of the financial assessments for peace-keeping operations by the U.N. Has he not ?

External Affairs Minister -: The Permanent Representative has made a statement in the smaller group, that is, the committee stage. In tact, there are more than one statement which have been made by the Permanent Representative of the Government of India. It is a fact that we stand for universality and we also feel the dues should be paid. That is one aspect. The other, as to whether non-payment automatically results in forfeiture of the right of vote, is a matter which is an important matter, and this will be considered.

As that matter is going to be discussed, I do not want to make any specific statement on this issue. Our effort is to find a solution which might be acceptable to both and we have made statements which are not inconsistent with the possibility of finding a solution which might be acceptable to the two parties. The important thing is that on this issue, the U.N. should not split, and some method should be found whereby the U.N. could be saved from this real danger that it faces today.

## INDO-CEYLON AGREEMENT

Other matters have been mentioned in the course of the debate. I would like to say something on this Indo-Ceylon Agreement, about which several hon. Members have made their comments, and place the position clearly before the House so that the House and the country might be able to judge the circumstances under which this agreement has been arrived at.

It has been said that persons of Indian origin in Ceylon have been there for generations and have contributed to the prosperity of Ceylon. This is correct. It is further said that given these facts, such persons of Indian origin in Cey-Ion are automatically Ceylon citizens and, therefore, no concern of India. That is the essence of the argument put forward by some hon. Members who have offered their comments. It has been our contention that a vast majority of persons of Indian origin should be regarded as Ceylon citizens. We never deviated from that contention, and in our talks with Mrs. Bandaranaike, we reiterated this position. If Ceylon had accepted

### 280

this contention, the problem would have been solved long ago. The fact of the matter, however, is that Ceylon did not accept our contention. On the contrary, it put forward the vie that those persons of Indian origin on whom Ceylon did not confer Ceylon citizenship automatically continue to be Indian nationals and, therefore, it was the responsibility of the Government of India to agree to their repatriation to their homeland. In our talks in Delhi last month, Mrs. Bandaranaike again expounded the same view.

I might add that this basic difference in our positions was recognised even in 1954 when talks took place between the two Prime Ministers. And as a result of these talks, an agreement was reached between the two countries which, unfortunately, for various reasons did not work. An understanding was then reached that both Governments would, in accordance with their own laws, consider applications for registration as Ceylon or Indian citizens as the case may be, and that the case of the residue would be further considered by the two Governments, after two years, i.e., after two years from 1954.

It was agreed during the recent talks that there was no meeting ground between these opposing points of view about the citizenship of these persons, but that, nevertheless, leaving aside our respective stands, we should endeavour to reach a pragmatic solution of the problem, treating it as a human and political problem. We agreed that every endeavour should be made to find a solution, so that this long-standing problem, which had bedevilled our relations, should be out of the way, and that we should enter into an era of close friendship, understanding and cooperation. I am confident that every Member of the House would like our relations with Ceylon, with whom we are bound by ties of history and culture, to be one of utmost friendship and good

neighbourliness. It was easy, having reaffirmed our point of view, to break off the discussions, but this obviously was undesirable, and it was in this spirit and in the spirit of give and take that we reached agreement on the 30th October, 1964.

Some Members have spoken as if there was no problem at all. They seem to think that India had no concern with these people, that it was Ceylon's problem and it was entirely for the Government to find a solution to it. This is not a realistic constructive approach. If it were Ceylon's problem only, why did we undertake a series of negotiations, most of them at the highest level, since 1940-41.

Is it possible for this House to wash its hands entirely of people of Indian origin in Ceylon, leaving them to suffer the consequences of being neither Ceylon, nor Indian citizens ?

I appreciate that there may be a difference of opinion as to the content of the agreement, but I urge that there can and should be no difference regarding the desirability of reaching an agreement on this vexed question and of establishing satisfactory relations with our very friendly neighbour, Ceylon. As to the contents of the agreement, the figure of 5,25,000 might appear to be large. The figures mentioned in the agreement were, however, agreed upon after prolonged and difficult negotiations and discussions. We had to take into account the many difficulties that the Ceylon Prime Minister put forward in undertaking to confer citizenship on more than 3,00,000 out of the 9,75,000 persons of Indian origin, who, at present, are neither Ceylon nor Indian citizens. Eventually, we agreed to confer Indian citizenship on many more people than we had originally offered, namely 3,00,000 in the course of the official talks in Ceylon. This is certainly a heavy burden we have Undertaken. These persons will, however, as I mentioned earlier, be coming over a period of 15 years, and will be permitted to bring their assets, which would, to some extent, lighten our burden.

I would like to make it clear that there is no question of wholesale compulsory repatriation. There are already fairly large number of people who wish to come away voluntarily, and we think that if the scheme progresses smoothly, and if we are able to absorb the repatriates usefully in the country, the element of compulsion will not have to be applied at all.

The agreement that was concluded, I am sure, is a good and amicable solution of a vexed problem. The agreement, if properly implemented, will yield rich dividends in friendship and good relations with Ceylon and in the happiness and contentment of people of Indian origin in Ceylon, who are at present technically in the "stateless" category. We hope that all concerned will cooperate in the working of the agreement.

An hon. Member : Will these 5,25,000 persons come back to our country during the 15 years with the children that they get in the meanwhile ?

External Affairs Minister : The whole matter has not been finally decided whether this number will be including the children. That is total number. Whatever is the residue, will be the subject matter of a separate discussion.

I would like to mention two other points. The Ceylon Government announced its intention to bring the Ceylonese citizens of Indian origin on a separate electoral register. A feeling had been roused-I agree quite rightly-among Members. Our Prime Minister had written to the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mrs. Bandaranaike conveying our great concern and we hope the Ceylon Government will appreciate our point of view

### 281

and that nothing will be done to undermine the spirit of the agreement concluded between us. I do not wish to say much more on this subject at sent. I can assure the House that we shall make every effort with the Ceylon Government to persuade them not to give effect to this intention.

The second point is the plea of some Members that we should have sought the concurrence of the affected persons in Ceylon. I would like to inform the House that our representatives have been constantly in touch with the representatives of the organisations of such persons and I myself, when I was in Colombo, had talks wih the persons affected and with their leaders. The representatives whom we met did strongly urge that the two Governments should come to a final decision about this question. They also said that it was difficult to question or suggest actual numbers on which settlement can be effected. Whatever the settlement it will have to be based on the repatriation of certain numbers to India and the agreement of the Ceylon Government to confer citizenship rights on those who are left in Ceylon. The broad pattern of the settlement which was finally agreed upon between the two Governments was agreed but I must say that the numbers as such were not agreed. Obviously, it cannot be, it is a question of trying to find a solution which might be acceptable to both.

An hon. Member: May I ask my hon. friend whether it was not a fact that Mr. Natesan, who is one of their leaders and who is one of the noted parliamentarians there in the Ceylon Parliament had himself taken objection to the Government of India making it their principal concern about the so-called stateless people and their reaching an agreement with the Ceylon Government making it possible for the Ceylon Government to send away such large sections from Ceylon ?

External Affairs Minister : I hope the hon. Member who belongs, as he does, to South India knows that there is what is called the Tamil Cevlonese population there .... (An hon. Member : Jaffna population; they are the bulk). The gentleman whom the Leader of the Swatantra Party has mentioned is really the leader of that group. Unfortunately, it must be remembered that there has been a conflict between the Tamil Cevlonese and those who come from the Jaffna area. I did not want to mention it in this form but because the bon. Member is asking me to give information I say this. There are the Tamil Ceylonese who are Cevlonese citizens, settled there for generations and who are admittedly Ceylon citizens. There is no question of change in the status of those persons. In the Jaffna area their leaders are not accepted as leaders of this group estate labourers, who have mostly gone there and their leader is Mr. Thondaman who is also a Member of Parliament but he got citizenship much later. There is a distinction between the Ceylonese, who are Tamil Ceylonese and who are there for a long time

and those people who are of Indian origin. Unfortunately, there is a conflict between the two and their approach, between the two, had been varying from time to time.

An hon. Member: Why were not their representatives associated with the negotiations that were going on ? They were the party concerned.

External Affairs Minister: The agreement was between the two Governments and it would have been, from our point of view, a good thing if those also could be associated but it is not uncommon that when two Governments negotiate, private individuals are not associated. That does not mean that their views are not ascertained; they are known. Mr. Thondaman is also a Member of their Parliament and he is in touch with the Ceylon Government also. The House would kindly appreciate that it is not easy to persuade another Government to agree to associate in the talks people whom they do not want to associate. From our side we ascertained their views. From the beginning the stand is that whatever agreement is arrived at, it should be equitable and honourable to both the countries and it should also be broadly acceptable to the persons concerned.

An hon. Member: We have been consistently maintaining this stand which the late Prime Minister, mentioned in the Lok Sabha on 7-8-61 answering a question :

"The question is not so much of origin but of their present, legal, constitutional position. According to us, they are Ceylon nationals." Besides, answering a question on 26th August 1963, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said :

"Our position has been that those who are entitled under our Constitution, they will be accepted and registered as Indian citizens and there is no objection to it provided they are not compelled, no coercive method or force is employed and they decide it voluntarily."

That has been the stand of our late Prime Minister. Has that stand been followed by the present Ministry?

External Affairs Minister : He could as well have quoted the speech of our Prime Minister

which he made at the time of opening of these talks. We had to find a solution.... (Interruptions.). I have attempted to explain that this contention that all of them were Ceylon citizens was not acceptable to the other Government. They had already applied for Ceylonese citizenship rights and those applications in lakhs were

### 282

generally rejected. Therefore, one method could be to continue that and say that they are Ceylonese citizens and therefore we should forget about them. But in an important matter like this, the choice is not easy and either you leave them there and expose them to all the legislative measures, Ceylonisation of employment and Ceylonisation of trade and the like and then get them helter-skelter, or you enter into an agreement taking into consideration the difficulties that might be expressed by the Government concerned and then try to arrive at a solution which may not be entirely to our liking but a solution based on the principle of give and take. So, there is no contradiction between the earlier stand and this.

An hon. Member: When they applied for Ceylon citizenship, they were asked to submit their birth certificates also, and the registers which contain the date of birth and so on had been hidden from them. The dates were not given by the Ceylonese Government. Therefore, the people could not substantiate their application with the birth certificates. I can submit that even some of the Ministers in the Ceylon Government would not be able to produce birth certificates of their parents or grand parents if they are asked to do that, not to speak of the people of Indian origin.

External Affairs Minister: The difficulties may be there, and they were there, I admit; but what is the answer? If there is a particular mode of proof that is prescribed under any legislation, and if that proof is not provided, then I do not say, what is the answer.

Even according to this agreement, we made some rough assessment and it came out in the course of the discussion-and after examining the figures and other information that we havethat the number of people who will be given Ceylonese citizenship rights will cover almost all those persons who were born in Ceylon because 1,30,000 or so have already been granted Ceylonese citizenship rights, and three lakhs more that are sought to be taken will cover practically all those people who were born in Cevlon. It has not been firmly agreed to; this difficulty which has been mentioned by the hon. Member opposite was before us when we were considering as to what could be the practical ways of implementing it. At one stage it was suggested that in earlier applications which were given at that time, even the-statement of those contained in the applications that they have been born there would prima facie be accepted. I am not saying that that is a firm agreement, but it is quite possible that we might be able to persuade them that the proof of age in the case of those who in their-earlier applications have already asserted that they were born in Ceylon should be accepted as sufficient proof. The implementation of this agreement, let us be quite clear, means legislation even in Ceylon, because there is no law there now nor is there any constitutional provision under which they could grant citizenship rights to those to whom they have agreed to give citizenship rights. They will have to undertake legislation, and it will be our endeavour in the course of further talks for implementing the proposals to ensure that adequate procedures are laid down so that this type of difficulties might be taken note of and might be avoided....

I have already explained the position quite clearly. If we have to take, as we have agreed to take, about 5,25,000, our assessment is based not on any just guess but on account of the context, the application and approaches that have been made to our High Commission.

An hon. Member : You have agreed to take. But if they are not willing to come, what are you going to do ?

External Affairs Minister: We will see what is the answer. Why should we take a hypothetical stand? About three lakh people are such who are wanting to come straightaway. In fact, they will be staggered, that is, their coming will be phased over 10 years. In the meantime there is the agreement that they will continue to be in employment, and thereafter we can see as to what is the attitude of the others in a matter of this kind .... (interruption).

Let us not try to read in the agreement something which does not exist, but we will work together in a spirit of mutual understanding and accommodation. I have every reason to hope that the Ceylonese Government will not be unreasonable.

### INDO-CHINA

I should like, with your permission, to mention a few more points to the House, some salient features of the present situation in South-East Asia to which some hon. Members did make a reference. I will briefly mention the situation in the countries of Indo-China and the surrounding areas.

The troubled situation in Indo-China continues. Hon. Members are, no doubt, aware of the many forces at work in that unhappy area which has known no peace ever since its liberation from colonialism 10 years ago. We are in frequent diplomatic contact with other members of the Geneva Conference in which we always try to emphasize the need for a political rather than a military solution in Indo-China.

In Laos, unfortunately, the talks between the three political factions in Paris have yielded

#### 283

no results yet. In the absence of an agreement between them it is difficult to make any progress towards restoring peace and tranquillity in Laos and towards the full implementation of the Geneva agreement of 1962. We have supported the proposal for convening a 14-nation conference on Laos.

In Viet Nam, the situation continues to be as unsatisfactory and dangerous as before.

In regard to Cambodia, as hon. Members are aware, the Government of Cambodia desires Cambodia's neutrality and territorial integrity to be guaranteed at an international conference and has been pressing for this for quite some time. We support Cambodia's plea for an international conference and we have pressed our point of view in our contacts through diplomatic channels with the members of the Geneva conference. Recently the breach of diplmatic, relations between Cambodia and the United States of America appeared to be imminent. But we note with satisfaction that Cambodia and the United States have agreed to talks in New Delhi which might help in the improvement of their relations. These talks are likely to start very soon. We have welcomed the holding of these talks in New Delhi for which we have offered to make available such facilities as may be desired. We hope that as a result of these talks the relations between the two countries, which are both friendly to us, will improve.....

An hon. Member: Cambodia has been asking about guaranteeing her frontiers and it was on that question that it broke with the U.S.A. Have we got any definite views about it and may I know whether we will be able to assist them in this matter ? Cambodia has been crying hoarse that her frontiers be guaranteed.

External Affairs Minister : I have already mentioned that it is Cambodia's desire that her neutrality and territorial integrity should be guaranteed. That is the main point and we hope that as a result of these steps, we could prevent the breach between the United States and Cambodia, and it could be opened for reconvening the Geneva conference where the thing which is uppermost in the mind of Cambodia might be satisfactorily solved.

### CAIRO CONFERENCE

With regard to the Cairo conference, there have been remarks, some appreciative and others that it was a useless exercise that only platitudes and principles were enunciated and nothing concrete emerged out of it. In a conference of this nature where a large number of countriespractically half the number represented in the United Nations-have met and subscribed to some principles, then it will not be wise and proper simply to brush it aside and say that they agreed only upon principles and that nothing concrete emerged out of it.

I would like to remind the House that in international community and international relations, principles play a very important part. They influence the thinking in all the capitals and it will not be a good world where there are no principles for international behaviour and for international relations. This august House should not take this issue so lightly and should not really laugh away the principles, because principles are a matter of very great importance. There were certain principles which have been agreed upon and those principles affect the thinking and attitude even when concrete issues arise between the countries bilaterally or in any other disputes of this nature. I am sure that-as I can see from the mild protests that are now being raised-we are not opposed to subscribing to good principles. We should really try to evolve sound principles of international behaviour. The principles that very prominently emerged as a result of the discussions in the Cairo conference which are contained in the declaration that was adopted are peaceful coexistence, eradication of colonialism, determined fight of the international community to end colonialism in any form or shape from all parts of the world, to work for disarmament and to work for peace. These are laudable principles. The adoption of these principles in this conference and the solemn declaration that these will be adhered to will go a long way in resolving even the specific problems that might exist between two countries.

An hon. Member: Our Prime Minister made a very laudable suggestion in that conference that there should be a delegation going to China to persuade China against having nuclear weapons for aggressive purposes. May I know why this suggestion of the Prime Minister was not carried to the logical conclusion ? What were the countries in Cairo which supported this suggestion ?

External Affairs Minister : The fact is the Prime Minister did make a suggestion like that, but many countries thought that there was no use, because China has not even agreed to sign the Moscow test ban treaty and therefore, there is no point in asking them-to stop. If they want to go ahead', they will go ahead. Therefore, it cannot be said that the suggestion was not proper, if other countries did not agree to it. There was a unanimous declaration that none of us will undertake any tests or develop nuclear power for deadly purposes or non-peaceful purposes. They also called upon all the countries of the world which have not yet subscribed to the Moscow test ban treaty to subscribe to it and to desist from carrying on any test. France, China,

### 284

Cambodia and several other countries have not signed the Moscow test ban treaty. It was clearly mentioned in that declaration itself that all these non-aligned countries declare that they themselves will adopt a certain code in the matter of development of nuclear energy and they also called upon all those countries which have not signed the test ban treaty to subscribe to it and to desist from undertaking any tests. I have already said in my statement that China exploded this bomb in flagrant violation of the declaration of the countries that collected in Cairo.

An hon. Member : Even after this code of conduct formulated at Cairo, Indonesia has come out with her intention to produce atomic power for defence purposes. It is flagrant violation of that declaration.

External Affairs Minister : If they do it, that will be in violation of this agreement. If some countries choose to go back upon the declaration, that does not mean that the declaration is bad or it is not worthwhile attempting to have unanimity.

The declaration that was adopted on nuclear energy and use of nuclear devices for non-peaceful purposes only was very clear and that substantially met our viewpoint. We wish it were a little more explicit, but when a large number of countries are there, one has to do one's best and just be content if the substance is achieved.

An hon. Member: Are political conferences to be the equivalents of theological seminaries and eucharistic congresses or something more positive ? Is it the only purpose to enunciate principles which are good for all time to come and which will be valid for all eternity ? What happens when participants or nations flagrantly violate the declaration ? Will these congresses like the Cairo Congress have the guts to condemn aggression ? Did you get them to condemn the Chinese aggression against your own motherland ? What is the use of enunciating these principles ?

External Affairs Minister: There should not be any doubt in anybody's mind that a conference of sovereign countries should be regarded only as a meeting of a group of theoreticians or theologians or religious heads merely propounding abstract principles. It is not correct at all to describe the declarations of a gathering of this type at that level. Let us be clear that these declarations are not treaties as such. It is really a declaration of policy to be adopted by a group of countries that get together. They definitely influence their course of action subsequently and therefore, there is a great value of in countries coming together and subscribing to such principles, because they create lot of support in favour of those principles even in countries who are not in that conference. The subsequent information that we have got from other capitals of the world, who did not participate in this conference, does go to show that the declarations that were adopted did have a profound effect on their thinking on many issues that are likely to come up in any form. (Interruptions).

### MALAYSIA AND INDONESIA

The relationship between Malaysia and Indonesia continues to be strained. We, in Cairo, did make some attempt to find some way by which these difficulties might be resolved. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Malaysia was not there. Some talks did take place, and at diplomatic level our efforts continue to improve the relations between Malaysia and Indonesia. We firmly believe that there cannot be a military solution of these difficulties and that the two countries should be enabled to discuss this matter and find a solution. Some effort has already been made by certain other friendly countries and there have been contacts at certain levels, but the situation really has not very much improved. We are in touch with the two governments and also other friendly countries. I have myself, the House will be glad to know, an invitation not only from Malaysia but also from Indonesia and, may be in about a month's time or so, after I finish my work in the United Nations, it is my intention to go into that part of this world and try to do something .... (Interruption). I would request hon. Members, when we are making an effort to improve the relations, not only not to

interrupt me but also not to make me take a stand which may come in the way of our efforts which we are making for the improvement of those relations....

### INDIANS IN BURMA

A mention has been made about the people who are coming from Burma. The bon. Member, the Maharaja of Bikaner, who recently returned from a visit to Burma has narrated the difficulties that are being experienced. We are seized of the problem and we have also conveved to the Burmese Government our concern on several aspects. The Foreign Minister of Burma had agreed to visit India and it was our intention to continue the talks that I had initiated in Rangoon when I went there. Therefore, we are seized of this problem. But the problem which the hon. Member mentioned was more in relation to the provision of facilities for their coming out. Those arrangements we are making from time to time. But more important than these facilities for repatriation is the basic question of the continuation of the large number of Burmese who are still there in Burma. As I mentioned on an earlier occasion, I have the assurance of the Burmese Government at the

### 285

highest level that these Indians--and they run into lakhs I would like to add here--who are prepared to fit in with the changed conditions there both in relation to land and other thingsthe working classes-have a future there, and those of them who decide to continue to live there will be assured of not only safety but also honour so that they can live there as respectful citizens.

The leader of the Jan Sangh group did make a mention that in relation to giving compensation there has been some discrimination. He is making a confusion between the earlier nationalisation measures which took place several years ago when some of the British concerns including.... pharmaceuticals and certain oil installations were taken over, and the present one. In this recent nationalisation proposal which has hit a large number of Indians who were in business, there has been no discrimination between either a European concern or a Chinese concern or an Indian concern or a Pakistani concern or a Burmese concern. People who have engaged in a particular type of trading activity irrespective of their nationality have been hit. Therefore, on that score there is nothing to mention. We-may not like many things that they may have done but we must be clear in our mind as to what is the correct factual position.

Sir, I am grateful to the House for the indulgence they have shown to me. I have ventured to reply to some of the important points that have been mentioned. We should, Mr. Speaker, continue to strive for putting in our best efforts for maintenance of peace, for increasing international standards, for reducing international tensions, for working for disarmament and for our fight against colonialism. These are the very central ideas to which we are wedded and in the pursuit of these ideas, I am sure, our own problems, howsoever difficult and impracticable they may appear to be at first sight, are capable of solution if we hold on to our way of thinking in a very clear manner and with determination.

USA CHINA INDIA SRI LANKA SWITZERLAND LAOS FRANCE CAMBODIA EGYPT CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA INDONESIA MALAYSIA BURMA PAKISTAN

**Date** : Nov 01, 1964

## Volume No

### 1995

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha on International Developments

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on November 17. 1964, on international developments

Several developments of particular interest to India have occurred during the last six weeks since the House adjourned on 3rd October, 1964. I am aware of the great interest that the members of this House take in these developments and I am, therefore, taking the earliest opportunity to share the information at Government's disposal and the Government's thinking on these developments with the members of the House.

From the 5th to the 11th October, India participated in the Conference of Non-Aligned nations. Our Delegation was led by the Prime Minister. Prior to the Conference, the Prime Minister was on a State visit to the United Arab Republic at the invitation of President Gamal Abdel Nasser with whom he had the most friendly exchange of views on matters of mutual interest and on international affairs generally. The talks between the two leaders were held in an atmosphere of warmth and understanding which characterise the relations between the United Arab Republic and India. Preparatory meetings of the Conference at Foreign Ministers level in which my colleagues and I participated were held from the 30th September to the 3rd October.

The Cairo conference gave non-alignment a new sense of purpose in promoting international peace and understanding and I would like to stress that the emphasis throughout the deliberations was on peace, peaceful co-existence and international cooperation. I have placed on the Table of the House a printed document containing the declaration on the programme for peace and international cooperation as adopted by the Conference. The Cairo declaration points the path to a better and a more equitable world order in which cooperation and conciliation, rather than confrontation and conflict, will be the guiding principles of international relations.

The Cairo Conference was a unique gathering of Heads of State/Government representing almost half the member-states of the United Nations. The countries represented at the Conference belonged to four different continents with different cultures, interests and background and yet they demonstrated a remarkable unanimity of views on the crucial international issues of the day. These are bound to exercise a powerful influence in shaping world public opinion and in influencing the course of international events in future. For us in India it was particularly gratifying that the Conference unanimously endorsed the policies of non-alignment, peaceful co-existence, settlement of differences between States by paceful means and the inviolability of the frontiers of States as they existed at the time of independence. It was also gratifying that the Conference devoted considerable time to the question of general and complete disarmament which is

### 286

one of the basic problems of the contemporary world and stressed the urgency and the need for reaching early practical solutions to free mankind from the danger of war and the fear of nuclear annihilation. The Heads of State/Government not only declared their readiness not to produce, acquire or test any nuclear weapons but also called upon all countries, including those who have not yet subscribed to the partial Test Ban Treaty, to subscribe to it.

As the House is aware, it is our policy to strive, for the improvement of the atmosphere between India and Pakistan in which a peaceful and honourable solution of our difference may be possible. It is in this spirit that the Prime Minister on his return journey from Cairo stopped over for a few hours at Karachi in response to the invitation he had received from the President of Pakistan, H.E. Field Marshall Mohammed Ayub Khan. In the course of the informal talks between the two leaders it was agreed that "discussions between the two governments at appropriate level should be held at the earliest possible moment so as to give effect to the common desire to develop friendly and cooperative relations between the two countries". As the House is aware, the Home Ministers of India and Pakistan were to meet at Rawalpindi on 23rd November. This meeting has had to be postponed at the request of the Pakistan Government because of the latter's preoccupations with elections. A fresh date in the future for the meeting will be fixed after the usual diplomatic consultations to suit the mutual convenience of the Home Ministers. Apart from the Home Ministers meeting, it is possible that other meetings at various levels may also take place for the purpose to which both Heads of Government gave expression in the Joint Communique.

Significant developments took place last month which were of direct interest to us and of importance to world peace. These were the retirement of Mr. Khrushchev from the chairmanship of the Council of Ministers in USSR. the assumption of office by the Labour Party in the United Kingdom and the explosion of an atomic weapon device by China. The changes in the governmental setup in the USSR and the UK are obviously internal matters, but, so far as we are concerned, we look forward to continuing close relations with the new governments. We have been assured by the Government of the U.S.S.R. that not only will the friendship between India and the U.S.S.R. be maintained, but these will be further strengthened. Similar sentiments have been expressed by the new Government of the United Kingdom. The explosion, however, of an atomic weapon device by China within a few days of the non-aligned nations' declaration in Cairo, not only constitutes, a flagrant disregard of the hones and wishes expressed by the non-aligned nations and the people of the world generally, but a developing threat to humanity and human civilisation. Between the atom bomb and the spirit of humanity, we have always expressed ourselves strongly against the bomb and affirmed our confidence that in this struggle the spirit of humanity is bound to prevail.

It is important that we should maintain our balance and poise in the face of this provocative action of china in defiance of world public opinion. The Government of India have considered this unfortunate development from the standpoint of our national interests and the interests of world peace. We will not deviate from the path that we have chosen and we shall continue to develop our resources of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only and for the progress and prosperity of our people. We will continue to work together with like-minded countries to reinforce and invigorate world public opinion against nuclear weapons tests, for the early elimination of all nuclear weapons throughout the world, and for general and complete disarmament which is the unanimous goal of the United Nations.

The House is aware that the Prime Minister of Ceylon had accepted our Prime Minister's invitation to visit India some time after the Cairo Conference to exchange views on the Status and the future of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon on which differences had existed between India and Ceylon over a period of the last 25 years. Her Excellency Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, accompanied by her colleagues, paid a State visit to Delhi from 22nd to 29th October 1964. There were frank and friendly talks in an atmosphere of mutual understanding. It is not my purpose now to go into the history of this problem and the various efforts made in the past by both countries to resolve it. I am happy, however, to state that in the recent talks that took place in Delhi between the two Prime Ministers, it was agreed to resolve this question on the basis of a practical human approach, without prejudice to the respective position on principle taken by the two Governments. After prolonged and arduous discussions. an agreement was reached according to which Ceylon agreed to confer citizenship on 300,000 persons out of approximately 975,000 who are at present neither citizens of India nor of Ceylon. India agreed to accept repatriation of, and to confer Indian citizenship on 525,000 persons. The problem of the balance of 150,000 will be discussed between India and Ceylon a little later. Both the conferment of citizenship by Ceylon and conferment of citizenship by India and repatriation would be in accordance with an evenly phased programme spread over a period of 15 years. Ceylon agreed that the persons repatriated to India will be allowed to bring in their assets and those who were in employment on the date of the agreement, that is on 30th October, 1964, would be allowed to continue in employ-

#### 287

ment in Ceylon until the age of 55 or until the date of their repatriation, whichever is earlier. I have, placed a copy of the exchange of letters between the two Prime Ministers and of the joint communique issued at the conclusion of the agreement, on the Table of the House.

The Government of India view the conclusion of this agreement with Ceylon with satisfaction. The agreement removes an irritant in the relations between India and Ceylon. These people of Indian origin who are hard-working and disciplined will, no doubt, be an asset to India and to Ceylon. Those coming to India will be arriving over a period of 15 years and will be bringing their assets with them. We, on our part, will he able to plan their constructive absorption into our national economy by devising schemes which will permit utilisation of this disciplined manpower to the benefit of our national interests and their own well-being.

## INDIA USA EGYPT PAKISTAN CHINA UNITED KINGDOM

# Volume No

1995

# KUWAIT

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of the Crown Prince

His Highness the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Kuwait, Shaikh Sabah Al Salem At Sabah, arrived in New Delhi on November 17, 1964 on a 13-day State visit to India. On November 17, the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, gave a dinner in honour of the Crown Prince.

Speaking on the occasion, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said :

I extend to you a hearty welcome to our country. We feel very happy that you have been able to find time although it is for a very short period to come here and give us an opportunity to meet and discuss with you and with your other colleagues.

Kuwait and India have maintained best of relations and it is a matter of gratification for us that His Highness the Amir of the State of Kuwait has made it a point to visit India and be here every year during the period of Ramzan.

During the last few years Kuwait has made great progress. If I might say so you are one of the richest countries of the world and I am told that the per capita income, or the average income, of Kuwait is higher than even the city of New York. Unfortunately, we are not in that happy position. We are struggling to change the face of our country. We are very big no doubt, but our problems are bigger still. However, we are going ahead with courage and determination.

My predecessor our great Prime Minister, the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru laid the foundation

of the economic development of our country. We are treading the same path and I do hope that we will be in a position to bring about a radical change in our present conditions. We are a democracy and function through democratic methods. Our pace may be bit slow but we are making a steady progress. Industrial development in our country during the last decade has been, if I might use that word, phenomenal and our effort is to bring about a new social order in which poverty and unemployment will have no place.

Trade relations between Kuwait and India have been of great value both for Kuwait as well as for us and we do hope that it will further expand. Discussions are going on in regard to collaboration of certain very big projects here in India. I do hope that those discussions will succeed and we will participate in joint ventures, fruitful for us as well as for Kuwait.

I must say that Kuwait has been very generous in respect of those who have gone from India and who have established themselves there. As your Highness told me there are about 20,000 Indians in Kuwait and they have full freedom, complete freedom of occupation and they can join any profession they like.

You were good enough to ask for some technical personnel from our country, doctors, engineers and others. We have been able to give some of them and we should be indeed happy if we can be of further assistance to your country.

We feel very happy for the treatment which Your Highness and your Government have been

#### 288

giving to the Indian citizens in your country. It speaks, if I may be permitted to say, so very highly of you, Sir, as well as of the Government of Kuwait.

I am very happy that Your Highness has come here and you will be able to visit some other parts of India. Your visit is very short. I very much wish that it had been somewhat longer. However, during the short period, Your Highness will be able to see something of our past and also something of our new developments. May I once again thank Your Highness for your kind visit and may I say that we will continue to work for peace in the world and it is a happy augury that we see eye to eye with each other on many important and vital matters. I will be failing in my duty if I do not mention the fact that it was Kuwait which was amongst the first few countries who lent their full support at the time of Chinese aggression. I must express my sincere thankfulness for the same.

May I now request Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, to rise and drink a toast to the health of the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Kuwait.

KUWAIT INDIA USA

**Date** : Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

**KUWAIT** 

Reply by the Crown Prince

Replying to the toast, His Highness the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Kuwait, Shaikh Sabah Al Salem Al Sabah. said:

It is indeed a great pleasure and privilege for me to pay this visit to the great nation of India, thanks to my friend, the Prime Minister, H.E. Lal Bahadur Shastri who was kind enough to extend this gracious invitation to me. I also take this opportunity to thank sincerely for the hospitality and kindness and the fine words directed and dictated by his big heart. All this I cherish and store as a- very dear souvenir.

Both India and Kuwait have deep affiliations, from the past as well as striking similarity in the Problems confronting them at present in the process of consolidating their national freedom. With precepts of social justice, economic progress, better standards of living and enrichment of human values.

For centuries our boats, with their brave sailors crossed the ocean to anchor friendly and peacefully on your beautiful shores carrying from and to India not only what is usually carried in terms of goods and trade, dates and timber, spices and pearls, nay but something much more valuable, when proper evaluation is applied. They brought and took the most and valuable spiritual and cultural products emanating from human contact. They exchanged friendliness, affection, and understanding which form the basis for our present spontaneous similarity of approach to basic internationl problems such as disarmament, banning of nuclear tests, prevention of wars, and the endeavour to build a world of peace, love and prosperity.

Ladies and Gentlemen,--We in Kuwait, since the declaration of our independence, have translated our beliefs and aspirations in a declared policy which aims at the establishment of justice in a peaceful world and prosperity to all nations.

Among our friends, India was one of the first to express her understanding and sympathy and accord recognition to our independence since the first days of its declaration. As Arabs we don't forget any expression of friendship but cherish it in our hearts for ever with love and devotion.

I request you to raise a toast to the Prime Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri.

# KUWAIT USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### KUWAIT

Joint Communique on Crown Prince's Visit to India

The following is the full text of the Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on November 29, 1964, at the conclusion of the visit to India of His Highness the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Kuwait :

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India H.H. the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Kuwait, Shaikh Sabah Al Salim Al Sabah, paid a State visit to India from 17th to 28th November, 1964. He was accompanied, among others, by H. E. Abdul Aziz Husain, Minister of State for Cabinet Affairs, and H.E. Adel Jarrah, Minister Plenipotentiary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Kuwait. During his stay in India the Crown Prince visited New Delhi, Aligarh, Agra, Bangalore, Poona and Bombay. This provided him an opportunity to acquaint himself with India's historic past and composite culture, and to obtain a first hand knowledge of her present progress and development. The Crown Prince expressed his admiration at the planned development taking place in India under the Five Year Plans and the steady progress India has made towards raising the standards of living of her people. The Crown Prince and his party were touched by the warmth and cordiality of the we]come accorded to them by the Government and people of India.

#### 289

The Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Kuwait had intimate discussions with Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and with other members of the Indian Government, on world affairs, and another matters of mutual interest. These exchanges revealed a close identity of views between the two countries on varied subjects. Both countries adhere firmly to the policy of positive non-alignment and the principles of peaceful co-existence. They commended the efforts of the non-aligned nations at the recent Conference of Non-aligned countries in Cairo, towards lessening world tensions, and strengthening the forces of peace and international cooperation.

The Prime Minister of India observed that the two conferences of Kings and Heads of State of the Arab countries, held in Cairo and Alexandria in January and September 1964, were significant in leading the Arab countries along the path of mutual co-operation and progress and expressed India's continuing sympathy and support for the legitimate aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine.

The Crown Prince and Prime Minister of India commended the partial Test Ban Treaty as a significant step towards strengthening the forces of peace and deplored the development, possession or proliferation of nuclear weapons and the carrying out of test explosions.

The Crown Prince expressed the hope that the differences between India and Pakistan which have unfortunately affected the relations between the two neighbouring countries, would be resolved peacefully by direct negotiations without any external interference.

The Crown Prince of Kuwait and the Prime Minister of India condemned the use of force in settling border disputes between States and expressed their conviction that where aggression is committed the aggressor should not be allowed to retain the fruits of aggression.

The two Prime Ministers noted that there was considerable scope for enlarging Indo-Kuwait collaboration in commercial, financial and technical fields. They were gratified to note the growth of trade between the two countries and discussed prospects for further collaboration, especially in the field of the development of the petroleum industry and its products in both countries. They reaffirmed their desire to develop jointly specified industrial and commercial ventures, including shipping, and they agreed to explore further avenues of mutual economic and industrial collaboration.

The Crown Prince informed the Prime Minister of the happy situation of the Indian community in Kuwait at which the Prime Minister expressed his satisfaction and added that India would be most happy to offer any further facilities that may be required in these fields.

The Crown Prince extended a cordial invitation to the Prime Minister of India to visit Kuwait at his convenience which he accepted with pleasure.

# KUWAIT INDIA USA EGYPT CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN **Date :** Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Indo-Nepal Air agreement signed

An Agreement between the Government of India and His Majesty's Government of Nepal for the operation of air services beween the two countries, which was initialled on August 1, 1964, was formally signed in New Delhi on November 26, 1964. Shri V. Shankar, Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation, signed on behalf of the Government of India, and His Excellency Mr. Yadu Nath Khanal, Nepalese Ambassador, on behalf of His Majesty's Government of Nepal.

Indian Airlines Corporation have been operating air services to Nepal since its inception and the Royal Nepal Airlines Corporation started operations to India in 1960. The air services by the two airlines which have hitherto been operated under temporary authorisations would be placed on a formal basis after the Agreement has been ratified by the Governments of the two countries.

The Agreement is expected to facilitate and promote closer contact between the peoples of India and Nepal and thereby contribute to the furtherance of existing friendly relations between the two countries.

290

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date :** Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### SEMINAR OF ASIAN PRESS COOPERATION

#### Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech at his Luncheon to Delegates

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, gave a luncheon to the delegates to the seminar of Asian Press Cooperation, at Hyderabad House, New Delhi, on November 21, 1964.

The following is the text of the speech he made on the occasion :

I am happy to have this opportunity of meeting the distinguished delegates to the Seminar of Asian Press Cooperation, which has been meeting in Delhi since the beginning of this week. I would like also to thank you for finding the time to accept my invitation to lunch.

Ever since our own Independence and the emergence of other States in Asia as independent entities, there has been a growth of an Asian consciousness, and the need has been felt for some kind of Asian outlook. Ties of geography, history and culture bring us together, and when we speak of an Asian consciousness and outlook we do so not in any spirit of antagonism or with any sense of narrow nationalism. In effect, our purpose is to see now, in spite of the acknowledged differences which exist, we can readjust the relationship and build up more understanding between Asia and the rest of the world. This, I would suggest, is only possible if the countries in Asia have a greater knowledge and understanding of what is happening in our own countries, and if the world outside Asia is able to get a balanced and objective picture of what is happening in Asia as a whole.

Needless to say, organs of public opinion have a very important part to play in all this. Such organs however only reflect what is actually happening in a country. As our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, once observed :

"The best publicity is what one does in one's country. The best publicity figure I have known in my term of years was Mahatma Gandhi, because he did things in India. He did not talk to the outside world. He just did things which forced public attention on India, and which brought people running to India to see what he was doing in India. and made newspapers write about him and his work. This happened because there was solidity in his work. In the ultimate analysis, therefore, what counts is that solid basis."

The common factor of our problems and objectives in Asia is that of development of our resources and meeting the needs of the large masses of our people. The extent to which all of us are able to recognise and tackle this problem is the extent to which we can create a consciousness about Asia. When the countries of Asia have reached a point of internal development which approximates to what is happening in the outside world, it is only then that we shall be able to secure the attention which we deserve. This is the main task which we are facing in India and I am sure it is a task which you yourselves are facing in your own countries. I hope during your stay here you have had an opportunity of seeing something of the efforts which we are making in this direction.

For many years now in India, we have been discussing the idea of closer economic collaboration between Asian countries. However, it was only in 1961 that an expert consultative group under the chairmanship of an Indian was appointed by ECAFE to look into this question.

We have all along taken a keen interest and participated actively in all discussions regarding regional economic cooperation. Our approach to the various issues involved is constructive and practical and our ideas regarding the problems of economic development and the ways and means of solving them are in tune with Asian aspirations.

In spite of our limited resources, we have been trying to assist the other Asian countries by providing training facilities for their personnel in various fields, by deputing our own experts, by giving the technical knowhow required for industrial development and by making credits available for the purchase of Indan capital goods for the establishment of various industries. In addition to the assistance provided under the Colombo Plan our assistance is now being provided on an increasing scale, on a bilateral basis also. We have reason to expect that regional economic cooperation among the countries of Asia will acquire momentum with the passage of time and quicken the pace of their economic and social development, the raising of the standard of living of their peoples and their liberation from the age-old shackles of poverty, ignorance and disease.

#### 291

Peace and unity amongst Asian countries are an essential condition for the full development of social, economic, cultural, and political co-Operation in Asia. The concept of the unity of Asia forged during the period of struggle against foreign domination is now being damaged by new ambitions and new conflicts which have arisen in Asia. We in India had dreamt of Asia as an area of peace, freedom and cooperation. It was in pursuit of this dream that Jawaharlal Nehru called an Asian Relations Conference in 1947 even before India had become fully independent, and took a leading part in the holding of the first Asian-African Conference in Bandung in 1955. Close and friendly relations with all Asian countries, including China and Pakistan, are at the very heart of this Indian policy of making Asia an area of peace, freedom and cooperation.

The picture of Asia today is, however, very different from-what we all had envisaged. In Indo-China problem of peace, independence and neutrality remains unsolved despite nearly ten years of continuous work by the International Commission of which India is the Chairman. India's own problems with its fraternal neighbour Pakistan also remain unsolved despite our sustained efforts to come to some understanding with that country with which we are bound inseparably by geography, history and culture. It is our unflinching determination to settle this problem through methods of mace consistent with the unity and integrity of India. Our conflict with our other neighbour China has a significance which transcends purely bilateral relations between India and China. It affects the unity of Asia and the future of peaceful co-existence in Asia. More than any other development it is this conflict, imposed on us by China, that has clouded the vision of Asia as an area of peace. freedom and cooperation.

As close observers of events and developments in Asia you are aware how India, ever since the People's Republic of China came into existence, went out of its way to establish friendly relations with China, and how even after the unprovoked aggression by China in 1962, we sought a peaceful and honourable settlement of the border problem and accepted fully the mediatory proposals made by six Asian-African nations who met at Colombo.

A new and dangerous factor has recently been introduced into the affairs of Asia. I am referring to the nuclear explosion which took place at Lop Nor. It has been said that India had raised her voice against this explosion because we are in conflict with China and because we are envious of the Chinese achievement I need hardly remind you that India had, throughout, opposed nuclear tests and the spread of nuclear weapons. We ourselves have solemnly renounced the application of nuclear energy to non-peaceful purposes. India has taken this decision not because our scientists and technologists cannot make the atom bomb, but because of our firm belief that the atom bomb is not a bomb of peace or a bomb of liberation; it is not a symbol of the power and glory of a nation, but a symbol of death, destruction and selfannihilation of mankind. It is against this that India has raised her voice. May I add here that we in India, as the rest of the people of Asia, are firmly convinced that the spirit of man or the spirit of a nation cannot be cowed down by the atom bomb.

Finally, may I express the hope that as a result of your deliberations here you will have created a greater consciousness in your Indian colleagues of the need for a wider dissemination of news about other Asian countries. You, on your part, I have no doubt. will also ensure that this objective is realised in your own countries.

# INDIA USA SRI LANKA CHINA PAKISTAN **Date :** Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Letters embodying Trade Arrangements Exchanged

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on November 18, 1964, embodying trade arrangements for 1965 between India and the U.S.S.R. Mr. B. A. Borisov, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade of U.S.S.R., signed on behalf of his country and Mr. D. S. Joshi, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, on behalf of India.

### 292

The Union Minister of Commerce Mr. Manubhai Shah, the Deputy Minister of Commerce, Mr. S. V. Ramaswamy, and the Soviet Ambassador, Mr. I. A. Benediktov, were present.

A Soviet Delegation, headed by Mr. Borisov, had arrived in India on October 11, 1964 for reviewing the progress of Indo-Soviet trade during 1964 and for considering the further progress to be made in 1965. The Delegation had discussions with an Indian Delegation, led by Mr. D. S. Joshi. The two Delegations concluded their discussions on the 18th of this month.

Both sides have expressed their satisfaction at the progress of trade between the two countries in 1964. It is estimated that the volume of Indo-Soviet trade this year will amount to about Rs. 80 to Rs. 85 crores each way i.e., India's exports to the Soviet Union will be about Rs. 80 to Rs. 85 crores in 1964.

Regarding 1965, it has been agreed to increase the trade further by about 50% to reach the level of about Rs. 125 crores each way. This will mean an increase of about Rs. 40 cores in India's exports to U.S.S.R. in 1965 compared to the exports in 1964. As the trade between the two countries is a balanced one, imports from U.S.S.R. and credit repayments will be equal to India's exports. Thus the trade targets which were agreed to between the two countries for 1966 under the long-term trade agreement will now be reached in 1965.

Consistent with the Soviet policy of increasing their purchases of manufactured products from developing countries, about 40% of the total exports from India in 1965 will consist of manufactured goods. The Soviet side has shown interest in buying from India, among engineering products, particularly new items such as electric transformers, air conditioners (indoor), waterneaters (household), accumulators, textile machinery, knitting machines, twist drills, and among chemicals and other products, specially BHC powder, zinc phosphide, mercurial seed dressings, calcium carbide, bleaching powder, detergents, chrome pigments, wire enamel, rosin, woollen knitwear, men's shirts, spectacle, frames, linoleum, sports goods, sheets and turkish towels, dyed handkerchiefs and tarpaulins besides other products.

The percentage of tanned and semi-tanned goatskins to be purchased by U.S.S.R. in 1965 will be increased to 55% i.e. the tanned skin will be in larger quantities than the raw goatskins.

The Soviet side has also been requested by the Indian side for the deputation of Soviet specialists to advise Indian industry in the preparation of tanned skins, sheep-casings, bananas and shellac according to the requirements of the export market.

There will be all-round increase, in the export of the usual items of export from India such as tea, jute products, tobacco, coffee, spices, cashew kernels, cotton fabrics, leather footwear, deoiled cakes, etc.

On the side of the Soviet exports to India, machinery and equipment and spares and components for important projects like Harduganj, Pathratu and Balimela power stations, irrigation projects, and various Indo-Soviet projects like Bhilai, Ranchi, Hardwar and other heavy industries projects will be a prominent feature. In addition, U.S.S.R. will supply essential materials like mineral oil products, ammonium sulphate. non-ferrous metals, pig iron, tinplates and rolled steel products.

### INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ITALY LATVIA

# **Date** : Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

#### UNITED KINGDOM

Shri Y. B. Chavan's Statement in Lok Sabha on Defence Aid

The Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 26, 1964, on his visit to the United Kingdom for defence talks :

I rise to make a statement on my visit to the United Kingdom during the period November 12 to 21, 1964.

As the Members of the House are aware, I was to have visited the United Kingdom on my return journey from the U.S.A. in June 1964. but this visit could not take place as I returned to India direct on hearing of the sudden passing

#### 293

away of Jawaharlalji. It was then agreed with the British uthorities that my visit to the United Kingdom should be postponed until after the general elections in that country. Subsequently it was decided in consultation with the British authorities that I should visit he United kingdom during the period November 12 to 21, 1964.

The purpose of my visit to the United Kingdom was to: (a) explain to the British authorities the basis and content of the Indian Defence Plan for the period 1964-69;

(b) seek financial and technical assistance from the British Government for the implementation of the Indian Defence Plan; and

(c) more specifically seek their assistance for the modernisation of the Indian Navy which had several over-age ships needing replacement.

### KEEN DESIRE To ASSIST

My discussions with the British Ministers were most cordial and disclosed a wide measure of agreement in regard to the size of the Chinese threat and the measures required to meet it. The British authorities expressed their keen desire to assist us in solving our problems relating to defence supplies.

They are willing to provide technical assistance in the field of defence production to enable us to undertake in India the manufacture of several defence equipments of British origin.

They have also indicated that they would consider sympathetically our request for aid towards the licence fee, normally charged by the British Government in respect of manufacture, technical assistance etc., and as a first case in point have accepted our request in respect of the technical assistance fee for supplying equipment to the Chanda Filling Factory.

On the general question of financial assistance and provision of credits for purchase in the United Kingdom of military hardware, production equipments and components for indigenous production, the British authorities indicated that they would continue to help India, within the limits of their available resources. It has not been possible to reach an agreement on the scale of future assistance on this matter, since the British Ministers were currently engaged in a review of their defence and financial policies. I am confident that after these reviews are completed by the British Government, it will be possible to reach an agreement with them on this matter.

### **REQUESTS FOR DESTROYERS**

I explained in considerable detail the urgent need of the Indian Navy for a minimum number of three destroyers or frigates for replacing some of the over-age ships in the Indian Navy and I requested that the British Government should consider making available to us on loan three destroyers from their operational reserve on the understanding that these destroyers would be returned to them if they were urgently required by the Royal Navy for meeting any emergent situation. There was considerable, discussion in regard to the type of frigates which can be made available by the British Government and which will suit the Indian requirements and the conditions on which they should be made available. The British authorities pointed out that it would not be possible for them to release three frigates of the same class from their operational reserves. I have indicated that at least a minimum number of two frigates should be, made available to India immediately. They have given an assurance that our request would be considered in the light of the review of their defence policy which they were currently engaged in.

In the statement placed before this House on September 21, 1964, 1 had referred to the offer by the British Government of a loan for meeting the external costs, during the first four years, of the programme for the expansion of facilities in the Mazagon Dock and for the construction of three Leander Class frigates in that yard. During my visit to the United Kingdom I was able to finalise the terms of this credit and to sign a loan agreement for the sum of œ4.7 million. A copy of this agreement is placed on the Table of the House for the information of the Members of the House.

### SUBMARINE MANUFACTURE

I also discussed with the British authorities the extent of assistance that would be available for increasing the anti-submarine capability of the Indian Navy. They have indicated their willingness to provide facilities to enable us to place an order for a modern submarine on one of the British shipyards. However, a final decision can only be taken after details of the assistance that can be made available by the British authorities for the construction of this submarine have been settled. This is under discussion with the British authorities. In the meanwhile, they have agreed to provide us a Royal Navy submarine for a period of two to three months each year for the next few years to train our Navy personnel in anti-submarine warfare.

In addition to the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations and Secretary of State for Defence with whom I held detailed discussions, I called on Prime Minister Wilson and some other members of his Cabinet. During my stay in the United Kingdom and throughout my discussions with the British authorities, I was struck by the amount of goodwill they had for us.

294

There is also a keen desire on their part to help us in building up our defences. I am quite confident that more concrete results will be forthcoming as a result of these discussions after the British Government had an opportunity to complete the review of their defence and financial policies.

# USA INDIA RUSSIA LATVIA **Date :** Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Defence Agreement Signed

The following is the text of the agreement between the Governments of India and the United Kingdom, signed on November 20, 1964, in the form of an exchange of letters :

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 20th November, 1964, which reads as follows :- "I have the honour to inform you that in pursuance of discussions between our two Governments, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will make to the Government of India a special Defence Credit (hereafter referred to as the "loan") of up to œ4,700,000 to meet payments due under contracts entered into between the Government of India and persons or corporations in the United Kingdom and approved by the United Kingdom Government, in respect of the reconstruction of the Mazagon Dockyard at Bombay, and the construction the-re of Leander Class Frigates.

2. "The loan shall be used only for goods or equipment wholly manufactured In the United Kingdom or services supplied by persons or corporations resident in the United Kingdom.

3. "The United Kingdom Government, on receipt from the Government of India of a request for the payment of sums due under the said contracts with details identifying the contract under which the goods and services in respect of which the payment is due and with a certificate by the contractor that the goods have been wholly manufactured in the United Kingdom or the services have been supplied by persons or corporations resident in the United Kingdom and accompanied where required by the United Kingdom Government by a certificate from the consulting engineers that the payments are so due. will make these payments out of the loan on behalf of the Government of India. No payment out of the loan will be made after 31st March, 1971.

4. "Interest will be payable by the Government of India on each payment out of the loan by the United Kingdom Government at the rate currently applied by the United Kingdom Treasury at the date of each such payment to a loan for a comparable period out of the Consolidated Fund under Section 3(2) of the Export Guarantees Act 1949. Interest will be payable on each payment from the date upon which the payment was made. The United Kingdom Government will notify the Government of India on the occasion of each such payment by the United Kingdom Government giving the amount of the payment, the rate of interest chargeable and the terms for payment. Interest due on the amount of the loan outstanding will be paid half yearly on 30th April and 31st October in each year.

5. "The Government of India will repay to the United Kingdom Government the amount of each payment made by them in pursuance of paragraph I of this letter by 10 equal yearly instalments, the first instalment being paid on 30th April in the second financial year (1st April to 31st March) following that in which the payment out of the loan was made.

6. "The Government of India may at any time repay the loan to the United Kingdom Government by paying to them the amount then outstanding with interest due thereon.

7. "I would be glad to have your confirmation that the Government of India, accept the loan on the terms and conditions proposed in this letter and that this letter and your reply in that sense should be regarded as constituting an agreement between the two Governments."

I confirm that the Government of India accept the loan referred to in your letter on the terms and conditions proposed therein and that your letter and this reply should be regarded as constituting an agreement between the two Governments.

> Yours faithfully, Sd/- Y. B. CHAVAN

The Rt. Hon'ble Arthur George Bottomley, M.P.

Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations.

Commonwealth Relations Office, Downing Street, London, S.W.1.

# INDIA USA IRELAND LATVIA RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

# UNITED KINGDOM

Press Communique on Defence Talks

The following is the full text of a Press Communique issued in London on November 20, 1964 at the conclusion of the visit of the Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, who arrived in London on November 11, 1964 :

Mr. Chavan, Minister of Defence in the Government of India, has visited London during the last two weeks to have discussions with British Ministers over a wide range of common defence interests.

Both Mr. Chavan and British Ministers have particularly welcomed this opportunity of full discussions as Commonwealth partners of matters of importance to them both, at a time when many changes in the world have affected the defence situation. British Ministers re-affirmed that it was their policy to support India, as a Commonwealth partner, against external threats. British Ministers, conscious of the fact that Britain has been for many years past the main supplier of military equipment to the Indian defence forces, have assured Mr. Chavan of their desire to co-operate with the Indian authorities in solving problems relating to defence supplies, and that they would continue to help India, within the limits of their available resources, in its efforts to improve its defences.

Opportunity was taken of Mr. Chavan's visit to discuss the terms of and to sign a loan agreement for the sum of œ4.7 million which, as was announced in September, the British Government will make available over the next four years to help finance the rebuilding of the Mazagon Dokyard and the construction of three Leander frigates.

British Ministers recognised that in the years before Leander-class frigates are completed the Indian Navy had a requirement to replace a number of ageing ships in her fleet. They pointed out that the British Government was currently engaged in an urgent review of their own defence policy. However, they gave an assurance that in the light of this review, the Indian requirements in this field would be further considered by British Ministers.

Mr. Chavan indicated that in order to increase the anti-submarine capacity of the Indian Fleet there was a requirement for a modem submarine. British Ministers offered assistance in this respect, and also to provide meanwhile a Royal Navy submarine for a period each year for antisubmarine training. The matter will be further pursued.

British Ministers and Mr. Chavan re-affirmed the importance which they attach to the closest possible co-operation between the Services and expressed the hope that within the spirit of the Commonwealth partnership close liaison would continue to be maintained between them.

### UNITED KINGDOM USA INDIA LATVIA

**Date** : Nov 01, 1964

# Volume No

### 1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Loan Agreements Signed

The Governments of India and the United States signed in New Delhi on November 30, 1964 three agreements providing for U.S. loans totalling \$60.3 million (Rs. 28.7 crores) to promote the development of industry, power generation, and transport in India.

Shri C. S. Krishna Moorthi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, signed for India and Mr. Joseph N. Greene, Charge d'Affaires, signed for the United States in the absence of Ambassador Chester Bowles.

The first loan provides for \$50 million (Rs. 23.8 crores) to be used by the Government of India to finance- the import of a broad variety of commodities required to maintain existing facilities and expand both agricultural and industrial production. This non-project loan covers the import of fertilizers, steel, lubricants, machinery and machinery parts, sulphur, rubber, tyre cord, carbon black, caustic soda, insecticides, chemicals and a wide range of components. Within these categories, the Government of India is free to set the amounts of imports according to the needs of the economy.

By making possible an increased flow of raw materials and spare parts, non-project assistance helps maximize production and also lower production costs. This in turn increases India's

#### 296

ability to expand her exports and earn foreign exchange.

With the loan concluded today, total nonproject assistance extended by the United States for the Third Plan comes to \$835 million (Rs. 398 crores).

The second loan amounts to \$7.2 million (Rs. 3.4 crores) and will meet the cost of acquiring 25 broad gauge diesel locomotives by the Indian Railways. These 2,600 horse power diesel locomotives will be among the most powerful machines ever exported from the United States.

During the Third Plan the Indian Railways plan to commission 407 broad gauge, diesel locomotives. The present loan and earlier U.S. Government credits are financing the purchase of 324; the balance of 83 will be produced at the Varanasi diesel locomotive factory, which has been established with the assistance of a separate U.S. Exim Bank loan. The loan concluded today is the sixth credit extended by the U.S. Agency for International Development to the, Indian Railways.

Diesel locomotives have several advantages over steam engines. They accelerate faster and their use of dynamic braking permits them to operate at higher speeds with safety. The faster speed makes it possible for more trains to be run and for more service to be obtained from railroad wagons. In addition, diesels are cheaper to operate than steam locomotives. They can be used for as long as twenty hours per day.

The 25 diesels to be provided under today's agreement will be used in the Manmad-Dhond and Dhond-Sholapur-Wadi sections of the Central Railway. In these two steeply-graded sections of Maharashtra, the anticipated traffic is larger than can be adequately handled by steam engines.

The third loan, amounting to \$3.1 million (Rs. 1.5 crores), will be used to procure and install a 89,100-kilowatt generator at the Sharavathi Hydroelectric Project, Mysore State. This will be the eighth generator of the same size to be commissioned in this vast undertaking, the biggest power generating plant in Asia. U.S. credits of \$26.8 million and Rs. 34.5 crores already have been made to meet the major part of the cost of this project, which will have an ultimate capacity of more than one million kilowatts. The first generator of the Sharavathi undertaking is scheduled to be dedicated soon by the Prime Minister.

All three credits concluded today have been extended to the Government of India by the U.S. Agency for International Development. They are repayable in dollars over a 40-year period, with no repayments called for during the tenyear grace period. The loans carry interest at three quarters of one per cent per annum during the grace period and two per cent per annum for the remaining 30 years.

297

### USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Nov 01, 1964

# December

# Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record Dec 01, 1964 Vol. X DECEMBER No. 12

CONTENTS

# PAGE

### CEYLON

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Renewal of Visas to Indian Nationals 297

# INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Address to the General Assembly 297

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Albania's Allegations against India 303

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the President of the Security Council 304

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech in Rajya Sabha opening the Debate on Foreign

# Affairs

305

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 311

# INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR

## President's Message

317

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation 318 INTERNATIONAL EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS Vice-President's Inaugural Address 318 President's Speech at Raj Bhavan welcoming His Holiness the Pope 320 Reply by His Holiness the Pope 321 President's Speech at Archbishop's House 321 Address of His Holiness the Pope at Archbishop's House 322 His Holiness the Pope's Farewell Message to the President 322 INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS President's Inaugural Address 322 **NETHERLANDS** Agreement on Aerial Photo-Interpretation Institute 325 PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Sino-Indian Border Dispute 325 India's Protest against Chinese Refusal to withdraw from the Demilitarized Zone 326 India's Reply to Chinese Allegations 326 UNITED KINGDOM Prime Minister's Address to the Federation of British Industries 326 Prime Minister's Press Conference at Marlborough House 328 Prime Minister's Statement on the Conclusion of his Visit to the United Ki ngdom 332 Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on his Visit to the United Kingdo m 332 MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA ALBANIA USA CHINA

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

## Important developments have taken place during the period since we met here last year. For India, if has been a sad year. The passing away of Jawaharlal Nehru has been a cruel blow. His message, however, continues to inspire all those striving for peace and international understanding for the freedom and dignity of individuals and nations.

The most important problems facing the world today are the problem of war and peace, the problem of colonialism and racialism and the growing economic disparity between the developed and developing countries. These problems are in some way inter-related. There can be no lasting peace so long as colonialism and racialism are not eradicated completely and unless purposeful steps are taken to reduce the economic disparity. It is a matter of satisfaction to us that attempts are at least being made to tackle all these three problems effectively in this Organisation though the success has so far not been commensurate with the efforts made. We have, however, to persevere and work hard towards achieving these objectives.

It is unfortunate that at a time when the international community has embarked on a determined policy of reducing the risks of war and of building up of confidence amongst nations, the People's Republic of China has thought it fit to maintain war as an instrument of national policy and to question the principles of peaceful coexistence. The People's Republic of China committed a massive premeditated aggression in 1962 on India-a country which, as the Assembly is well aware, has consistently tried to befriend China. This wanton attack was not only against the spirit of Bandung but was also against all canons of international behaviour. Despite the sincere efforts made by six Non-aligned Afro-Asian countries, the Chinese forces continue to be in occupation of 14,500 square miles of Indian territory and 14 to 15 divisions of Chinese army stand poised on India's northern borders. Their preparations for war thus still- continue and so also their violations of our territory and air space.

The problem of war and peace is the most important one for our Organisation. The advent of nuclear weapons has changed the nature of war not merely in quantitative but in qualitative terms. Nuclear war has become not only more dangerous. it is evident that it will destroy all that man has succeeded in constructing on this planet. The nuclear age demands that the great powers adhere to the medium of negotiations as the only valid basis for settling differences, howsoever fundamental and acute these might be.

The concept of peaceful co-existence has now been accepted by an overwhelming majority, if unfortunately not all, of the Governments of the world Peaceful co-existence was the central theme of the declaration of the second conference of Heads of State/Government of non-aligned countries held at Cairo in October Last. The conference declared its deep conviction that in the present circumstances mankind must regard this as the only means of strengthening world peace and has further suggested that the General Assembly of the United Nations should adopt on the occasion of the 20th Anniversary of the United Nations a declaration on the principles of peaceful coexistence. It was their hope that such a code supported by the whole world would result in the consolidation of peace and security.

The detente which came about in the international situation towards the end of 1962 and whose high water mark was the signing of the Moscow test ban treaty in August 1963, seems to be fading out. The deterioration of the situation in South-east Asia, and the emergence of new conflicts in the Mediterranean, the heart of Africa and indeed on our own borders, are each of them capable of escalation which might ultimately lead to a general conflagration.

Disarmament remains one of the most important issues before the Assembly. The Moscow test ban treaty, the hot line between Washington and Moscow and the joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. declaration not to place nuclear weapons in orbit in outer space had together raised hopes for an acceleration of the process of disarmament. Not only has there been no further progress towards bringing the underground tests within the scope of the Moscow treaty, we have now witnessed fresh explosions in the atmosphere which at least were banned under the treaty. We have always felt that as long as bigger and more destructive nuclear weapons were being tested, the preconditions did not exist for serious and purposeful negotiations on disarmament. This was one of the principal reasons why for so many years in this Assembly we concentrated on an agreement to ban nuclear tests. The need for an agreement to ban nuclear tests was foreseen by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru as early as 1954. The question was carefully considered at the Bandung conference of Afro-Asian States in 1955. People's Republic of China was one of the signatories to the Bandung Declaration which stated inter alia and I quote :

"Pending total prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, conference appealed to all powers concerned to reach an agreement to suspend experiments with such weapons."

Since then this world organisation has discussed the matter year after year culminating in the adoption of resolution 1762(XVII) condemning, all nuclear tests. The partial test ban treaty has now been acceded to by well over a hunderd States. The Cairo conference of Non-aligned

#### 298

countries called upon all States to accede to the treaty and to abide by its provisions in the interest of peace and the welfare of humanity. In defiance of this overwhelming world opinion and in utter disregard of the Bandung declaration signed by it, China has exploded a nuclear device thereby reversing the hopeful trends and adding once again to the dangerous pollution of the atmosphere. Consistent with the attitude of this Assembly on nuclear tests and particularly in the spirit of resolution 1762(XVII) India cannot but condemn the nuclear test conducted by the People's Republic of China. This action of China is fraught with dangerous consequences. It may well start a fresh nuclear race among countries which admittedly possess nuclear capability at the present time. The risk of proliferation has thus increased manifold.

The Assembly must take serious notice of this development and ways and means of preventing the risk of further proliferation. The Cairo declaration signed by Heads of State or Government of 48 non-aligned countries has called upon all States to accede to the Moscow treaty partially banning the testing of nuclear weapons and to abide by its provisions in the interest of peace and welfare of humanity. The conference has also urged the extension of the Moscow treaty so as to include underground tests and the discontinuance of such tests pending the extension of the agreement. It is the considered view of my delegation that the positive measures suggested in that declaration should form the guide lines for further action by its Assembly. During this session we would suggest the adoption by the Assembly of resolution which would reiterate its condemnation of all nuclear tests, urge cessation of all further tests, call upon all States who have not already done so to accede to the Moscow treaty and request the United Nations and the Soviet Union to reach an agreement prohibiting underground tests. Now that technique has advanced far enough to make underground tests comparatively easy of detection, my delegation hopes and believes that the time has come for bringing the underground tests within the scope of the Moscow treaty.

India has asked for the inscription of an item on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons on the Agenda of the current Session of the Assembly. The importance of non-proliferation cannot he over-emphasised. This question is as important as that of banning nuclear tests. We feel that the Assembly should direct the 18-Nation committee on disarmament to discuss the question of non-proliferation as a matter of highest priority. We appeal to the nuclear powers to abstain from policies leading to the dissemination of nuclear weapons and technology among those States which do not at present possess them. The non-nuclear States. on the other hand, should declare their readiness not to produce, acquire or test any nuclear weapons.

While on the subject of disarmament, I welcome the latest proposals of the Soviet Union referred to by the distinguished Foreign Minister of U.S.S.R. in his statement. They deserve the careful consideration of this Assembly and of the 18-Nation committee on disarmament. Disarmament, as we all know, is a very complex problem and if it is to come about, we must ensure that it embraces both nuclear and conventional aspects.

Mr. President, the Government and people of India had the privilege and honour of welcoming His Holiness Pope Paul VI in India early this month. His messages are of special significance in the context of the prevailing atmosphere of tension in the world. In a message to a special audience to newsmen in Bombay on December 4, the Pope said and I quote :

"We entrust you our special message to the world. Would that nations could cease armament race and devote their resources and energies instead to fraternal assistance of developing countries. Would that every nation thinking "thought of peace and not of affliction" or war, would contribute even part of its expenditure for arms to a new world fund for the relief of many problems of nutrition, clothing, shelter and medical care which affect so many people.

"From the peaceful altar of the Eucharistic Congress, may this, our anguished cry, go forth to all Governments of the world and may God inspire them to undertake this peaceful battle against sufferings of their less fortunate brothers."

As I said earlier, Mr. President, there are many areas of conflict in the world today which could lead to a general conflagration. In such a dangerous situation, it is of vital importance for states to renounce the use of force in the settlement of disputes. All States Members of the United Nations have subscribed to this idea by signing or adhering to the Charter. Even those who are as yet outside the United Nations have been loud in claiming that they stand for peace and prosperity in our planet. The basic assumption from which we proceed is that once all States accept the idea of settlement of international dispute solely by peaceful means we would have taken a major step towards creating an atmosphere in which international peace and security could be maintained effectively. For this reason, we welcome the initiative for the Soviet Union in submitting an item for the agenda of the current session of the Assembly entitled "Renunciation by States of the use of force for the settlement of territorial disputes and questions concerning frontiers". At a time when frontier disputes are threatening international

peace and security, it is of utmost importance that the General Assembly should declare that force shall not be used in the settlement of such

### 299

disputes. The Organization of African Unity has declared that the frontiers existing at the time of independence shall be respected The Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned States has laid down that "the established frontiers of states shall be inviolable". The Assembly should welcome these declarations.

Mr. President, we have been closely following the developments in the Congo and are greatly concerned about the present situation there. India has always been strongly in favour of the withdrawal of all foreign troops and mercenaries from the Congo. We continue to bold the view that outside interference which infringes the interest and sovereignty of the Congolese people should end immediately. In this context we support the Organization of African Unity in its efforts to restore peace and harmony in this strife-torn land and bring about national reconciliation.

The situation in Cyprus threatened peace in the mediterranean a few months ago. We hope that the powers concerned will show restraint and prevent a further deterioration in the uneasy peace now prevailing there. India is of the view that Cyprus is entitled to and should enjoy its sovereignty and independence without threat or use of force by any foreign power and without any foreign intervention or interference.

Mr. President, most speakers before me have dwelt, at some length in one way or another, on the problem of United Nations peace-keeping operation. We met here on December 1 in an atmosphere of confrontation. I am glad the confrontation has been avoided. It would indeed have been disastrous for the Assembly and the organisation itself if we had decided to vote on the question whether or not article 19 of the Charter was applicable to the members who had not contributed towards the cost of peace keeping operations in the Congo and Gaza. The result of the vote either way would undoubtedly have led to considerable diminution in the strength and vitality of our organisation. While we ourselves believe in collective responsibility and have contributed millions of dollars towards the costs of

peace keeping operations as also supplied thousands of troops and tons of material to the United Nations. we at the same time recognise that no member state can be compelled to contribute either troops or funds to such operations.

If the confrontation has been avoided, it is because ultimately the two powers concerned have themselves realised that a confrontation which would lead to break up of the United Nations, was in no one's interest. Secondly, the mediatory efforts of various groups of members as also the devoted attention which our Secretary-General gave to the problem. were of the greatest help. However, the Assembly cannot rest content with the situation as it obtains today. There are many items on our agenda which need early attention. Therefore, it must act quickly to bring about a solution of the problem of past arrears as also concern itself with how best to proceed with the consideration of the political and constitutional problems relating to U.N. Peace-keeping operations. One procedure which immediately comes to my mind is to entrust this political and constitutional problem to the working group of twenty one as it is constituted at present with some slight increase in its membership if necessary, but certainly with wider terms of reference.

Whatever the forum in which the problem is discussed in detail, it seems to my delegation that certain basic factors will have to be kept in mind. The primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security lies with the Security Council. It is our hope that an expanded Security Council as envisaged in resolution 1991 (XVIII) would be much more representative of the wishes of a large majority of member states and would function accordingly.

Over the past few years the General Assembly has played an increasing role in the field of peace keeping. My Delegation hopes that the examination of the political and constitutional problem by the working group will result in a precise definition of the scope of the functions of the General Assembly and the Security Council in this respect so that the situation which assumed such threatening proportions when we met for the current session, may not recur.

Recently some attention has been devoted to the technical aspects as distinct from political and

constitutional implications of the United Nations peace keeping operations. In his introduction to the annual report, the Secretary General has also referred to this matter. While we ourselves are not in favour of setting apart certain military units for service with the United Nations, we have no objection. In principle, to a technical study which might lead to more "more efficient and more economical peace keeping operation in the future". However. my delegation is not at all sure that the present is the most appropriate time for a study of this kind.

The amendments to the Charter recommended in Resolution 1991 (XVIII) would, if ratified, expand the non-permanent membership of the Security Council to 10 and the membership of the Economic and Social Council to 27. In our view the proposed expansion in the membership of the two councils would serve to broad-base them by including a larger number of Afro-Asians and other developing countries. India has already ratified the amendments and so have a number of other states. However, the ratifications still fall short of the necessary two thirds. What is more, none of the permanent members of the Security

#### 300

Council has so far ratified them. We are, however, glad to note that the Soviet Union has indicated its willingness to ratify the amendments. We hope that France, U.K. and U.S.A. would similarly move to accept the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations.

Mr. President, among the major problems before the United Nations are the questions of the eradication of colonialism and racialism, the, worst manifestation of which is to be witnessed in the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa. My Delegation's stand on these issues is well known both in the United Nations and outside. It is our conviction that the continued existence of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism in any form in any part of the world is contrary to the ideals of the United Nations Charter and prevents the development of international cooperation, and impedes the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples. Having ourselves waged a struggle against colonialism, we are passionately devoted to the elimination of colonial rule everywhere at the earliest possible date. It is a source of great satisfaction to us that the number of independent countries in Asia and Africa increases each year and the process of liberation has now become irresistible and irreversible. Most of the colonial powers have realised that they live in a changing world and that if they are to win the goodwill and friendship of other nations they must need the demands of the colonial people. To resist these demands would be to invite trouble and conflict.

Whilst many dependent countries have attained independence, colonialism in some of its worst manifestations is still evident on the continent of Africa where territories like Southern Rhodesia. Angola, Mozambique are still groaning under the voke of colonialism. As long as colonial rule continues in any part of Africa or Asia or any where else, we cannot rest on our laurels and must assist the peoples of these territories to attain their independence. The courageous peoples of these territories have our warmest support in their struggle for freedom and independence. There can be no peace and co-existence between colonialism and freedom. Our support and sympathies lie entirely with the subject peoples everywhere.

The question of Southern Rhodesia has been discussed in various forums of this organisation and is constantly under review in the committee of twenty four. The views of the Government of India with regard to Southern Rhodesia are well known. We are totally opposed to independence being granted to the minority Government in Southern Rhodesia and we have stated that if a unilateral declaration of independence by the minority Government became a reality, the Government of India would not recognize it. It is our view that the granting of independence the Southern Rhodesia must follow and not precede the establishment of majority rule in the territory- We have, therefore, welcomed the clear statement of the United Kingdom Government that a unilateral declaration of independence by the Smith Government would be considered by the United Kingdom as an act of rebellion against the crown.

Mr. President, Portugal today presides over the largest colonial empire that exists in the world.

The Cairo Conference of Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries has declared its determination to ensure that the peoples of the territories under Portuguese colonial rule must immediately be given independence without any conditions or reservations. My delegation joins other delegations from Africa and Asia in condemning the Government of Portugal for its obstinate refusal to recognise the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples contained in resolution 1514 (XV).

The people of South West Africa have suffered long under the reactionary regime of South Africa. We are entirely against the attempts of South Africa to annex the mandated territory of South West Africa. South Africa is attempting to influence public opinion in some western countries by providing facilities for profitable investment of capital from these countries in South West Africa. The investment, as a recent United Nations study has shown, have little or nothing to do with bettering the lot of the indigenous people of South West Africa. It should be the responsibility and duty of all countries to see that they do not become, even unwittingly, partners in the South African game of exploiting and annexing the mandated territory of South West Africa.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, the problem of apartheid is one of the most serious problems before this organisation and it has exercised our minds for the past 18 years. India was the first country to bring the issue of the racial policies of the Republic of South Africa before the United Nations. The struggle for racial equality in South Africa is associated with the name of Mahatma Gandhi and we have, ever since, been in the vanguard of the struggle. For 18 years now this organisation has put up with the flagrant disrespect and disregard that South Africa has shown for the Charter and for world opinion. The Government of South Africa is blindly stepping from one henious act to another and the growing hate and frustration of the indigenous people must inevitably lead to violence and war. This organisation cannot remain a silent spectator to what is

301

going on in South Africa. The people and the Government of India are whole heartedly behind the indigenous people whose lives are being poisoned by a minority Government which represents no one else but itself. For our part we have taken all necessary measures against the South African Government. India was the first country to break trade and diplomatic relations with South Africa. Most recently, we were the first member state to respond to the appeal of the Chairman of the Committee on Apartheid for Assistance to the Victims of the Racial Policies of the Government of South Africa. We hope other nations will generously contribute and respond to this appeal.

Whilst a majority of the countries in Asia and Africa are conducting a political and economic boycott of South Africa, there are other nations who, in disregard of General Assembly's resolutions, still continue to trade with South Africa. As a matter of fact, the economy of South Africa during the last few years has been strengthened rather than weakened. For this unfortunate development the powerful trading partners of South Africa cannot avoid responsibility. If the trading partners of South Africa were to withhold their cooperation and conduct an economic boycott, we have no doubt that the South African Government would have no option but to make drastic changes in its racial policy. If we are to hope for an early and peaceful solution of the racial problem in South Africa, every kind of pressure has to be applied on the Government of that country so that conditions may be created for the solution of this problem without conflict and bloodshed.

Mr. President, I turn now to the ever urgent yet unresolved problem of economic development. As the distinguished Secretary General has reminded this Assembly year after year, "... the present division of the world into rich and poor countries is much more real than division of the world on ideological grounds". The importance that the international community attaches to this problem is evidenced to economic development. These items will doubtless be debated in detail at the appropriate time in Second Committee. But today I would like to focus attention on one issue only-what can the members states of the United Nations do to fulfil the hopes and aspirations which were evoked by the historic conference on trade and development?

In his introduction to this year's annual report, U. Thant has rightly called this conference "one of the most important events since the establishment of the United Nations". When the Government of India sent its delegation to Geneva to attend the conference. it did so in the hope of playing a part in finding ways and means to attain the rate of economic growth that had been set as the target for the development decade. We wanted to urge the view that only a fundamental change in the pattern of international economic relationship could free the world from the stranglehold which traditionally stagnant societies exercise over its rate of economic development.

In Geneva, however, we were rather disappointed to find that our colleagues from the developed countries, seemed to be somewhat unprepared to meet the challenge of the situation. Many of them seemed instinctively to get together to protest the interests which appeared, in their view, to be threatened. Even so, the conference was able to view the global picture in its proper perspective and to appreciate the fact that the only hope for the developed and the developing countries alike lay in the quest for a new economic order. While it was generally recognized that the primary responsibility lay with each country for its own economic growth, the goal of world prosperity could only be reached if the international community also accepted its share of responsibility.

The final act of the conference is the beginning of a new chapter of concrete action by each and every one of us. The conference gave its findings on the state of the world economy, it evoked a series of guide lines for national and international action, it formulated a number of hopeful suggestions for dealing with commodity problems, for promoting trade in manufactures and semimanufactures and for financing the development of trade and the promotion of economic growth. At the same time, since not all of these suggestions had been adopted by unanimity, the conference also recommended the establishment of continuing machinery to carry on its unfinished business. It is, therefore, imperative for this Assembly to take the first possible opportunity to establish the continuing machinery recommended by the trade conference. We are happy to note that some useful preparatory work has already

been completed by the Secretary General as evidenced by the unanimous recommendations of the committee set tip by him to devise special conciliation procedures in the new organization. Once the conference has been set up as an organ of the General Assembly, we earnestly hope that every effort will be made to implement its recommendations. The member states of the United Nations should decide, in the free exercise of their own sovereign will, to adopt such recommendations as part of their own economic policies, and take the positive steps necessary to develop the determination of their own peoples to contribute their utmost to a better world economic order.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I would wish to draw attention to the international cooperation year which is to be celebrated in 1965 -the 20th anniversary of the United Nations. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in making the

#### 302

suggestion in favour of the international cooperation year to the Assembly in November 1961 had said : "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 is 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 .... Perhaps it would be a truer picture if the cooperating element in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on cooperation and not on conflict". (1051st meeting, page 623). The truth of these words cannot be over-emphasised.

The programme of the international cooperation year that has been drawn up by Member States intends to provide valuable opportunity for bringing about a greater awareness of the extensive cooperation among nations and to make possible a concerted effort to expand cooperation throughout the world. Most of the work of this Assembly will now be done during 1965. It is my earnest hope, Mr. President, that in the coming year we will be able to move forward from co-existence to co-operation.

INDIA USA CHINA INDONESIA EGYPT RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CONGO CYPRUS

# FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE PORTUGAL GUINEA SWITZERLAND

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Albania's Allegations against India

The following is the text of the statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the General Assembly on December 17, 1964, in reply to Albania's allegations against India :

I am constrained to exercise my right of reply, as the representative of Albania in his statement this morning made certain wild and baseless allegations against India. It is not my wish to enter into a dialogue with him, but I shall say a few words to refute his false allegations and distortion of facts, in order to put the record straight.

The representative of Albania has made an attempt to brush aside the inconvenient fact of Chinese aggression against India and has sought to confuse the issue by placing before the Assembly the version of the case as put across by the People's Republic of China. As a close follower of the People's Republic of China, he has no option but to accept that version as gospel truth; otherwise it would be heresy on his part. Therefore I have no intention of replying to all the baseless allegations and distortions of fact contained in his statement. The whole world, with very few exceptions like Albania is well aware of the fact that the People's Republic of China invaded India and forcefully occupied Indian territory. The facts of the Chinese aggression have been brought out clearly and lucidly in numerous letters- and notes sent to Peking by the Government of India over the past few years. They fully refute the baseless claims on our territory made by the People's Republic of China.

They are contained in published documents and those who wish, may care to study them in order to judge for themselves the truth of the matter.

As already stated by me in this Assembly on 14 December. the People's Republic of China is "in occupation of 14,500 square miles of Indian territory" (1301st meeting, Page 43-45); it is surprising that the representative of Albania should in utter disregard of this patent fact make an utterly baseless. accusation against India. India is not occupying even an inch of the territory of the People's Republic of China.

India accepted the proposals put forward in all sincerity by six non-aligned States : Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ghana, Indonesia and the United Arab Republic. On the other hand, it is China which, while proclaiming its readiness to accept the proposals in principle, took all possible steps to ignore them. Of late, it has been ridiculing and criticizing these proposals. By continuing to enjoy the fruits of aggression, China has clearly refused to enter into negotiations except on its own terms: This is a position which quite understandably is unacceptable to India.

Albania can well afford to believe in the peaceful character of the People's Republic of China, secure in the knowledge that the vast Eurasian land mass separates it from China, and secure in the belief that the People's Republic of China has no interest in physically integrating it when ideologically it has already been integrated with China. We, too, had been led to believe in the peaceful intentions of the People's Republic of China-a country which we had always tried to befriend. The Chinese attack, therefore, caught us completely unprepared and was all the more of a great shock to us, as it was least expected. While Albania is at liberty to hold any views it likes, it can hardly blame us if, as a result of our own experience, we can no longer believe in the peaceful intentions of the People's Republic of China.

## 303

INDIA ALBANIA USA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BURMA CAMBODIA GHANA INDONESIA

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

### Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the President of the Security Council

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, sent the following letter dated December 26, 1964, to the President of the Security Council, in reply to Pakistan's protest against the application of certain provisions of the Indian Constitution to the State of Jammu and Kashmir:

I am instructed by the Government of India to refer to the Permanent Representative of Pakistan's letter of the 17th December, 1964, regarding application of certain provisions of the Indian Constitution to the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Government of India totally reject the contentions and misrepresentations of the Government of Pakistan embodied in the Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter, which have not the slightest justification, in law or in fact.

As has been repeatedly stated on behalf of the Government of India before the Security Council, the State of Jammu and Kashmir, as a constituent State of the Indian Union, is an integral part of India for whose security and good government, the Government of India has total responsibility. There can be no interference with this responsibility by Pakistan or by any one else. It is no doubt well known to the members of the Security Council that what has stood in the way of India's full exercise of this responsibility is the illegal occupation, through invasion and continuing aggression, by Pakistan of 2/5ths of the State of Jammu & Kashmir, which continues despite our representations to the Security Council.

Pakistan's contentions that Jammu & Kash-

mir is not a part of the Indian Union and that Pakistan will not recognise the application of Articles 356 and 357 of the Indian Constitution. are meaningless, since neither the fact of accession of the State of Jammu & Kashmir to India nor any measures pertaining to the governance of any part of the Indian Union require acceptance by the Pakistan Government.

The President of India in certain circumstances and for the purpose of the continuance of good administration, which would ensure the security and well being of the people, has the power to take over the Government of any State of the Union. The decision of the President at the request of the Jammu & Kashmir Government. which is a constitutional government elected on the basis of adult franchise, to make Articles 356 and 357 of the Constitution applicable to the State of Jammu & Kashmir, is merely an exercise of the responsibility which inheres in the Government of India. There can be no question of any change of status thereby of Jammu & Kashmir-, which, since its accession to India, has become irrevocably an integral part of the Indian Union. The Application of Articles 356 and 357 and of certain items in the Union and Concurrent List of the Indian Constitution which is the subject matter of Pakistan's letter, is purely an internal affair falling under the domestic jurisdiction of India.

The U.N. Commission resolutions do not constitute an international agreement, as alleged by the Government of Pakistan in para. 4 of its letter. These resolutions became obsolete and inapplicable entirely because of the Pakistan Government's failure to implement their basic provision, namely, the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Pakistan armed forces from Jammu and Kashmir, and continuing forcible and illegal occupation of the State for the past 17 years. Besides, the application of the laws and Constitution of India to Jammu and Kashmir has nothing to do with these resolutions.

The application of Articles 356 and 357 to the State of Jammu and Kashmir does not in any manner affect India's desire to seek an equitable and honourable solution of all its differences with Pakistan. To this end India has been making friendly overtures to Pakistan though, unfortunately, there has been hardly any response from the Government of Pakistan. That Government after agreeing to India's request for an official level conference for the purpose of restoring tranquillity along the cease-fire line and along India's international borders with Pakistan, postponed such a conference indefinitely. Likewise, the Home Ministers' Conference, which was to be held towards the end of November, was postponed indefinitely by Pakistan. Pakistan' leaders by their recent statements have again sought to build up an atmosphere of hostility between the two countries.

The Government of India regret to note that Pakistan has chosen to threaten India with 'disastrous consequences' if Articles 356 and 357 are applied to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Such a threat only goes to show Pakistan's intention to create trouble and conflict in Kashmir.

It is requested that this letter be circulated as a Security Council document.

## 304

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech in Rajya Sabha opening the Debate on Foreign Affairs

Initiating the debate in the Rajya Sabha on international affairs on December 22, 1964 Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, said :

Sir, I beg to move

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Sir, the House might recall that on the 17th November, I made a statement on the floor of this House giving a resume of the important international events that had taken place during the six weeks interval between the earlier October session when the international situation was discussed and the, 17th of November. In that statement, I made reference to important events like the Cairo Conference, relationship with Pakistan and the situation that had developed as a result of the explosion of a nuclear device by China and also to the agreement with Ceylon about the future of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon. It is not my intention, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to refer to these points and in the opening remarks I will confine myself mainly to bringing the information before the House up-to-date so that I might be able to devote greater time in the course of my reply after hon. Members have had an opportunity to offer their comments about the international situation. The statement that I made earlier in a sense may be considered to be part of my opening remarks and it is not my intention to go over the same ground again.

## SOVIET UNION

Sir, after I made that statement, I visited the Soviet Union and was there for two days, on my way to New York for attending the Session of the United Nations General Assembly. During my stay there I had the opportunity of exchanging views and of having discussion with Mr. Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, and also with Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers. These discussions were very useful and in the course of these discussions not only matters of mutual interest between India and the Soviet Union were discussed but the international situation in its broad aspects -important aspects like world peace, disarmament and other important aspects-was discussed. As a result of these discussions I found that there was a large volume of identify of views on major international questions. The Soviet Union's views about disarmament, about the desirability of lowering international tensions, about support for the concept of non-alignment, about the policy of peaceful co-existence were identical with our views. These are the important items in which there is identity of views between the views of the Soviet Government and

of the Government of India. On matters of mutual interest between our two countries the Soviet Union continues to follow the policy of friendship and co-operation with India and their desire to increase the economic relationship both in the matter of trade and in the matter of association, co-operation and collaboration in the various industrial projects continues to be at the same level if not at a somewhat higher level.

## UNITED NATIONS

Thereafter I went to the United Nations General Assembly where I spent about two weeks. Mr. Chairman, you would no doubt be aware that the United Nations General Assembly this year started under very peculiar circumstances. In fact, fears were entertained that the tensions that have arisen between the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, about the question of financing the peace-keeping operations were of such a nature that even the future of the organisation was threatened. On this issue there was a sharp cleavage of opinion and stand. The United States view in this respect was that the expenditure that had been incurred by the United Nations for peace-keeping operations in Congo, Gaza and elsewhere was such to which contributions should be made by all countries irrespective of the stand that they had taken at the time when these peace-keeping operations were undertaken. Whether a country was in favour of these peace-keeping operations or not, whether a country had supported or opposed the initiation of these peace-keeping operations, it was the contention of the United States that all countries should contribute to finance these operations. On the other hand the view of the Soviet Union was that such operations which had been undertaken not under the authority of the Security Council of the United Nations but by Resolutions of the General Assembly were in a sense unauthorised and as a consequence of that it was contended that no country could be compelled to contribute to the expenditure that was incurred for such peace-keeping operations. This was the basic

#### 305

difference of opinion of the substance of the question.

Then again what was the effect of non-payment within the period of two years? According to the United States, non-payment would automatically result in forfeiture of the right of vote to the defaulters; on the other hand the Soviet Union's contention was that the whole operation being unauthorised there was no responsibility to pay and therefore non-payment did not affect the status of a country that had refused to, pay. To refresh the memory, the House may kindly recall that the main question was examined by the World Court and the World Court had come to the conclusion and had given the opinion that the countries should contribute to this expenditure which had been incurred for peacekeeping operations. The important question, however, at this stage was the effect of nonpayment of dues by the Soviet Union. France also is a defaulter but they would have completed their two years period of default in another two months or so. We had given a great deal of thought to this matter and we had come to this conclusion that we ourselves having always contributed our share of these peace-keeping operations, countries should pay and it is desirable that they should pay. At the same time on the constitutional and juridical question after a great deal of examination we came to the conclusion that non-payment does not automatically deprive the country that has failed to pay the right of vote in the United Nations and we had made our position clear in the working group where our permanent representative made a clear statement that mere non-payment does not result in automatic forfeiture of the right of vote. That is a matter which comes up again for consideration. I have clarified this position as there was some comment that our own position in this respect was not quite clear.

In this atmosphere the United Nations General Assembly met and the delegates attended the session in an atmosphere of great tension and it was feared that if this matter was brought to a head and votes taken irrespective of the results of the voting the United Nations faced a real crisis and the future of the United Nations was itself in grave danger and doubt. I am happy, however, that the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, showed a spirit of accommodation and mutual understanding and neither of them appeared to be too keen to bring matters to a head and added to this was the effort made by the group of Afro-Asian countries and also the Secretary-General. It was the combined results of all these efforts as also the great spirit of mutual understanding which was shown by both the United States of America and the Soviet Union that the immediate crisis was averted. An important, and if I may add, ingenious device was thought of-that the work could start and the United Nations General Assembly could undertake the transaction of such business which did not call for the exercise of the right of vote. And it was by acclamation that the President of the General Assembly was elected and in this respect the House will no doubt join with me in expressing our joy and happiness that a distinguished African has been elected for the first time as the President of the General Assembly. Mr. Alec Oaison Sackey, the distinguished Ambassador from Ghana, has been elected as the President of the United Nations General Assembly, by a unanimous vote, by acclamation. By a unanimous vote another very significant event took place, that is, the admission of three new countries that have emerged into full Statehood, namely, Zambia, Maiawi and Malta. All the three countries were admitted as full-fledged members of the United Nations. We have very good relations with all these three countries and we have watched with great sympathy and with all possible support their movements for freedom from colonialism and now that these three countries have emerged as independent nations and as full-fledged members of the United Nations, our felicitations go to the people and Governments of these countries. We are looking forward to our close and friendly collaboration with these countries and we wish that they will play an important role in the world organisation. We will work in close co-operation and collaboration with these countries.

Work in the General Assembly has not really started in a business-like manner yet. Only the general statements have been made by the representatives or permanent delegates of various countries and the general debate is likely to continue even for some days more when the General Assembly reassemble sometime in January. Even the next date when the General Assembly meets after the Christmas recess has not yet been finalised. It may be either on the 14th or 11th, more likely the 11th, but no date has yet been finalised.

I took this opportunity of my presence there to have talks with the Foreign Ministers who had come there for the General Assembly session. Many of the Foreign Ministers had not attended the session, particularly the West European countries on account of their other commitments, but most of the African and Asian Foreign Ministers were there. I had a very useful discussion with the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Dean Rusk, when matters of mutual interest to both countries were discussed and the inter-national situation, particularly in relation to sensitive points in Asia and Africa was considered. As a result of this I had the satisfaction to learn that the United States also is anxious to create a situation whereby tension

#### 306

in these various sensitive areas is reduced. They are also keen that in areas where peace not only of those areas is uncertain, but international peace is also in jeopardy, steps should be taken in consonance with their general approach to various intricate problems and steps should be taken to reduce the tension in those areas.

It was a healthy thing that came to my notice there and this was noticed by representatives of all countries. The Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union and the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, of the United States, had several meetings between themselves, between the two of them. They discussed very complicated and difficult question about which there is a sharp difference of opinion between the two countries. There was willingness to meet and to talk and to find a solution not only to the immediate problem that faces the United Nations, namely, the question of contributions to the United Nations peace-keeping operations, but also it is known that they talked about other important questions. The situation in Africa, in the particular context of the Congo situation, South-East Asia, disarmament, these were the points about which opinions were exchanged and there were press reports also, which were not speculative, in which the two leaders of the two great countries did give some inkling of the nature of the talks that were going on. This is a good development and this shows that there is willingness on the part of these two countries to have direct

contacts and to make efforts to understand each other's viewpoint and to narrow down their differences as far as possible. This does not mean that the differences between the two countries have in any way been narrowed down or that every difficulty has been resolved. I am not suggesting that. But the fact that they met and talked and discussed these matters does show that the process of detente is likely to receive greater fillip as a result of these talks and it is hoped that this process will continue with good results.

## TALKS WITH FOREIGN MINISTERS

I myself had an opportunity of exchanging views with the distinguished Foreign Ministers of many countries in Asia and Africa. I think that on this occasion I met as many as 24 or 25 Foreign Ministers and we discussed matters, which were of great importance for the areas concerned, for the parts of the world to which these distinguished leaders belonged, also to our bilateral relations between our two countries. In this respect although this was not a very easy work from the point of view of both time and energy, I am happy that it did give an occasion for me to have important discussions and thus enabled me to understand their way of thinking on various important matters.

I would like, while talking about the United Nations, to clarify one matter about which there has been a lot of speculation in the press. This came to my notice when I was away to New York. This is about India's attitude or India's stand on the question of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. I would like to say very clearly that our original stand remains, according to which we had supported the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. In fact, it is not a question of admission. It is a question of representation, as to which Government represents the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Whether it is the Taiwan regime or the Formosa regime or the Government, that is, the People's Republic of China, our stand has been that People's Republic of China is entitled to have the representative in the United Nations. Our stand in this respect continues and I am not happy that there should have been an unnecessary controversy and doubts raised on this question, which unnecessarily have embarrassed us in various respects. It is true that the attitude of China is this. Not only on account of our conflict, but also in several other respects, their general posture is not that of peace or of co-operation, but it is that of war and bolligerency. That unfortunately continues. But its admission to the United Nations should be considered not always on this view, as to whether we like a particular country or whether we like or dislike their policies, but on the principle of universality which we have always advocated and also to ensure that the country of the size of China, with their population, should be in the United Nations, so that they are amenable to international discipline, they influence others and they also, in turn, are influenced by the atmosphere that prevails. That is the view that we have always taken and we continue to take this view, and therefore there need not be any controversy on that score.

#### DISARMAMENT

Sir, the most important question before the world today is that of war and peace, whether the world is progressing towards peace and what should be done to generate that atmosphere and climate of peace. This is the most important issue that faces the world today. In this respect we have always attached the highest importance to disarmament, Our representatives in the United Nations year after year have taken a very clear stand on this all important issue. In the General Assembly, in the various Committees, in the Disarmament Committee, we have taken steps very patiently but very consistently to ensure that the world moves towards disarmament. The alternative to disarmament the alternative to peace, is disaster and conflagration,

#### 307

which certainly is not in the interests of the world. It certainly is not in our interest either. Therefore on this question of disarmament we have taken- a very clear stand, and this time again it is our intention to pursue this line which we have persistently pursued for several years. We however feel that disarmament has to be approached from an overall angle. It is a difficult and complicated problem which cannot be oversimplified, and to pick up one in one sphere might lead to results which may not be quite appropriate and may not be quite desirable either. For instance, if we talk only of, say, nuclear disarmament, the countries who have got large conventional armies or conventional armaments may get an edge over others, if there is a success in the nuclear field. I do not suggest that we should not continue our efforts on nuclear disarmament. We should continue those efforts, but let this be a coordinated approach and let no country by just putting across a propagandist posture get away with this impression that - they have put really peaceful proposals before the world. It is of great importance that we attach importance to this problem from an overall angle and not be misled by merely propagandist suggestions that are made from time to time with a view to stealing advantage over others by stressing the importance of disarmament in one or the other sphere. It is important therefore to keep that aspect always in front of us. In this connection there is the lead given by the Cairo Conference where they made a call to all countries who have not subscribed to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty to subscribe to it, calling upon all countries who have the nuclear weapons or devices not to give them to others, not to give possession or control to others; also a determination by those countries who have not got the nuclear devices not to have them or not to possess them-these are the three important aspects of the Cairo declaration. There are, I am fully conscious of the fact, grave difficulties and very real difficulties in the way of persuading all countries to adopt this code, to subscribe fully and completely to this, but the objective is desirable and we should continue to direct all our efforts to achieve this. Several countries who have not subscribed to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty should subscribe to the Test Ban Treaty and the scope of the Moscow Test Ban Treaty should also be amplified to cover the underground tests also. The importance of these things should not be underrated. On the one hand we are hoping that the world would move towards disarmament. If on the other hand the countries continued to replenish their arsenals by adding to this stock of deadly weapons and also go on exploding the devices, both in the open and under-ground, then surely this is not consistent with the avowed intention put across by these countries that they are thinking in terms of disarmament. It is therefore necessary that as a first steep all those countries who have

not yet subscribed to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty should subscribe to it. As I said in my statement on the 17th, it is unfortunate that notwithstanding this overwhelming opinion China in flagrant defiance of this opinion exploded a nuclear device-to which I made a reference in the statement that I made on the 17th of November-and in that respect it is a definite setback to the force of peace, force of disarmament and the steps that the world was patiently taking for lowering tension, and to that extent the reaction even in other countries is also similar, namely, that this is a step which is definitely a step in the wrong direction and has increased the danger of proliferation and danger of conflict, and therefore this is a very serious matter of which the world should take note.

An hon. Member: What about France?

External Affairs Minister : About France our attitude is quite clear. We have always said that the attitude of France in not having subscribed to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty is absolutely incorrect and wrong, and when they exploded their device in the Sahara, in the United Nations we supported the resolution that expressed strong disapproval of the explosion by France of their nuclear device.

An hon. Member: Is it a device or a bomb?

External Affairs Minister : Bomb is also a device.

An hon. Member: Let us not minimise it.

External Affairs Minister: I do not at all minimise this, and if this expression nuclear device is something which is always used, it is an accepted expression and it is not minimising or maximising. This is the normal expression that is used for this type. When nuclear energy is used for non-peaceful purposes, then it is called a nuclear device. A bomb is something less dangerous than a nuclear device, if I may use that expression. I know that his English is much stronger than mine, but, probably in these technical expressions I have an edge over him, and particularly these matters are scientific and not just literary. I was mentioning that this matter is a very serious matter and we take very serious note of this, and this is a question which

has been engaging the attention of the Government of India, and our Prime Minister during his last visit to London did pose this problem before the nuclear powers of the world. His poser is of great importance and significance. Here is a situation where the world is anxious for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, nuclear devices. Reaceful uses of nuclear energy is the

#### 308

direction in which the world should move. It is. therefore, a matter of grave concern for the world and also it is a matter of importance that the principal nuclear powers--the Soviet Union and the United States of America-should take note of this situation and they should find some answer to the situation that has been developed by new countries coming into session of nuclear devices. Therefore, the non-nuclear world should have the assurance, should have the satisfaction, should have the sense of security and safety that by their adherence to the policy of non-proliferation they do not expose themselves to the danger that is inherent in the proliferation of nuclear weapons either by developed, or by passing control to other, countries. This matter has already started being looked into seriously by the powers of the world. Although it is too early yet to say if any concrete result out of this is likely to come out. we have to see this in relation to the general approach of disarmament and non-proliferation. This posture, is in keeping with our general approach to disarmament and non-proliferation and we should view it in that context. We should not regard this as a nuclear shield as has been wrongly described in a press conference. We are not asking for any nuclear shield from any particular country. We are posing a problem before the main nuclear powers if they want non-proliferation, if they want that other countries should not develop their own weapons. It is for them to devise some method of reassuring the countries who do not possess the nuclear weapons, that they should not feel insecure and unsafe in this situation.

#### PAKISTAN

Sir, I said something in my statement on the 17th November about our relations with Pakis-

tan. It is unfortunate that the Pakistan Government asked for the postponement of the Home Ministers' Conference. We were hoping that the two Home Ministers would meet and would be able to settle some of the important matters which bad exercised the minds of all of us here in this country and which were resulting in this unfortunate situation with which we are faced of a large number of Hindus Coming put from East Pakistan, and even now their flow into India continues unabated.

An hon. Member : Are there only Hindus who are coming out ?

External Affairs Minister: The hon. Member is quite right. "Non-Muslims" would be a better expression because Christians also have been pushed out from there. Buddhists have been pushed out. Tribals, who probably do not know any religion but who do not happen to be Muslims of the type that perhaps are welcomed in Pakitan, all these people are being pushed out. It is really a very sad situation, and it was hoped that the two Home Ministers would meet and would try to find some solution of this vexed problem so that there may be an abatement of migration of non-Muslims from East Pakistan.

Sir, there was also a meeting at official level to work out some agreement so that the tense situation at the cease-fire line, where a large number of incidents had taken place, resulting in the loss of innocent lives, could ease. We were hoping that these meetings between the Home Ministers and also at official level to discuss or to eliminate the incidents at the cease-fire line would result in some satisfactory solution of these vexed problems and this would improve the atmosphere so that all differences might be discussed in a better atmosphere. But unfortunately all these hopes have been falsified. And not only this, but unfortunately the general tone and general trend of propaganda in Pakistan is of a very virulent type. All types of allegations, incorrect allegations, unfounded allegations have been levelled such as we are siding with one or the other parties who are in the field in their election. This unfortunately is the state of affairs. But we should continue to hope that this may be an unfortunate or completely unjustified posture which has been adopted during the election, and once the elections are over they would settle

down so that we can again resume the talks with them. After all, we are neighbours, and our efforts should continue to improve relations with our neighbours to the best of our capacity. But it is to be remembered that there cannot be any satisfactory solution unless there is a reciprocity of approach on the Pakistan side. Whatever our good intentions or howsoever well-intentioned we may be, they may not yield any result unless there is reciprocal response from the Pakistan Government.

## CONGO

Sir, there are only one or two things more which I would like to mention in my opening speech. The situation in Africa, particularly in the Congo, is there. As you know, there is a very fierce debate that has been going, on in the Security Council over the Congo. The situation there is really bad and the general feeling amongst the majority of the African countries is very strong on this issue. We ourselves have always taken the view that this is a quarrel between the Congolese and the Congolese where the Congolese unfortunately are fighting the Congolese. and there should be no interference from outside in any form. We are strongly in favour of the elimination of all outside interference and withdrawal of all troops so that the

#### 309

solution of the vexed problem of the Congo, of this strifetorn Congo is found in the African way. Sir, the Organisation of African Unity have. been devoting a great 'deal of energy for solving this vexed problem. They have constituted a Conciliation Commission under the distinguished presidentship of President Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya and we have always supported their efforts to find a satisfactory solution. But this is possible only if the outside interference from all sides is eliminated and there is a national reconciliation, the objective that' the Organisation of African Unity have put before them. There cannot be a military solution. Any military intervention really accentuates the situation, exasperates it and does not lead towards a solution. We have always been of that view, namely, that there should be no intereference from outside and the Organisation of African Unity should work out a satisfactory solution.

#### SOUTH VIETNAM

Sir, South-East Asia is another very difficult and sensitive area. The situation in South Vietnam, where there is this political instability, has added to their difficulties of an international character. There also is this allegation on either side that there is interference on the side of South Vietnam. There is this allegation that North Vietnam and the Chinese continue to support the forces of subversion and, therefore, this constant trouble continues in South Vietnam. On behalf of North Vietnam there is this allegation that there is American interference and the Americans are there in a big way. For the solution of the Vietnam situation, the sooner it is realised that a military solution of this vexed problem and of this difficult problem is not possible, the better it will be for Vietnam and for South-East Asia. A military solution is not possible and it only mounts tension increases the tension. Therefore we have always advocated the convening of a Conference of the Geneva type. a Geneva type Conference which could pick up from the point at which the last Conference ended their labours so that we could find out where the parties have slipped back. It is interesting that the basic principles that were evolved as a result of that Conference are not contradicted by the parties concerned. The allegations are that the spirit of that Agreement was not implemented. The difference is on implementation, not on the basic approach that was evolved as a result of that Conference. Therefore there is hope that if the Conference is reconvened and the matter is examined dispassionately and if all the parties concerned are there, it is possible to find a solution on political lines and ultimately in South-East Asia the solution lies in eliminating, these outside influences, these extraneous influences and of neutralising these various countries in South-East Asia.

#### LAOS

In Laos the situation continues to be uneasy, though it is not that disquieting as it is in Vietnam. The two Princes held some talks in Paris but the results of these talks were not very fruitful. There also is general agreement that a Geneva-type Conference might pave the way for solving this difficult position in Laos.

## CAMBODIA

In Cambodia, as you know, the U.S.A. and Cambodia were conducting bilateral talks in Delhi. Unfortunately progress has not been made and they have said that they are not making much progress., Let us hope that after reporting to, their respective Governments these talks are resumed either here or elsewhere because it is easy to snap the relationship, it is easy to break the relationship but whatever may be the differences, our effort has always been to persuade the two sides not to break diplomatic relations but to continue their efforts for resolving whatever may be their differences.

## INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION YEAR

The year 1965, Mr. Chairman, is the International Co-operation, Year for the United Nations. Our Prime Minister when he attended the United Nations General Assembly, had made an appeal that the world which appears to be torn by strife and by conflict is still continuing but there are large areas of co-operation and understanding and if we pick up the Areas of understanding and co-operation and not be too much overwhelmed by. the conflict that prevails in the world, then that might be a constructive way of lowering tensions in the world. There is a unanimous Resolution of the U.N. General Assembly that the 20th Year of the U.N. should be celebrated as the International Co-operation Year and we in India owe a special responsibility, we have special interests in this and I hopethat the world, as a result of the spirit of International Co-operation Year, would move from the present tenseness and present conflict to one of Co-operation.

### CEYLON

On Ceylon the statement that I made on 17th November gives the basic information about the Agreement. To bring this matter uptodate, I would say that our Commonwealth Secretary visited Colombo and there were further talks and a joint statement was issued at the end of these talks about the establishment of procedures for implementing the agreements that had been arrived at. 310

Mr. Chairman, in these remarks, I have ventured to bring uptodate the various events and am looking forward to the viewpoints of the Members. The international situation is at the moment very complicated and there are large areas of tensions. There is great conflict in the world but at the same time we have preserved and we have to patiently work for peace, for disarmament, for ending colonialism and we have to bend our effort through a co-operative effort so that these may become a passing phase and the world may. emerge as a result of the patient efforts of the world towards peace and towards amity rather than conflict and confrontation.

INDIA USA EGYPT PAKISTAN CHINA CONGO FRANCE GHANA ZAMBIA MALTA TAIWAN PERU RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM KENYA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND LAOS CAMBODIA SRI LANKA

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Replying to the debate on international affairs in the Rajya Sabha on December 23, 1964, the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh said :

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to go into details and I shall edeavour to confine myself to answering some of the important points that have emerged in the course of the high level debate that took place yesterday on the international situation. First of all, Sir, I will take this matter which has aroused doubts and which has necessitated a personal explanation by an bon. Member. I am afraid even after his personal explanation the House does not appear to be satisfied.

#### COLOMBO PROPOSALS

And it is, therefore, necessary for the position in this respect to be briefly recapitulated and the salient points again brought to our mind so that there may not be any misunderstanding on this score. In the first place, Sir, reference has been made to the Colombo proposals, and one hon. Member, a senior Member of our party said that there is nothing sacrosanct in those proposals.

Without using any expression or adjective, let us examine impartially the background of those proposals. It will be wrong to regard them as Indian proposals and therefore, we should view it in that perspective. When the massive Chinese aggression took place in the year 1962, a group of non-aligned Afro-Asian countries get together and they put forward certain proposals which, if acted upon by both the sides, that is to say, the People's Republic of China and India, could be the basis of negotiations. Let us keep this always before us. It will be wrong to suggest that they are Indian proposals. In fact, we did not entirely like those proposals and if they were our proposals, then those proposals would have been completely different. But in a spirit of respect and regard for our Afro-Asian nonaligned brothers, we accepted those proposals in a spirit of compromise. Our acceptance itself meant a certain compromise on our part and therefore, it will be wrong to suggest that they are Indian proposals.

What are those proposals ? The entire background of those proposals was that a party that has gained by a unilateral act of aggression should not enjoy the fruits of that aggression, before going to the conference table. That was the philosophy behind them. It is quite obvious that if negotiations have to start, they should start on a basis of honour, on a basis of equity. (interruptions).

I am trying to explain it and I am not going into the details. I am only saying that this was the main objective behind it. In their attempt to give content to that, on details they might not have exactly seen our viewpoint, and therefore, I described it as a compromise and not something which is entirely to our liking. So I do not see any danger in our position being misunderstood by the general proposals which I am placing before this honourable House. Therefore, we must keep this aspect of the Colombo Proposals before us.

What happened thereafter? We said that we accept the Colombo Proposals in toto, and if the other party, namely, China, also is prepared to accept them in toto, then we are prepared to negotiate and to discuss the question on merits. China, on the other hand, whereas they continue to say that they accept these proposals in principle-an expression the exact meaning of which I have never been able to understandthey were never prepared to act upon what was enjoined under the Colombo Proposals to be done by China. So this is the position in which we find ourselves and I think we have gone to the maximum limit in trying to accept the proposal which by themselves were compromise proposals. And so to suggest that we should give in on that score is, to my mind, not fair to us and, therefore, it is likely to embarrass us. I

#### 311

would request that on a matter of this importance, we should not indulge in just theoretical suggestions and that we should carefully weight the suggestions that are put forward. We are so anxious that our image is not being damaged. that our viewpoint is not being misunderstood. But if we ourselves introduce these elements of doubt, then surely nothing damages our image more than the projection of ideas which create doubts in the minds of our countrymen, and certainly these are things which are bound to affect our position. I hope by this clarification no doubts would be left in any person's mind in the country that in the matter of the Colombo proposals we had taken a very fair stand. If I did not mention this in my opening speech, it was for this reason that having clarified our position and the People's Republic of China having categorically stated that they do not accept the Colombo Proposals, there was nothing further on this score that we could do. Therefore, it is wrong to suggest that on this issue we should compromise our position. It will not be fair either to the Colombo Powers. It will certainly not be fair to our country that we should raise

doubts on this issue.

## INDIA-CHINA BORDER

Another point, Sir, which is of equal significance and perhaps the seriousness of which was not fully appreciated by the two very respectable colleagues of mine, was raised. It was said that after all it was an undefined boundary and perhaps by some give and take there could be some possibility of compromise. I think that such a suggestion having been made with the best of intentions and perhaps innocence is likely to be greatly misconstrued. Let us try to understand the position correctly. In our anxiety to find a way out of the difficult situation let us not create a situation where the basic thing slips, because that will be a very dangerous thing for the Country. We should try to understand the correct position. I remember distinctly the seriousness with which this matter was handled in this House and in the other House by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. He made it clear that it would be wrong to imagine that this is just a matter of little border dispute between the two countries. It is a clear case in which very sizable areas of our country are being demanded by China and it is really a territorial claim which has been made by China and not just a border dispute. I remember very distinctly the expressions that were used by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. Lest any misgiving should arise on this score, I would like to clarify precisely the position with regard to this boundary question as it has been tried to be explained by some colleagues of mine.

The common border between India and China is not a new or unknown border, but one which has been formed through centuries of history of neighbourly co-existence between the two countries. There was never any dispute about this border in history not even during the first ten years of the existence of the People's Republic of China, until, in fact, China put forward vast and fantastic territorial claims against India in September, 1959. We have to see this posture of China. It is not just a border dispute. We have to realise this difference. It was not a border dispute which China thus precipitated but territorial demands, involving over 50,000 sq. miles of Indian territory and affecting the sovereignty and integrity of India. To call it a genuine and honest misunderstanding about the border is something contrary to facts...

Sir, our stand has been that India's northern boundary is well-defined and delimited, though not demarcated, and that when national boundaries have been defined and delimited by custom, tradition, history, geography and treaties, as it is in the case of the Sino-Indian border, it remains the valid and recognised boundary even though not demarcated on the ground. Had the Chinese case been that there is some doubt about the border at certain specific points, it could certainly have been possible to clear and settle these doubts through negotiations. But the Chinese case is not that, but that vast areas of India belong to China. Now this is a matter which we should not lose Sight of and it is in this context that we have to see what our attitude and what our approach should be.

The third point that was suggested and which again was repeated by an hon. Member is this. He said that the United Nations or the world statesmen should find some group of people who could suggest some boundary or some delineation which could then be considered by the two countries. Now if you examine this thing, there is not much substance in it but on the essence of the proposal our attitude has not been that of recalcitrance ...

The hon. Member : The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, offered to send the India-China dispute to the International Court. He also offered mediation.

External Affairs Minister : Sir, this was precisely what I was trying to say. If he had said that yesterday, probably so much misunderstanding would not have arisen. This is nothing more, as now mentioned by him, than what was said by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. He had said that "I am prepared to take this matter to the Court of International Justice."

#### 312

He also said, "I am also prepared to refer this to arbitrators chosen by the two countries and their decision or award would be acceptable to me." But the hon. Member forgets that this was categorically rejected by China. At that very time when this was said by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, it was rejected by China. (interruptions).

Sir, this is not a matter which we should consider in a light-hearted manner. This is a problem of grave concern to us and, therefore, any half-baked suggestion without full thought being given to its various aspects and its remifications will be a very dangerous exercise and even if persons with high intellect and great understanding are the authors of any such suggestion, I would appeal to them that while dealing with such a difficult and delicate issue any attempt at over-simplification or any attitude of innocence will not help the situation at all. Let us try to understand its full implications. It is a problem with which we may have to live for years together.

Let us have that resoluteness. Let us have that determination, let us have that clarity of approach while we are dealing with this problem. It will be very dangerous if we permit our best of intentions to overtake us when we are dealing with a neighbour of the type of China and when the problem is difficult and delicate as it is when vast territorial claims are made against us. I would, therefore, beg to hon. Members from both sides of the House to view this problem in all seriousness and not to be carried away merely by a very obvious temptation sometimes to score a debating point this way or that way. The matter is much more serious to be explained away or to give any satisfaction to any person merely on the ground of trying to score a debating point. The matter is much too serious and we should, therefore, view it in that background and perspective and not try to throw up suggestions which may not have much meaning. If there is anything, it could be discussed, it could be considered but before it is put across, it must he very thoroughly examined. These things are made use of in various international forums and also for purposes of injuring our case amongst other friendly countries. So, let us be very cautious when we make any such statement.

## INDO-CEYLON AGREEMENT

Now, I would make a brief reference to an-

other matter, the Indo-Ceylon Agreement, about which the distinguished leader of the D.M.K. made a very impassioned speech. I would very briefly try to meet some of the points that he raised, Sir, the first point that he made while criticising this was that this was a matter which was entirely for the Government of Ceylon, that it was not an Indo-Ceylon problem. Now, let us examine the validity of this argument. Here in this question about which the distinguished Icader of the D.M.K. himself referred to various earlier discussions between the two Prime Ministers. In fact, the dialogue about this started more than twenty years ago - even before Independence there were discussions between the then representatives of the Government of India and the representatives of the Government of Ceylon. In 1940 there was a discussion about his matter. After Independence, there were four or five discussions between the two Prime Ministers and there were other discussions at official level. So, it is not correct now to say that this is a problem with which we are pot concerned. At the same time, he shows more concerned about the people there and yet he wants to take an easy line and say that this is entirely for Ceylon and that we should not bother about it. Now, you may have objections to he substance of the agreement but to say that this is a matter with which we are not concerned is certainly not borne out by events and by closing our eyes to a problem, the problem does not get solved. W.- have to tackle the problem howsoever inconvenient and difficult it may appear to be. The very trend of its handling before and the way that the two countries were. dealing with this problem should not leave I any doubt in anybody's mind that this was a problem in which we were not very much concerned. Here were people of Indian origin whose future was uncertain and, therefore, we were greatly concerned. The second point raised by him was that this was a human problem and the question of human rights should have been given a great deal of prominence in our approach. I entirely agree with him : It is very much a human problem and it was this main consideration, that this was a human problem and human rights were involved, that made us tackle it this way and we have tried to find a solution to this very vexed problem; how does this problem involve human rights ? Here is a group of over nine lakhs of people who are not Indian

citizens-because we say that they cease to be Indian citizens-and Ceylon does not accept them as Ceylonese citizens. They have not got the right to vote there and they are generally denied many of the things that are permitted and allowed to the people who have acquired Ceylonese citizenship. So, it is very much a human problem. Here is a group of over nine lakhs of people whose status is not determined. Ceylon is not recognising them as such. We are suggesting to them that they should but they do not. Yet. he posed a very simple question. "Would they shoot them down? Are they going to throw them in the ocean ?" Now, the distinguished leader of a group like the D.M.K.

#### 313

can take that attitude; I cannot take that attitude. I have to take a realistic attitude, not a political approach. He may have his eyes on the General Elections and he may be thinking of using this as a big lever for his election campaigns in Madras State but as a member of the Government, I have to take a more realistic view. The future of these people is a matter of grave concern and I hope it should be a matter of grave concern to the D.M.K. leader also. Here are the people who have got no status whatsoever. They are not Indian citizens. Even if they are Indian citizens, I cannot do much for them there except that if they find themselves in difficulty, they have to come back. That is the normal connotation of issuing a passport to an individual-the host country can always send him back. If they have not got Ceylonese citizenship then it is very necesary that I should find an answer so that they can get the citizenship either of Ceylon or of India. That is precisely the approach and it is for the restoration of the human rights to these people, the fundamental rights of citizenship, so that they can enjoy this civil right and rights under international convention and law that we entered into this agreement.

An hon. Member : May I just intervene and ask whether it was contemplated that there would be communal representation, that they would be placed in a communal register ?

External Affairs Minister: The hon. Member

has raised a very valid point and he knows my answer. This was never mentioned and we have strongly. protested, against that. This was a matter which was never mentioned in the course of the discussions. The earlier persons of Indian origin who had been given Ceylonese citizenship were kept in a joint register so that we had no reason to doubt....

I was saying that this group of over nine lakhs of people should be given either Ceylonese citizenship or Indian citizenship and it is precisely what we have done. There may be difference of opinion about the number of people ...

The question of grant of citizenship right to these people was of importance and, therefore, we entered into negotiations so that this uncertainty, this statelessness and this absence of any status should end. Hence we started negotiations and the basic agreement has been welcomed even by the critics of this. There will be no uncertainty and people will get either Ceylonese or Indian citizenship under this decision. Those who are to get Ceylonese citizenship will get absorbed in their society, in their civic life and in their stream of life and the others would become Indian citizens who enjoy normal rights in the country where they stay.

Now this Point which has been raised by an hon. Member about the separate electoral register is a valid point because this-was never discussed and we have taken very strong objection to this and we hope that our efforts in this respect will succeed because it was never contemplated that these persons who are given Ceylonese citizenship rights should be placed on a separate electoral register. Our way of thinking in this country has always been that there should be no separate electorate in any form or shape and therefore we are strongly of the view that this is something which was not contemplated and therefore this should not be the position. I hope the Ceylon Government, after the election when they form their new Government, will take note of this attitude of ours and will not do anything which will create a situation which was not contemplated at that time.

Now, the third point which was raised by an hon. Member was this. He asks whether this has been accepted by the people who are involved. I will be quite candid. This is a compromise formula; I do not Eke the whole of it. Nor does the Ceylon Government like the whole of it. The people concerned, all of them, do not like it; some like it, others don't I am conscious of the fact that Mr. Thondaman and his party have made a statement where they say that this agreement is not acceptable to them. But let us not forget one important thing, which probably is not known to hon. Members, that there are lakhs of people there in Ceylon who want to come back to India on their own and they have been approaching the Indian High Commission for grant of travel facilities to return to India ...

It will be one of the important thing-, in procedure that applications will be invited from all those who are persons of Indian origin in Ceylon to apply either for Indian citizenship or for Ceylon citizenship. And once these applications are invited we can see as to whether the number is so small as is contended by the hon. Member there or whether the number is large as is our information. After all we are functioning there although we do not make loud speeches and this is a matter about which we did not want to talk at all because if we said that a large number of them were wanting to come back, in the negotiations that is not a point which goes in our favour.

The procedure that we are trying to settle is one which will give an indication of the wishes of the people. Now, the principles have been decided by negotiation and may be the number of applicants who apply for Indian citizenship may not be large or may fall short of it. That is a matter which, when we know that situation.

#### 314

we can consider as to how best we could solve it. This is an aspect which we have to keep in mind. (Interruption).

The other important thing is that people who are repatriated will be permitted to take out their assets unlike the unfortunate people who are coming from Burma. So there are several good features of this agreement and it is really very unkind if in a sweeping way it is brushed aside and said that is a betrayal of this or betrayal of that. That type of expressions we are all accustomed to hear. Unless there is any substance behind them, merely strong words do not cut much ice. So this was a very considered decision that we took after ascertaining the opinion of the people concerned. I had myself occasion to discuss this matter both with Mr. Thondaman and Mr. Aziz, the two leaders belonging to two groups, when I was in Colombo. And we were in touch with the Government of Madras. It is true that we have not consulted the Opposition leaders here but the way that their mind is working I cannot say what would have happened if I had consulted them unless of course I had the veto. Whereas I am prepared to have their opinion I cannot agree to a veto being exercised by them. If they say that this is not acceptable, we cannot sit with crossed legs without moving forward because we carry the responsibility and not they. Therefore we have to view this agreement in this perspective and given, goodwill and understanding on both sides I am sure that this agreement will not turn out to be to our disadvantage. It will solve a, long-standing dispute between the two countries and the misunderstanding and bitterness that was being generated as a result of this problem will be eliminiated.

An hon. Member: I think unwittingly, said that it is a small country and asked. Why do you care so much about it? I think that should not be our attitude with regard to our neighhours. The smaller a country, the, greater should be our respect for their susceptibilities and our attitude should be one of good neighbourliness and not a chauvinistic approach. If I may be quite frank, I say a great deal of harm is clone to persons of Indian origin in Ceylon by the extremely intemperate speeches made by the party to which the bon. Member belongs. A great deal of misunderstanding is created between persons of Indian origin in Ceylon and the Ceylonese by the extremely unwise and intemperate speeches that are made by the D.M.K. leaders in Madras and I would appeal that in a matter of such complicated international nature it is not wise to adopt this attitude of not caring for other country's susceptibilities even though it may be a small Country. That is not the way that we should function in this country.

An hon. Member : the hon. Minister was pleased to state that there are lakhs of Indians

who are anxious to go over here. When the India-Pakistan and Ceylon Citizenship Act was passed the Indian Embassy there called for registrations. How many were registered then?

External Affairs Minister : I am glad he has reminded me of that. Besides these three lakhs of people who are now being taken by Ceylon as Ceylonese citizens at the time when the India-Pakistan Citizenship Act came into force, the Ceylon Government took 1,34,000. Add this three lakhs to that and that makes it 4,34,000. This 1,34,000 was the number taken ten years back. If you add the increase in population and also add another 6,000 who have been given Ceylonese citizenship in between the total number comes to practically the same that we are taking. It is more or less half and half basis. He asks, what was the number of applications at that time T Even at the present moment when we have somehow discouraged people from applying, there are 40,000 applications pending with our High Commission. So even now there are people who are wanting to come away when we have not invited applications ....

I do not know the exact number but it is a fact that we rejected a very large number of applications and we did not give them Indian citizenship and at that time this had been one of the complaints of the Ceylonese Government that at that time we did not grant citizenship rights to many people who had asked for such citizenship rights. I wish that these questions were not probed in that form. It is not in the interests of the people for whom be is speaking. Weshould therefore proceed in the right spirit because this is a matter which we have settled after a great deal of controversy and it is our intention to go ahead with the follow-up action based upon that agreement. (Interruption).

An hon. Member : May I know whether the Government of India have made it clear to the Ceylon Government that they will not consider the agreement binding on them if the new Ceylon Government also insists that Indian citizens, who are going to be given citizenship in Ceylon, are to be placed on a separate register?

External Affairs Minister : We have made our position quite clear and our Prime Minister has

written to the Prime Minister of Ceylon where he has made it absolutely clear that this step that they are contemplating-they have not yet taken this step--to take, namely, placing the persons to whom they grant Ceylonese citizenship rights on a separate register, will not be acceptable to us. We have made the position quite clear and let us work for their not insisting

## 315

on this. Rather than giving an ultimatum at this stage, we should depend on our capacity....

An hon. Member : What you have said just now is that if they do not accept our suggestion, that will not be acceptable to us. Does it mean the additional proposal of a separate register or the whole Indo-Ceylon agreement ?

External Affairs Minister : Let us not spell out things of a hypothetical nature. We hope that this will not happen. It is very interesting that the D.M.K. leader did take exception to this. Probably he believes in separate things, but whatever may be his attitude, we are quite clear as to what we should do. We are quite determined to see that these people are not placed on a separate register. (Interruption).

Now, Sir, it might be of interest for the House to know that the two leaders, whose names have been mentioned before Mr. Thondaman and Mr. Aziz have both welcomed this basic decision that the state of uncertainty about the future of these people would come to an end. They will get either Ceylonese citizenship rights or Indian citizenship rights, which is a step in the right direction. I know they are worried about the number ...

The agreement that has been entered into will, I hope, be appreciated by persons of goodwill in both countries. We all of us are interested in improving our relations with our neighbouring countries and it would be wrong to think that we can improve these relations by sticking to our hard position and that we should never approach these problems in a spirit of mutual accommodation. We should in an increasing measure try to bring about a spirit of accommodation rather than have a rigid approach while considering these problems which create difficulties. I do not plead any helplessness. If we try to argue in a very long wish way, I think that would not at all help us. We have taken this decision and we intend to implement it. So, there is no question of any helplessness or being apologetic about it.

## GOODWILL VISITS To NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES

These were few main points about China and about the Indo-Ceylon agreement that were highlighted. There were certain other matters, but I will not take long over them. I shall try to go over this around rapidly. Now, I welcome the suggestion made by an hon. Member that we should encourage the visits of non-officials, including Members of Parliament, to some of our neighbouring countries and also other countries in Asia and Africa. I welcome that and it is our intention to organise visits by non-officials, including Members of Parliament, so that they Might explain our viewpoints and our stand on some of the issues. I also concede that the work that can be done by these non-official groups can be of a more lasting character. There is the diplomatic work. That has to continue because that is essential and that is inescapable. Besides that it can be supplemented and it should be supplemented by these visits. It is our intention to organise such groups.

## BRITISH GUIANA

About British Guiana, an hon. Member had mentioned that we should convey our feelings with regard to the British Guiana situation to the United Kingdom Government. He would no doubt be aware that two distinguished Indians, Mr. Tek Chand, a former Member of Parliament and retired Judge, and Mr. Mirza Bakar Ali, were in the group who had gone to British Guiana to watch the elections. They were supposed to give their report to the United Kingdom Government, and I will have an opportunity of discussing the political situation with them because, as experienced public men they can give good advice even outside the limited scope of their assignment, namely, to watch the elections. We have always felt great concern about the unfortunate racial conflict there. We are not happy about it, but we do not think that the cry for partition is the answer. We in India know what such a cry means and

what misery it can bring to people. May be out of frustration they are now crying for partition, but it is a matter which will have to be dealt with sympathy and with care, and we will see what best we could do, but let us not put in our finger more than what the situation justifies. They are British Guianese, may be persons of Indian origin, and therefore we should, while having all the sympathy for them, not create an impression as if they are functioning under our guidance or under our inspiration. That is not in their interests, that is not in our interests either. This is the situation with regard to that area of the world.

### CHINA'S ADMISSION TO U.N.

With regard to the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, we have continued to stick to our stand even after the 1962 aggression, and that stand continues. There is no change in policy .....

An hon. Member : Why did the Government of India change their stand on that particular issue, namely, of treating China's admission as a substantive issue ? The Government of India voted first in favour of China's admission being treated as a substantive issue, but now - a result of Afro-Asian pressure they changed their stand and have agreed to treat it as a procedural issue.

#### 316

External Affairs Minister: We have not changed our position at all. Whenever there was any occasion for voting, we had always said that it was a matter which should be decided by simple majority. If there is a change in the situation on account of the Chinese aggression or hostility to us or by their exploding a bomb, these are different things. It should be considered. But having given consideration to these issues and even after the aggression in 1962 we continued to stick to the earlier policy that we had adopted, namely, of supporting their admission into the United Nations; and that policy continues unaltered and, therefore, there is no change in that policy.

### CHINESE EXPLOSION

On the bomb I had in my opening remarks clarified the position as best as I could, and I am glad that there is a growing appreciation of the Government's policy of developing our nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and there is a greater realisation of the various integrated issues involved in this, and there is greater support not only amongst our own party but even amongst members of the opposition that we should continue our efforts for developing nuclear energy with greater vigour and with a greater purpose, namely the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We should not talk too much of the future one way or the other. The policy is what I enunciated today. Why should we unnecessarily try to project ourselves too much into the future? This is the policy that we are pursuing and we should not try really to clinch the issue more than this. On the positive side we are determined to work even with greater determination for disarmament, for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and for generating a climate of peace because we believe that war and conflict are not the answer to the world situation as we face today, but it is peace and reconciliation and an atmosphere of understanding, and we should therefore, continue to work hard even against all odds for bringing about a world where desarmament, peace and reconciliation are the keynote and not conflict, escalation of tensions and armament.

USA SRI LANKA INDIA CHINA TOTO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BURMA PAKISTAN PERU **Date :** Dec 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION YEAR

President's Message

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, issued the following message on December 31, 1964 on the eve of the International Co-operation Year : The United Nations has designated the year 1965, the 20th year of its existence, as International Co-operation Year. This follows from a suggestion made by our late Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. He felt that too much prominence was being given to the disagreements and conflicts between nations and too little to the much more numerous matters on which they were co-operating and helping one another. He hoped that if we occupy our thoughts more with the idea of international co-operation, an atmosphere would be created that would dispel some of the distrust in which the conflicts that afflict the world have their origin.

The nations of the world have in fact already achieved a very considerable degree of international co-operation. Through the United Nations Organisation and its specialised agencies member States have been working together in almost every field of human activity, political, economic, social, cultural and educational. They have combined their efforts in peace-keeping operations in the Congo, Cyprus and elsewhere; improving the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products through the Food and Agricultural Organisation; in raising the standard of health and eradicating disease through the World Health Organisation. Directly also nations and groups of nations have been helping one another in various ways and the treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere and under the sea, to which so many nations have subscribed, represents international co-operation in a matter affecting the very survival of humanity.

The progress of science and industry which we have witnessed during the past two decades has brought together the races and cultures of the world as never before. We have no choice now

#### 317

but to live together as members of a single world community. Twentieth century man who is already probing the mysteries of the universe cannot restrict his horizon on matters affecting his very existence to the narrow comer of the, world in which he happens to dwell. Our true nationality is the human race, our home the world.

The main purpose of the International Co-

operation Year will be to remind the peoples of the world of the extent to which they are already living as members of a single world community. Who knows, from this realisation may spring a desire and a demand to make this world a single home for humanity.

USA CONGO CYPRUS

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION YEAR

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation

In a message to the nation broadcast on December 31, 1964 on the eve of the International Cooperation Year, the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, said:

Three years ago, our late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, had, in a memorable address to the United Nations General Assembly, on November 10, 1961, appealed for emphasising the elements of cooperation, rather than of conflict, between the nations and peoples of the world. He had said. "We live in this world of conflict and yet the world goes on, undoubtedly because of the cooperation of nations and individuals. . . . Little is known, or little is said, about this cooperation 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. . . . "

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's suggestion that the Assembly might consider devoting a year to international cooperation aroused enthusiastic response and culminated in the adoption of a resolution by the General Assembly designating 1965, the 20th year of the United Nations, as the International Cooperation Year. The United Nations has undoubtedly become the symbol and embodiment of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world for peace, justice and progress. The lofty principles enshrined in the U. N. Charter constitute a testament of faith in the future of mankind. This faith can be maintained and strengthened only by the united effort of all to rid the world of the ancient ills of hunger, ignorance and disease, and of the new terror of a nuclear holocaust.

There was a time when Man, for lack of knowledge of the physical world, was helpless in meeting the stark forces of nature. Today, he has acquired the means to improve his condition, through unprecedented growth of science and technology, which have uncovered many of Nature's secrets and hidden treasures. What is holding him back is selfishness and greed, which hinder the full exploitation and equitable sharing of the world's resources; and mutual fear and prejudice, which divert precious resources into the wasteful production of mighty war machines, not only wasteful, but incredibly dangerous and terrifying; in this age of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction.

The Year of International Cooperation serves to remind us all that it is only through practical acts of cooperation, whether in raising the standards of millions in the poor countries or in restoring freedom and equality to the oppressed nations and races, or even in the conduct of our daily lives that peace can be strengthened and the well-being of humanity secured.

USA **Date :** Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS

Vice-President's Inaugural Address

The Vice President, Dr. Zakir Hussain, made the following speech inaugurating the nine-day 38th International Eucharistic Congress in Bombay on November 28, 1964:

#### 318

The Government and people of India are happy that the city of Bombay was chosen as the venue of the 38th International Eucharistic Congress by His Holiness Pope John XXIII, of happy memory. Their joy is greatly intensified now by the fact that His Holiness Pope Paul VI has declared his intention of being present at this International Eucharistic Congress, which is being held in Asia for the first time.

We take pride in the fact that India is a secular State, it does not have special ties with any religion in particular but accords to them all the same reverence and the same rights under the law. This disposition, enshrined in the Constitution, reflects the innate respect of the people of India for all spiritual values wherever they may be found.

Christianity, as you know, came to India with St. Thomas, one of the apostles of Christ, who is believed to have died in Mylapore, Madras, between 64-68 A.D., that is, about 1900 years ago. Thus, Christianity is almost 2000 years old in India and has integrated itself into Indian life and history. The Catholic institutionsspecially schools, colleges, and social welfare organisations embodying the ideal of servicehave made a deep impression on all who desired educational and social reform and have influenced millions of our citizens in no small measure. The co-existence of several religions and their welfare activities have helped to promote a synthesis of cultures which thrive in their diversity and yet retain a basic unity. There are perhaps thousands of non-Christians in our country who have read the Bible-that miracle in English prose, as Arthur Quiller--Couch characterises it, and are more than acquainted with some of the great Christian philosophers and mystics--St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, Thomas a Kempis and St. Francis of Assiri, to name only a few, who have influenced their thoughts. But perhaps few realise the part

played by the Bible in our political life, and the struggle for independence. Gandhiji, the Father of our Nation, sought solace in some of his darkest hours in the teachings of Christ.

Our nation's attitude towards Christianity has not been a mere negative one of toleration. The Christian community has been assisted and encouraged to make its contribution to the political, economic, cultural and social life of the country. There have been Christian members in the Central Cabinet, there are Christian Ministers, Christian Governors, Christian Ambassadors and Parliamentarians. Christian contribution also dates back to our pre-Independence era and several members of this community sacrificed their lives in their country's struggle for freedom.

It would not be out. of place to mention one of its distinguished members-Kaka Joseph Baptista, a citizen of this citY--who defender Lokmanya Tilak over 50 years ago, during his second sedition trial at the High Court, and made a valuable contribution to the political life of this country, when he became the First President of the Indian Home Rule League. By a strange coincidence, the present year also hap-pens to be the centenary of his birth, and Bombay Catholics could take pride in giving to the country such a remarkable and distinguished personality. The commendable way in which Christians have integrated themselves with their compatriots is something of which the Indian people will always be proud.

Mahatma Gandhi was profoundly impressed with the Sermon on the Mount and in his own life he gave a shining example of humility and love, which showed that the ideals portrayed in the Beatitudes corresponded to the noble aspirations of his own heart. It has been rightly said that "Gandhi always preached the gospel of returning good for evil and had practised it. He had believed that the meek would inherit the earth, for he thought of India in terms of the poor and the oppressed and the downtrodden."

From time immemorial, the partaking of a meal together has been a symbol of friendship, concord and mutual respect among men. It is not surprising, therefore, that Christ, whom the late Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, described as "that relentless rebel against all untruth and injustice of every kind" should have established the practice of the Eucharistic Banquet through his last supper with his disciples, which was to be for them and their successors the symbol and source of unity and fundamental equality.

The delegates from all over the world, who assemble in Bombay on the occasion of the 38th International Eucharistic Congress, come together to partake of the same sacred Banquet, animated with a desire to pay homage to God and to intesify their spirit of love and goodwill towards each other and towards all men.

The theme chosen for the Congress is "The New Man" and its motto is "Order your lives in Love". In other words, the spiritual renewal of man is the aim of the Congress and this must be considered most timely today, when the world is being overwhelmed by the consequences of unprecedented developments in science and technology.

The late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, with his usual foresight, was keenly aware of this and, in the later years of his life, he expressed his concern, both in private interviews and in public utterances, about the hunger of the human

#### 319

mind for something deeper than Material progress. He reminded the rising generation again and again of the dangers that arose from indifference to the spiritual and ethical values of which developments in the modern world tended to deprive them and exhorted them to seek these values and realise them in their lives.

While it is fitting that spiritual renewal should be the object of study during the Congress, it is fundamentally important that the endeavour to promote this spiritual renewal should create a greater awareness of social responsibilities and of our obligations towards our fellowmen.

It is a matter of satisfaction to all of us in India, that the Congress has given practical application to its motto 'Order your lives in love' by promoting seminars concerning doctors and family life and the vast problem of supplying the essential needs of mankind. The family, as the basic unit of society, deserves this special consideration and problems concerning the moral training of children have been exercising the mind of the Government of India. As a consequence, a committee has been appointed to study this aspect of the national life and to suggest suitable measures.

The Food and Agricultural Seminar organised directly by this Congress itself is bringing together a notable group of economists and scholars, including Dr. B. R. Sen, Director-General of the Food and Agricultural Organisation, thus emphasizing the dedication of the Congress to the relief of hunger, misery and sickness throughout the world.

While we in India are acutely aware of the vastness of the problem, we feel that there is no occasion for defeatism. The magnitude of the problem is a challenge to modem society and we feel that it can be solved if it is taken up as a common effort of all the nations.

The world's resources, economists tell us, are adequate but all too often they are squandered or left undeveloped. The, consideration of the plight of millions throughout the world who stiffer from malnutrition and sometimes even starvation is reason enough to direct the energies and resources of mankind away from the feverish production of atomic weapons towards projects of universal benefit.

Jawaharlal Nehru expressed a wish about the atomic bomb many years ago: "We hear a lot about the atom bomb," he said, "and the various kinds of energy that it represents, and in essence, today, there is a conflict in the world between two things, the atom bomb and what it represents and the spirit of humanity. I hope that while India will no doubt play a great part in all material spheres, she will lay stress on the spirit of humanity and I have no doubt in my mind that, ultimately, in this conflict that is confronting the world, the human spirit will prevail over the atom bomb."

The resolution taken recently by our Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, reveals that this wish of the late Prime Minister has not been forgotten. We are happy to know also that in the Third Session of the Second Ecumenical Council. of the Vatican, many Bishops spoke vigorously against the bomb.

It is our ardent wish and prayer, therefore,

that the 38th International Eucharistic Congress may make a notable contribution to bringing about a deeper understanding among men and nations. Thus it will pave the way to the creation of a world social order which fulfils the ardent aspirations of the millions of men who long in their hearts for a society which is free from racial discrimination, exploitation and intolerance, and in which truth, justice and mutual respect prevail, for these are the sure foundations of peace, progress and prosperity.

This is an International Congress, and I am happy to wish the Delegates from overseas a pleasant stay in India, which, I trust, will enable them to see our problems and the efforts made to solve them. The Delegates from all parts of India represent the various cultures of India. They are united in a common faith and patriotic ideals and I trust they will make a valuable contribution to, the work of the Congress. May their meeting together with their fellow Catholics from all over the world strengthen the bonds of unity amongst all men and all nations.

### USA INDIA

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS

President's Speech at Raj Bhavan welcoming His Holiness the Pope

His Holiness Pope Paul VI paid a visit to Bombay from December 2 to 5, 1964 in connection with the 38th International Eucharistic Congress.

The President, Dr. S. Radbakrishnan, the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Hussain and the Prime Minister. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, were among those who met His Holiness in Bombay.

President Radhakrishnan made the following speech in Bombay on December 3, 1964, while

welcoming Hi, Holiness the Pope. who arrived

320

at Raj Bhavan to pay a courtesy call on the President :

Your Holiness and friends,

We are very happy to have you with us in this country. We know that it is the first visit that any Pope has paid to us and, therefore, it will be remembered for long. We are also keen students of Catholic theology. As a matter of fact, we know the way in which St. Thomas Aquinas reconciled Christian revelation with Aristotelian thought. In the same spirit your councils are now trying to reconcile Christian revelation with contemporary culture and we have been watching with great satisfaction the way in which your councils---Ecumenical Councilsmeeting in Rome are functioning today. I have no doubt that such meetings, encounters, which we have with each other coming here and trying to find out what non-Christian revelation stands for, will ultimately feel that at the top all people will work together and will work in a spirit of sincerity when they reach their fulfilment and beckon to each other as members of one common family of God. We are very happy to extend you a very very hearty welcome.

USA INDIA ITALY **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS

Reply by His Holiness the Pope

Replying to the President, His Holiness the Pope said :

#### Mr. President,

We come to Your Excellency to express our gratitude for the warm welcome extended to Us on Our arrival in India. We repeat Our profound thankfulness for this thoughtful and generous gesture, as well as for all the gracious favours which Your Excellency, and the Government of India, have so considerately granted, both on the occasion of the International Eucharistic Congress, and of Our Pilgrimage to this great religious and spiritual assembly.

With respect and homage, We express Our admiration of the Indian nation. We salute it in the person of Your Excellency, Head of State and President of India. Under such wise guidance, India is advancing towards greater prosperity, and ever more cordial relations with the other nations of the world. We pray that true peace, founded on justice and love, and so ardently desired and promoted by the Indian people, may reign between individuals, between families and communities, and between the peoples of the earth.

Permit Us, finally, to express the wish that the moral and civic virtues, which the world has admired in the great modem Indians such as Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, may be those which ensure the prosperity, the concord and the honour of the Indian people, which will always nobly characterize its human countenance, and which will make it exemplary and celebrated throughout the whole world.

We ask God to recompense the countless kindness shown to Us with His choicest favours and most abundant graces.

### USA INDIA **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

#### 1995

INTERNATIONAL EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS

The President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, made the following speech when be paid a return call on His Holiness the Pope at the Archbishop's House in Bombay on December 3, 1964:

We are all grateful to you more than we can say for your kind interest in our country, in our People and in world peace-the most important problem facing this generation.

It is my earnest hope that this desire for world peace will be strengthened not merely by political arrangements and economic alliances, but on the understanding of the peoples on the plane of culture and spirit, and your visit to our country and your kind expression,-all these will contribute to the building up of that bridge between nations which is essential for peace.

It is my earnest hope that all who are interested in that great work should carry on with the spirit of mutual understanding.

Your visit to our country has been profoundly appreciated by all people and I hope you will have a pleasant and interesting time during your few days here.

#### 321

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS

Address of His Holiness the Pope at Archbishop's House

The following is the text of the speech His Holiness the Pope delivered at Archbishop's House on December 3.1964 in reply to President Radhakrishnan:

Mr. President,

We thank you from our heart for your very kind words of greeting. As President and Head of State, you are the, personification of this great country, already so dear to Us and now dearer still by reason of Our meeting with its people and their rulers.

Our spiritual pilgrimage has had a most auspicious beginning and We rejoice in this opportunity, both to participate personally in the important international assembly being celebrated in Bombay, and to move among the beloved people of India and manifest to them Our deep affection and interest.

May Your Excellency ever enjoy divine assistance in the performance of your high duties, and every heavenly favour for yourself and your family. May India be blessed by God with His richest graces, with brotherly love and peace.

USA INDIA **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS

His Holiness the Pope's Farewell Message to the President

His Holiness the Pope radioed from aboard his aircraft the following farewell message to the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, on December 5, 1964 :

As we leave India on our happy return to

Rome, we cannot omit to reiterate to Your Excellency the profound and sincere gratitude we feel for the honour done to us by Your Excellency and by the Government of India, and for the innumerable kindnesses which made our visit a spiritual success.

We beg Almighty God to reserve for Your Excellency and the beloved Indian people a rich recompense of favours and graces, particularly of harmonious peace in justice. The efficient and comforting presence of the Air Force escort merits our highest appreciation and thankfulness.

INDIA ITALY USA

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS

President's Inaugural Address

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, delivered the following speech inaugurating the 22nd Session of the International Geological Congress in New Delhi on December 14, 1964:

Professor Wadia, Your Excellencies, distinguished delegates to the 22nd International Congress of Geologists and friends :

As Professor Wadia has indicated, I happen to be here on account of my official position and not because I have any knowledge of the subject of geology, either profound or superficial. It is a pleasure for me to extend a very hearty welcome to the delegates to the Congress, especially those who have come from abroad. Many of them perhaps are for the first time visiting this country and I was pleased to note that some of them had already gone on visits to our university centres, and I have no doubt that the workers in geology, whether in the Geological Survey of India or in our universities, would have greatly profited from their visits.

When the mediaeval universities were established in Europe, people used to run from one place to another, from Oxford to Paris, from Paris

#### 322

to Bologna. But nationalist tendencies had come up and separated these countries and each of them believes that it is something isolated from the rest. An illustration of international cooperation is visible in this Congress.

Our boys and girls, youngmen who were not in a position to proceed to other countries, to distant countries and learn from the experts on the subject have now an opportunity of finding out for themselves what work has been done and by whom? Your presence here will be a great inspiration to our workers in Geology.

In my own lifetime I have seen so many changes in the world of science : telephones, automobiles, radios, television, aeroplanes, etc. So much of scientific advance is taking place. In the 64 years of this century, work has been done which exceeds the volume of work done in previous many centuries. It shows how our age is essentially an age of science and technology and, in geology also, many changes must have taken place. Geological science has a certain human interest. Earthquakes, volcanoes, glaciers, wearing away of mountains, disappearance of rivers and change of direction-all of them are of great importance, though these events take long stretches of time to effect themselves. And it is also true that by the study of the rocks and fossils, what you call petrology and paleontology, some speculations and theories have also been advanced. We are saying that from the unicellular organism, through the primates we have come to man. When did life arise, when did consciousness come into being in this world? These are questions which are directly related to the investigations which geologists make.

We have a very early Upanishad which comes from the 8th century B.C., which talks about the cosmic evolution and it puts down five steps in that cosmic ladder. First of all, you have the inorganic, the physical so to say. Then you have the biological. Then the mental. Then the intellectual and then the spiritual. These are called anna, prana, or life, manas or mind with its instinctive and perceptual attributes and vigyana or the logical mind which frames concepts, which gives us ideas, which asks us to get a pattern of this cosmic panorama and tells us what we are to do.

That statement of the Upanishad tells us, we have now reached the level of the logical mind. the conceptual mind, which dwells in abstractions. which builds cathedrals, which builds temples. etc., but that is not the end of human evolution. This intellectual concept will have to grow into the spiritual. The intellectual concept gives us ideas of race, of religion, of nation which make us look upon people belonging to other races. other religions and other nations as then to themselves.

There are these concepts which are developed by the logical mind of man, what is called Vigyana. But it is said that this Vigyana has to grow into Ananda or freedom of the human spirit, when it rids itself of shibboleths, when it looks upon the whole world as kindred, as common fellowship. That is the idea to which we have to grow. It asserts that man, as a logical being, is not the final end of human evolution. He is incomplete, imperfect, he has to grow into something higher.

Well, that is coming to us from the scientific side also. The minerals we get, the oils we get, the fuel which we use, these have been the principles of industrial development. Today, we get uranium also and this uranium is a means by which nuclear weapons can be made. How these nuclear weapons are used? Whether it is for human betterment and progress or for the destruction of fellow human beings and destruction of all the great arts and achievements which have been built by the hard work and toiling effort of human beings. How it is to happen, depends on the spirit of man. This spirit of man has to grow, it has to evolve, it has to take a leap forward.

The human being as he is today belonging to a particular group, limited in its character, if he tries to develop chauvinistic, nationalistic concepts, then this uranium, which is dug out of the world's earth crust, may prove to be a disaster to humanity. But if it is to prove of benefit to humanity, it is essential for the human being to grow better. That is where the challenge thrown by the output of uranium on the one side and the Upanishadic concept which tells us that man, as an intellectual being, is not enough, he is not the final product of evolution. Both these things converge. If the challenge of our age is to be met, if this world is to grow into an earthly paradise where human beings can live in freedom, fellowship and friendship, if that is to happen, it is necessary for the human being himself to grow. So it is that we are called upon to use all the resources available to us for the purpose of perfecting ourselves.

You are great scientists, but this country from the beginning of history has emphasised another direction of human development. If you look into the Indus-Valley civilisation, you will find there the image of a Mahayogi, a man rapt in contemplation, trying to improve his own nature, trying to establish some kind of conquest over his own passions. You find again in the Buddha, who sits down under the Bodhi tree, trying to lacerate his body, torture his mind in quest of truth. He tells us man has to suffer if he is to grow in his nature. Every kind of quest is related to a conquest. You must be heroic. you must be able to establish your own things.

#### 323

When Jesus was by the side of the Jordan rapt in prayer and Meditation, he was again thinking of the improvement of human nature. So also Mohammad in the Mount at Macca trying to find out what the truth of things is. He is not outward bound, he is not looking to the earth but he is trying to find how human nature can be developed.

We have so many witnesses to this spirit, you may call it spiritual discipline, the spirit of holiness. This is the spirit which was exalted by this country for the last 50 centuries so far as our history goes. What happened in pre-history, Prof. Wadia and his colleagues will tell us. But I can only speak of the symbols which have come down to us from the Indus-Valley civilisation down till today.

Look at a man like Gandhi. He symbolises the soul of India, the spirit of India. People told him, they all came, up to him and said: "You are trying to win, freedom for your country but look at history. History tells us no country has ever won its freedom by the methods of truth and love as you suggest." His answer was : "Let us not follow the bad example of history. Let us set a good example by trying to achieve national freedom in this country by the methods of nonviolence, non-hatred, friendship, maitri karuna and adroha. These are the ideas which he put before us. So, from the time of the ancient Indus-Valley civilisation, down to Gandhi and Ramakrishna, you had one spirit, one kind of discipline which they exalted.

To make your thoughts conform to spiritual wisdom, to make your will in accordance with the realisation of the universal purpose of fellowship, to mould your emotions into some kind of harmony with the great cosmic purpose, to tell us that it is the will of the ages, it is the will of Providence, it is the meaning of history that we should move forward to an era of fellowship and friendship, to raise ourselves to a higher spiritual status. That has been the lesson which this country has adopted and has given to the world also.

Even today we do not exalt the military despots or the industrial magnates, but a man in loincloth like Gandhi or one like Vinobba Bhave, walking barefoot from place to place. These are the people whom this country exalts. They are the examples to tell us that man, in all his scientific glory, is nothing comparable to a man who has established supremacy-over his own nature.

It is the Buddha who said victory breeds hatred, the conquered live in sorrow. We should not aim at establishing any kind of material victory. Today, when we are trying to find out bow best we can harness these great nuclear powers, how we can use them for the development of human welfare and not for human destruction, it is the example which this country has put forward, with other countries.

There are embodiments of holiness and sanctity in every part of the world. Therefore it is nothing special, it is not a monopoly of this particular country. But we have now to come back to that. We have to realise that man is intended for selffulfilment, the is not intended for self-destruction. So the great uranium deposits, which we are able to get, from which we can make nuclear energy, these things will have to be utilised for the betterment of man, for making this world into a great whole, which it is intended to be.

God meant us to love one another and to create. He did not mean us to hate one another and destroy ourselves. That is the parting of the ways. That is the crisis in which we are. And it is essential for these great international scientists, who are assembled here, to remember something of this spiritual dimension which this country has exalted from the Indus Valley down to Mahatma Gandhi.

If you are able to do it, you will not only have enriched our geological wealth and knowledge, but you will have enriched the resources of humanity, the invisible forces of goodness which are there latent in every human being, you will be able to bring them out, make them manifest.

It is said that there is incarnation. That incarnation is not to be in a few individuals what a few individuals can do, the rest of humanity can also do. We must have the incarnation of the Supreme in the whole human race. That is what we should attempt to do.

Science has given us the facilities necessary. It has brought the world together. It has enabled us to understand the spiritual heritage of every nation and, if we can mobilise the spiritual resources of the whole world, if we are able to put them all into effect, it will be possible for us to make this world a better place than we have found it.

I am very glad to be here to make your acquaintance and inaugurate this 22nd International Congress of Geologists.

### 324

INDIA USA FRANCE JORDAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

#### 1995

#### **NETHERLANDS**

#### Agreement on Aerial Photo-Interpretation Institute

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on December 11, 1964 between the Governments of India and Netherlands for setting up an Aerial Photo-Interpretation Institute in India.

H.E. Jhr. G. Beelaerts van Blokland, the Netherlands Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary in India, signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of Netherlands and Shri M. G. Raja Ram. Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Education, signed on behalf of the Government of India.

According to the agreement the Netherlands Government agreed to give assistance to the extent of over Rs. 38 lakhs in the form of experts, fellowships, equipment etc. spread over a period of five years. The Government of India's counter-part expenditure would be about Rs. 98 lakhs.

After signing the agreement the Ambassador called on the Education Minister, Shri M. C. Chagla. The Minister pointed out that implementation of the agreement was more important and that it would further strengthen the bonds between the two countries.

The Institute will provide for specialised training to about 60 specialists and advanced training to about 15 senior specialists per year in the use of aerial photo-interpretation techniques in the disciplines of Geology, Forestry, Soil surely. Hydrology etc. and base map production.

Aerial Photo-interpretation techniques have been accepted as an efficient means of accurate evaluation of natural resources.

Those present on the occasion included

Mr. Noppers, First Secretary (Cultural Affairs), Miss M. L. Backelman, First Secretary, and Mr. B. Westerberg from the Netherlands Embassy and Shri B. K. Sanyal, Director, Ministry of External Affairs, Lt. Col. Dutta, Deputy Director and Col. Sen. Deputy Director Survey (Air), Survey of India, and Shri M. M. Malhotra, Deputy Secretary in the Ministry of Education, Government of India.

INDIA THE NETHERLANDS USA

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

## Volume No

1995

#### PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Sino-Indian Border Dispute

The following is the text of the statement made by the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, in Lok Sabha on December 24, 1964 on Sino-Indian Dispute :

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and Sarvashri Prakash Vir Shastri and S. M. Banerjee have expressed the view in their motion that there have been some contradictory statements regarding China's aggression and claims on our territory. I cannot help feeling that this is based on some misunderstanding and 1, therefore, take this opportunity of re-stating our position on this question in order to remove any such misunderstanding.

Some time after the Chinese had committed an aggression on our borders, the Colombo proposals were formulated by certain friendly countries. The Government of India accepted these proposals. but the Chinese Government did not do so. Later, the Ceylonese Prime Minister consulted us on the question of civilian checkposts in the demilitarised zone of Ladakh. In reply, the Government of India indicated their willingness to agree to there being no posts of either side in the said demilitarised zone. Since then, there have been no further developments. In this context. the question of any negotiations does not arise at present.

The Government of India believe in the pursuit of peace and in settlement by mutual discussions provided always that such discussions can be held consistently with the honour and dignity of the country.

325

CHINA INDIA SRI LANKA USA

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

India's Protest against Chinese Refusal to withdraw from the Demilitarized Zone

The following is the text of the statement made by the Spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, on December 31, 1964 :

The Government of India have seen reports of Mr. Chou En-lai's speech at the National People's Congress at Peking. The tone and content of the Chinese Prime Minister's references to India is a demonstration of China's aggressiveness and arrogance.. By refusing to accept the Colombo Proposals China had long ago slammed the door to all prospects of negotiations on the border question. What Mr. Chou En-lai has now done is to bolt and bar the door completely.

The Chinese Premier has asserted that the suggestion to hold talks between the two countries on the basis of no posts of either side in the demilitarized zone in Ladakh is an 'unreasonable Indian precondition' and that China would never withdraw its posts from this area. This is to put facts upside down and reflects an attitude of total intransigence and determination to hold on to the fruits of aggression. It is well-known that the suggestion about the withdrawal of posts was not made by India but by an impartial third party. India reacted to it positively beause of her desire to enter into negotiations with China. Mr. Chou En-lai has now finally killed this constructive suggestion and turned his back upon the Colombo Proposals. His speech seems to be Peking's coup de grace to the Colombo Proposals formulated by the six Non-aligned nations.

It should be clear to the whole world that what stands in the way of talks on the border problem are not Indian preconditions, so called, but China's truculence and arrogance. The Chinese Prime Minister has gone further and once again raised the spectre of China's fantastic claim to 90,000 sq. kilometres of Indian territory in the Eastern Sector, over and above the 14,500 sq. miles of territory in Ladakh illegally occupied by China. This shows that China's territorial appetite is not yet satisfied and that she has no desire for a peaceful solution. India will not be cowed down by these aggressive demands which she categorically rejects. The Government of India are, however, willing to talk with China, at any time when the Chinese give up their obstinate stand and agree to talks on the basis of the Colombo Proposals.

CHINA INDIA USA SRI LANKA TOTO

**Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

India's Reply to Chinese Allegations

The following is the text of India's reply to

Chinese allegations:

In a note dated December 28, the Chinese Government has protested to India against alleged violations of China's air space by Indian aircraft. it is significant that these allegations have been made public even before the protest note has reached the Government of India. Evidently, it is a propaganda charge rather than one based on facts, To say that Indian planes intruded into China's air space over extensive areas inside Tibet and Sinkiang and that one of these planes even flew over Szechuan Province is a fantastic fabrication. All Indian aircraft have strict instructions not to fly beyond the well recognised borders of India and these instructions have been scrupulously complied with by our aircraft, This applies also to the so-called Chinese line of actual control in the Western Sector. Even though India does not recognise this line, unilaterally imposed by China, Indian personnel and aircraft have never gone beyond at any time. Obviously, China has made these entirely false allegations for propaganda purposes and for maintaining tension along the Sino-Indian border.

CHINA INDIA USA **Date :** Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

#### UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's address to the Federation of British Industries

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri paid a visit to the United Kingdom form

December 3 to December 6 1964. On December 3. the Prime Minister was given a reception

326 by the Federation of British Industries at their premises in London. The Prime Minister was welcomed by Sir Peter Rung, who presided over the meeting.

Speaking on the occasion, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri said :

I am very glad to have this occasion to be here with you this evening. It is the first time that I am meeting you in your own country; but you are no strangers to me. I have met some of you earlier in my capacity as India's Minister of Commerce and Industry and I know others by reputation. All of you I know collectively as friends and well-wishers of India in her objectives of industrialisation and economic development.

The ties between India and Britain are many and have been in existence for a long time. But their nature has been changing. In fact, their strength lies in their capacity to change. Just as the political relationship between the two countries has undergone a major transformation and become as a result one of enduring friendship, in the economic sphere too, changes have been taking place--changes which are as welcome to us as they are, I hope to you.

In the past, Britain was a major exporter of textiles to India, while India exported cotton to Britain. Today, India is an importer of cotton and exporter of textiles. The textiles which we export to this country pay for our imports of plant and machinery of a more sophisticated kind than we used to import in the past. In the past, the jute mills and the tea gardens stood out as the kind of development into which British technology and finance went. Today, the Steel Plant at Durgapur, the Heavy Electrical Project at Bhopal, Oil Refineries and Heavy Engineering Works attract attention as symbols of Indo-British co-operation. The readiness with which the British people have responded and adapted themselves to changing conditions is, to my mind, a tribute not only to their wisdom, but also to the genuine friendship which has always existed between the peoples of India and Britain and which is now much more in evidence.

Many of you know India well. There is not much that I can tell you this evening which will not be known to most of you already. Ever since Independence, we have been engaged in a fight against poverty, disease, hunger and illiteracy. In 195 1, we embarked on our First Five-Year Plan and today we are approaching the end of the Third Plan. During the First Plan, our national income rose by 18% and during the Second Plan by another 20%. Despite the increase in population, per capita income in the first decade of planning went up by 18%.

We have made considerable progress in the spread of education in the country and illiteracy is being progressively reduced. The most popular course of study in the country today is technology of all kinds. And may 1, when speaking of it, thank the British people in general and the Federation of British Industries in particular for the fine Technical Institute that they have helped in establishing in Delhi? Many of the epidemic diseases like Malaria have been virtually eradicated. The average life span of an Indian has gone up from less than 30 years before Independence to over 40 years now. There are other signs of progress, of improvement in the lot of the common man. The sale of bicycles has gone up more than ten fold. In the past, sugar was not an article of daily diet for the vast majority of Indian people. Today, a much larger pro portion of our population can afford and demand this article of food, as well as adequate supplies of wheat and rice in preference to the coarser grains.

This rise in the standards of consumption, welcome as it is, creates new Problems. In the recent past, the food situation in India has been a matter of concern for us in India as well as our friends outside. The acute difficulties of the last few months however are now beginning to disappear. We are looking forward to good crops and even bumper crops in many parts of the country. And we are launching a special drive to increase the production of foodgrains as a long-term answer to our growing needs. This increase can come about through raising the productivity of every acre of land, through better irrigation, more fertilisers, improved seeds and techniques. On all these, we are bestowing special attention.

Although the progress which we have achieved since Independence is not inconsiderable, the fact remains that the average income of an Indian even today is only about & 25 per annum. Even this is distributed so unevenly that people in the rural areas have a much lower income on the average. Clearly. then we cannot rest content with the rate of our progress. We have, if anything, to redouble our efforts and in this task, the help and co-operation which we receive from other countries can make a truly crucial contribution.

Britain is one of the countries which has been helping us in our development. I am thinking now not merely of the aid which your Government has been generously giving us from year to year through the World Bank Consortium. I am thinking of many other things-things which we appreciate and value.

First and foremost. there is the duty-free treatment of our exports to Britain. This has helped us tremendously and if only all the industrialised countries in the world were to allow the exports of developing countries to come to them without

### 327

duties and without restrictions, perhaps much less of aid will be necessary.

Unfortunately, today this long tradition of duty-free entry has been interrupted by Britain's own financial difficulties. We know that Britain is facing a serious balance of payments problem. At the same time, I hope, and indeed expect, that the payments difficulties that the developing countries of the Commonwealth, and particularly India, are facing, would be appreciated. While you can, and I know you will, get out of your present difficulties in a matter of weeks or months, for us it is a problem of years before we can say that we have no balance of payments problem. Against this background, I cannot but express the hope that the present impositions on our exports to Britain will be withdrawn at the earliest possible moment.

I feel confident that Indo-British economic relationship which is so close and of such long standing, will develop further in the years to come. British capital, both public and private, has played a notable role in the, development of our economy. Our export earnings, though they have risen considerably in recent years, are still far from adequate and there is a serious gap in external resources which has to be filled. It is here that further investment of British capital in India will be of great and timely assistance. I would like to express the hope that such investment would be forthcoming. British investment in India, large as it was in the years before Independence, has continued to increase in the years that live followed. What has been even more satisfactory to us is that British investors. as a rule, have come forward with proposals which take due account of the changed circumstances and policies. They have diverted their attention increasingly to manufacturing industries with a high degree of technology in which we particularly need capital and know-how. They have also invested in partnership with the Government of India because in Indian conditions. the Government itself has to initiate new development in many fields.

Shortage of foreign exchange hampers new development and we are particularly short of sterling. All the sterling that we earn by exports or get as capital inflow from this country cannot pay for all that we wish to import from this country for traditional or technical reasons. The shortage of sterling sometimes affects the efficiency even of existing industrial units which need British supplies and replacements. This point was seen clearly by the Director General of the Federation of British Industries, Sir Norman Kipping and it was his intervention that led to a special arrangement to meet this particular need.

I do not wish to say more about the need for additional investment in India. You may, however, like to know what the policy of the present Government is in regard to foreign capital. You would be well aware that very shortly after Independence my distinguished predecessor. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. made a statement on the subject of private foreign capital in India and the policy which he them enunciated still holds good fully. In that statement be had observed :

Indian capital needs to be supplemented by foreign capital not only because our national savings will not be enough for the rapid development of the country on the scale we wish, but also because in many cases scientific, technical and industrial knowledge and capital equipment can best be secured along with foreign capital.

India is passing today through a phase which

every developing country must necessarily go through. We are faced with many problems but these are the problems of a growing country. Our efforts have been strengthened greatly by friendly assistance from abroad. Our ultimate objective is to stand on our own feet but for some more time to come we have to depend upon assistance from abroad. We have to keep up the tempo of our economic development and we have indeed to accelerate it.

Our population is growing and for some years to come, it is inevitable that the death rate will fall faster than the birth rate. Unless increase in our production, agricultural and industrial, is faster than the increase in our population, the average Indian will get poorer, rather than richer, from day to day. And it is, therefore. that in our present thoughts about the Fourth Plan, we feel that we must accelerate the rate of our growth. And in this great endeavour of bettering the standard of living of our people, we seek the cooperation of all countries-specially of those who know and understand India.

### USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA LATVIA RUSSIA **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

### 1995

### UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Press Conference at Marlborough House

The following is the text of the Press Conference held by the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, at Marlborough House, London, on December 4, 1964 :

328

Friends,

I am exceedingly glad to be here in London and to get an opportunity to meet so many people. I

hope you will give me the credit of bringing from my country the sunny days that you are having ! There were great misgivings in my mind about London being foggy and dark, but I find something else altogether. I might also tell you that this visit of mine is not for any specific purpose or asking for any kind of aid or help. Both the Governments are in a way new Governments. In India and here in England, both the Prime Ministers are new and we thought it would be good if we met amongst ourselves and exchanged views on various matters. I did get a good opportunity to meet the Prime Minister and also some of his important colleagues this morning. I had talked with Prime Minister yesterday and we propose to meet again this afternoon. We have covered a wide range of subjects and I do hope that our meetings and discussions would be helpful and useful.

Question : Could you please say what role Britain can play in the technical education of India ?

Prime Minister : Well, they have been helpful in this regard. The recent setting up of a technical educational institution in Delhi is a great venture; and it would be most useful for us. In other projects also, for example, in the Heavy Electrical Project at Bhopal, before the project was commenced, long before that, a training school for the technical personnel needed for that project was set up and about 3000 to 4000 boys are being trained every year in that technical school. So we have made it a policy that before any project is set up we should have a technical school connected with that project so that it can provide the necessary personnel to that factory or concern.

Question: I understand that you have met the Minister of Disarmament, Lord Chalfont. Have you discussed the subject of Chinese atom bomb, and would you be making any changes in your disarmament policy ?

Prime Minister : I have had some talks, but I hope you will not regret if I say that we do not propose to make any changes in our policy in that regard.

Question : Do you regard the atom bomb as a political weapon, Sir, or as a military weapon ?

Prime Minister : Well, it is a weapon to destroy mankind; having exploded one, atom bomb, China might consider it to be a political weapon. But the other nuclear powers, I know, know full well that it is a most deadly, destructive type of weapon.

Question : It is said that sonic of the difficulties in India in agriculture were caused by too ambitious a plan in the industrial sector. Can you comment on it ?

Prime Minister : Nothing is over-ambitious in India, looking to its great population of 450 million people; and we are today one of the undeveloped countries in the world. Our problems are much bigger as compared to any other developing country. So we have to lay equal emphasis more or less both on industry as well as on agriculture. Agriculture is of prime importance for us today and we do not concentrate on increased agricultural production. But side by side, we also contemplate that there will be industrial development, vast industrial development, which is absolutely essential for the general development of our country.

Question : Has any progress been made in the discussions on disarmament, and is Britain to help India in her diplomatic efforts in that direction ? And have you asked the British Government, to join in any agency of the United Nations ?

Prime Minister : We have discussed this matter, and India's stand has been that all the countries should concentrate on the elimination of nuclear weapons. The United Nations is the proper forum where this matter could be raised. India has formulated certain proposals on this matter, but how and in what form it would be placed will have to be decided a little later.

Question : Could you please say something on family planning, your Government's attitude and what are they doing about it?

Prime Minister : It is an important problem, but perhaps I am hardly the right person to whom this question should be put. It would be advisable to raise this matter with other Ministers concerned by the Government of India. Very recently the central cabinet has appointed a small subcommittee of cabinet ministers to go into this matter and decide as to how to expedite our schemes of family planning

Question : Do you think it is desirable for India to obtain a nuclear guarantee against nuclear attack from the existing nuclear Powers ?

Prime Minister : Well, it is not only for India that that guarantee is needed. It is needed by all the non-nuclear countries; and I think it would be important for the nuclear Powers to consider as to how they can guarantee the safety and security of the non-nuclear countries. It would be very wise on their part to give serious thought to this aspect of the problem.

Question : After this explosion of nuclear device. the Chinese suggested a world summit

#### 329

conference to be held to ban the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons. How did you react to this proposal?

Prime Minister : I do not know how far serious China was in putting up this proposal ? They have come up with this proposal after exploding an atom bomb, and this does not seem to be consistent. Secondly, China never agreed to sign the Moscow Test Ban Treaty and it was further proof of the fact that China could not be serious about it. They wanted perhaps to create some kind of psychological atmosphere in their favour.

Question : What is the position regarding the transfer by India to Pakistan of Beru Bari already endorsed by the High Court of India ?

Prime Minister : Yes, we have to do something in that regard. But there are difficulties in the way, and we have to overcome those difficulties. If some more time is taken. it should not cause much concern to you.

Question : Are you inviting Mr. Wilson to visit India ?

Prime Minister : Most certainly.

Question : I would like to ask you about the statement made by Indian Defence Minister (Mr.

Chavan), reported in the Indian Press recently, that one of the aims of Indian defence, is to see that India becomes the grave of Pakistan! Do you think that this reflects the Government of India's policy? And do you agree with the sentiments expressed ?

Prime Minister : I do not think he has ever made that kind of a statement.

Question : Could you please comment on the Commonwealth Immigrants Act ?

Prime Minister : We have to discuss it amongst ourselves and find a solution.

Question : Can you say something about India's relations with Pakistan. with particular reference to Kashmir ?

Prime Minister : Unfortunately, our friends outside only think in terms of Kashmir when the question of Pakistan and India's unity and amity are concerned. Kashmir. as you know, has acceded to India, and after that there have been three general elections; and there is a government of elected representatives of the people. They are ruling over Kashmir. So to suggest that India should part with Kashmir is. to say the least, a proposal, the implications of which are not fully realised. Secondly the secular aspect of this problem is very important to us. India believes in secularism and it does not make any distinction between one religion or the other. one community or the other. Luckily. the Jammu and Kashmir Government has a Muslim majority in that State. Once Kashmir is divided on the basis of Hindu minority and Muslim majority, it would hit at the very root of our policy of secularism. I think that there are various other factors On which India and Pakistan could meet and discuss. We have solved our Canal Water problem which seems to be insoluble sonic time back. But now we have similar other problems and what India has been wanting is to discuss those matters. Recently it was decided in my talks with President Ayub that the Home Ministers of Pakistan and India should meet and discuss some of the vital issues in the relationship between India and Pakistan, and it was stated that that meeting will be held soon. However, that meeting has been postponed and now we will wait for Pakistan's suggestion or advice as to when that meeting would be held.

Question : Have you, Mr. Prime Minister, had an communication recently from the Russian leader's, and have you any comments on it ?

Prime Minister : Yes, I have had some exchange of messages and I received a letter also from the Prime Minister of Soviet Russia, Mr. Kosygin. The messages were friendly and the letter was equally friendly. He has clearly and categorically told us that the Soviet Union and India will keep up their old relationships, and their friendship will continue in future.

Question : Mr. Prime Minister, how can a non-nuclear, non-aligned country-I emphasise non-aligned--defend itself against any attack by a nuclear country ?

Prime Minister : We will devise our own ways and means to help defend us. When I talk of the elimination of nuclear bombs. I need not be afraid of any nuclear attack. This world is big enough, vast enough to tackle this problem of the nuclear threat. Most of the world is without nuclear devices and nuclear weapons-most of the countries of the world; and, therefore. we should not think purely in selfish terms. We will have to take a wider view of things, and I do hope that if all the non-nuclear countries combine, they can create the necessary trend in the world for the non-use of nuclear weapons.

Question : Are you still of the opinion that China should join the UN: and have you been discussing this with Mr. Wilson as to bow this could be achieved?

Prime Minister : There is not much to discuss with the Prime Minister about the admission of China to UN. It will depend on so many factors, and on the attitude of the members of the United Nations. But India has been in favour of admission of China to the UN and we stand by that even now.

#### 330

Question : What is the strategic position of the Indian ocean ?

Prime Minister : I have nothing much to say on that.

Question : You just said that planning has not been over-ambitious in India. Have you-any plan in persuading Indian planners to relate their policies between economic and social spheres-? (Question not clear)

Prime Minister : I do not- think you are completely fair in suggesting that our plans had been a failure. The first and second plans were highly successful. Some obstacles and obstruction came in the midst of our third five-year plan, but we are trying to overcome them. The failure is perhaps not due to taking an unrealistic view of things in our country. May be, in such big plans there may be pitfalls sometimes. Yet, as I said, we cannot afford to get unnerved on account of such failings. I am very particular that we should do more and talk less. It has been the philosophy of my life. I have been a humble worker all my life and therefore, I have taken special care that our plans are not unrealistic and we are able to achieve. the target we fix in our fourth five-year plan. In fact, the proposals made by different study groups were much higher, much bigger was the plan they had suggested but we have brought it down to a considerable extent.

Question : Can you please say something on the relations between India and Israel ?

Prime Minister : Well, we have some relations with Israel. but it seems the status quo will continue.

Question : Could you please comment on His Holiness the Pope's visit to India ?

Prime Minister : We greatly welcome the visit of His Holiness the Pope. The people gave him "I tremendous reception. More than a million people thronged the routes and streets of Bombay when he. arrived there. I was also fortunate enough to meet him at the airport and call on him at his residence. His visit has been greatly appreciated by all because. it was his first visit outside his country.

Question : You have been described in today's papers as a person having 450 million problems. Why don't you reduce some of your 450 million problems by coming to some sort of arrangement with the Western powers that if you are really attacked from the North, they will come to your rescue as they did last time; and the resources and energies you save could be diverted to productive channel? In other words, whether you will accept any offer of western powers to come to your aid. and if so, the wasteful energy in arming India cannot be utilised ? (Indistinct)

Prime Minister : Every country has got its own prestige and dignity and honour. A country like India cannot afford to keep its defences weak. It is true that we do not want to race with China in the matter of military preparations, but yet we are trying to strengthen our defence forces and will continue to do so. It is not purely food and clothing and shelter which are needed by our citizens, by our people. As I said, the honour of the citizen, of the nation, is in no way less important than that.

Question : could you outline your views as to how a United Nations Peace-keeping Force or Standby Force can be achieved ? Is there any support forthcoming in this regard, including from your own Government ?

Prime Minister : Yes, we do support the idea of a Peacekeeping Force, and India has come forward to help with her forces in some of the countries where the UN wanted to send peacekeeping forces. But a practical formula should be found out on the basis of which we could get the support of other countries and specially of the Soviet Union. I do hope that it would be possible to find a solution for this difficult problem.

Question : Do you think that India with foreign financial help will be able to meet her economic targets, especially increase her exports ? (Indistinct)

Prime Minister : Well, we need foreign loans and also want foreign collaborations. There are certain objectives before us and all the help and collaborations have to function in that background, keeping those objectives in view. About exports, UK has been very helpful in regard to our exports. Recently they have imposed some surcharge, but formerly there were no such impositions; so they helped in increasing our exports to U.K. If other countries could also think on those lines. it would definitely help a developing country like India to increase its exports further.

Question : Have you tried to mediate on the question of the Russian payments to the UN,, which is worrying UN ?

Prime Minister : This matter has already been attended to. India has not intervened, but I am told that both the representatives of Soviet Union and United States are discussing this matter among themselves.

Question : Has any reply been received from Mr. Wilson to your invitation to him to visit India ?

Prime Minister : I might know it before I leave

331

USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA CHINA RUSSIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ISRAEL **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

#### UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Statement on the Conclusion of his Visit to the United Kingdom.

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri issued the following statement on December 5, 1964 at the conclusion of his visit to the United Kingdom.

I could not come to the U.K. earlier at the time of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference. Since then the U.K. Government have been inviting me to visit London as soon as possible, and this invitation was repeated by thee present government a few days after they took office. I accepted the invitation gladly, so as to have an opportunity of meeting the U.K. Prime Minister and the members of his Government, and have an opportunity to exchange views of mutual interest.

I have been here for three days and will be leaving tomorrow. I believe the visit has been interesting and helpful. I had three meetings with the Prime Minister of the U. K. and several meetings with his various colleagues. Our talks were friendly and informal; throughout I found an abundance of goodwill and sympathy for India and the Indian people. The old imperial ties which have broken in 1947 by the historic decision taken by Lord Attlee, as Prime Minister, have been replaced by real understanding and cooperative relations.

In the sphere of Indo-British relations we, naturally, talked about India's development plans and programmes. We also talked about the problem created by the Chinese attack in 1962 and about the recent Chinese explosion. I had, however, not come here to make any specific plea for aid or assistance. The Government of the United Kingdom has been assistance us in various ways in connection with our development plan, and the Defence Minister had recently visited in connection with our requirements of our defence needs.

I took the opportunity of this visit to have an exchange of views on the complex international situation, the urgency of the problem of peace and disarmament and the danger to humanity, We also talked about difficult situations in various parts of Africa and South East Asia. Both the British Prime Minister and his colleagues agreed with me that in this difficult world situations it is of utmost importance to have frequent opportunities, at various levels, of exchanging views in an informal manner, so as to understand each others point of view, even if we cannot agree on certain specific matters. The important thing was to work in the larger interest of world peace and disarmament in our various ways and for promoting economic and social progress, particularly in the developing countries.

I understood from my discussions that the United Kingdom consistently with their basic philosophy, intend to pursue actively the policy of granting independence to colonial territories in an orderly and practical manner. I was glad that in spite of my brief stay, the United Kingdom authorities made arrangements for me to see some of the historic sights of London. Wherever I went I was received warmly, and the memory of this friendly welcome will always remain with me.

I am grateful to the U.K. Government for their generous hospitality and to the friendship shown to me throughout my stay. I have extended an invitation to the Prime Minister and Mrs. Wilson to visit India, and they have been good enough to accept the invitation. Naturally no dates have been fixed but I hope they will be able to visit us soon.

### USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA **Date** : Dec 01, 1964

# Volume No

1995

### UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on his visit to U.K.

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following statement in Parliament on December 9, 1964 on his visit to the United Kingdom:

In response to an invitation from the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, I visited London from 3rd to 6th December, 1964. The period of my stay in the U.K. had necessarily to be brief but the visit was indeed useful.

Before my meetings with the U.K. Premier and other Ministers, I was happy to have had an opportunity of meeting Her Majesty the Queen.

A wide range of subjects came up for discussion during my meetings with Mr. Harold Wilson and several of his Cabinet Colleagues. We exchanged views fully and frankly in a friendly and informal atmosphere.

There was no formal agenda for discussions. However, some of the topics on which there was an exchange of views were as follows:

332

- (i) The complex international situation as seen from Delhi and London, particularly the difficult situations in South East Asia, South Asia and Africa.
- (ii) Problems of peace, disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, United Nations, the proposal regarding the multi-lateral force, freedom for the remaining colonies and programmes of assistance to developing countries.
- (iii)Balance of payment problem of the U.K.
- (iv) India's programmes of development and India's defence needs.

As the House knows, I had not gone to the United Kingdom with any specific requests or proposals. These exchanges of views were, however, useful. The U.K. Prime Minister and his colleagues stressed the importance of having frequent opportunities at various levels to exchange views in an informal manner so as to understand each other's points of view even if we cannot agree on certain specific matters. They felt that in the complex and difficult world situation personal discussions of this nature would help the larger interest of world peace and disarmament and assist the promotion of economic and social progress, particularly in the developing countries.

One of the matters which is of special importance to India and which has attracted much attention in the U.K. also is that of the recent explosion of a nuclear device by the Chinese and its impact on the nuclear policy of the Government of India. Our views on this question are well known. India is determined to pursue the path of peace and to work for the elimination of the nuclear menace which faces mankind today. The non-nuclear countries in particular have to give serious thought to this matter and the Government of India are already in touch with several other governments on this subject. Equally it is the responsibility of the great nuclear powers, particularly the USA and USSR, to think of concrete steps for the elimination of the threat that overhangs mankind. We must not forget that the nuclear danger is a menace for the entire people of the world. Our views were stated categorically and they were welcomed.

I was much impressed and touched by the warmth of friendship amongst the Government and other leaders of public opinion in U.K. for India.

I have extended an invitation to the U.K. Prime Minister and Mrs. Wilson to visit India and they have been good enough to accept this invitation. We look forward to this visit.

333

UNITED KINGDOM USA INDIA **Date** : Dec 01, 1964