1965

January

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vol. XI JANUARY No. 1

CONTENTS

PAGE

ANGLO-AMERICAN CONSORTIUM Agreement on Fifth Steel Plant Signed 1

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS President's Republic Day Message 1

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Statements in the General Assembly in reply to Pakistan's allegations against India 3 MAURITIUS

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Dr. Ramgoolam 9 Reply by Dr. Ramgoolam 9 PAKISTAN Indo-Pakistan Rice Agreement Signed 10

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Press Conference 11 POLAND Indo-Polish Credit Agreement Signed 13 **SWEDEN** Swedish Grants to India 13 UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Indo-Soviet Agreement on Bokaro Steel Plant 13 Contracts for Expansion of Barauni Refinery Signed 15 UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC Shri M. C. Chagla's Address to Indo-UAR Scientific Cooperation Board 15

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA PAKISTAN MAURITIUS USA CHINA POLAND SWEDEN

Date : Jan 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

ANGLO-AMERICAN CONSORTIUM

Agreement on Fifth Steel Plant Signed

The Government of India signed in New Delhi on January 27, 1965 an agreement with an Anglo-American Consortium for a study of the fifth steel works in the public sector. It is expected that this steel works will have an initial capacity of about 1.5 million tonnes of steel, depending upon the products it will make, and will be capable of expansion to about. 4 million tonnes.

The Anglo-American Consortium consists of

Koppers International, Blaw-Knox International Company, International General Electric Co., and International Investment Co. of the U.S.A.. and Davy and United Engineering Company, Wellman Smith Owen Engineering Corporation, and Woodall-Duckham Construction Company of the United Kingdom

In October, 1964, the Consortium made a three-stage proposal to Government. In the first stage the Consortium were to recommend the site and give proposals for Indian engineering participation. In the second stage, the Consortium was to furnish to the Government a detailed prospectus and financing plan for the foreign exchange cost of the plant. The third stage was to be the construction of the plant. The present Agreement deals with stage I only.

It will be recalled that the Government have in hand, feasibility studies for steel works in the Visakhapatnam-Bailadila and the Goa-Hospet areas and a detailed project report for a 1/2 million tonne plant at Salem. The Agreement concluded with the Consortium, dealing with the first stage of their proposal, itself falls into two stages. Within four months of the signing of the Agreement, the Consortium are to review the site studies already available and recommend at least two sites to the Government. The final decision on the site will then be made by the Government. The Consortium are also to submit a detailed proposal within the same time for Indian participation in the design, engineering and construction of the plant. Subject to a decision on the site and the adequacy of the Indian participation proposals, the Consortium are to prepare, within nine months thereafter, a detailed project report for the selected site.

The fee payable to the Consortium for all services to be rendered by them in Stage 1 is Rs. 4.6 million approximately.

The Consortium hope to submit a financing plan for the project within six months of the submission of the detailed project report. It is expected that a major portion of the foreign cost will be found by the Consortium from private financing institutions abroad and not Governmental sources.

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Republic Day Message

1

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan broadcast on January 25, 1965 the following message to the nation and to the Indian nationals abroad on the eve of the Republic Day (January 26):

Friends.

Tomorrow is the fifteenth anniversary of our Republic and I should like to take this opportunity of greeting our nationals at home and overseas and saving a few words to them.

The fast year has been a testing time for us all. The great leader, who had guided the destinies of our country since its rebirth as a free nation, is no longer with us. We who are left behind can have no greater inspiration than Nehru's life of dedicated service in our task of attaining the ideal an fulfilling the vision he bequeathed to us of a united, democratic, progressive and prosperous India.

Amidst the suffocating gloom of Nehru's departure from us, the nation displayed, as it has done before in moments of grave crisis, a remarkable sense of unity and responsibility; and the transition to a new leadership was effected with commendable dignity and orderliness. The new Government 'which enjoys wide popular support has been functioning with courage and caution. It is unfortunate that we have still with us diverse divisive forces based on region and language, religion and caste. It is essential to maintain and foster the sense of unity by subordinating these dividing factors to the central principle of national integrity and welfare. Nothing would help us more to do so than giving reality and meaning to our ideal of equality of status to every indidual. Democracy is more than adult suffrage; it is the institutional manifestation of a refined way of life which exalts the individual and invests him with dignity.

Our parliamentary democracy assures political equality to all. But the inequalities of caste and outcaste, the rich and the poor, are not only alien to the spirit of democracy, but are also a grave threat to its very existence. Social inequalities betray, corrupt, and deform the image of man. Social justice, however, cannot be promoted by acts of Government alone, necessary as these are; it calls for an innate belief in the ideal that even, human being has spiritual possibilities, that there are elements of sanctity and holiness in him which need expression and development. The general deterioration of our standards of behaviour may be traced to the neglect of the spiritual dimension of man. Through the discipline of home, school and democratic institutions, we must be trained to develop qualities of freedom from fear, from hate, from greed, from love of power and from selfishness.

If our democracy is to be stable it is necessary to raise the living standards of our people and ensure an equitable distribution of incomes and opportunities. Planned economic development has been our chosen instrument for freeing our people from want, Impressive as our achievements in this direction have been, they have not been commensurate with the expanding needs of a growing population. National income has been increasing but slowly and agricultural output in the first three years of the current Plan has hardly risen. It is true that bad weather has been a major factor behind this stagnation in farm production but have we done all that was necessary and possible to stimulate the agricultural sector into dynamic growth ? Has our rural administrative organisation been effective enough to transmit to the peasants the possibilities and potentialities of scientific farming ? Have we created the right economic environment through rational price policies and land reforms for the farmer to give of his best? It is necessary that we ask ourselves these questions : for a recognition of the factors behind our inadequate performance is the

first step towards their removal. This year's harvest promises to be a good one-the best one on record-I am informed; but the impact of it is' yet to be felt on prices. A psychology of scarcity persists. The behaviour of prices during recent years has indeed been a matter for serious concern; prices of food articles have risen the most and this has naturally affected the more vulnerable sections of our people. The character of the increase in prices has in it the makings of an inflationary situation. It is well to realise that the social tolerance of inflation among any people, and especially among a people the bulk of whom are poor, is bound to be very limited; their patience is not inexhaustible. The penalty we have to pay for inflation is not merely the sacrifice of future development; it is the threat to current economic, social and even political stability. It behoves us all-Government and the peopleto do everything in our power to check the upward spiral of prices. The sure and lasting remedy to inflation is, of course: increased production: but we should seek at the same time to eliminate the weaknesses in the existing system of distribution which has worsened the situation caused by a basic maladjustment- between growing demand and insufficient supply. While Government, on its part, will have to put down sternly anti-social behaviour such as hoarding and blackmarketing and act with great courage, the cooperation of the people is equally essential in seeing us through the present difficult situation. The various States should pull together so that the problem of equitable distribution of food is dealt with on a national basis.

The problems of food and rising prices are, of course, of prime urgency today and I am glad that the Governments at the Centre and the States are actively dealing with them. But the goals of economic development are certainly wider. The battle against poverty and ignorance, disease and discrimination will be a long and arduous onethe more so since we have chosen to fight it within the framework of democratic institutions. It calls for the utmost mobilisation of our human and

2

material resources. It is all the more tragic that when we should have strained every nerve and harnessed all our energies to the task of bettering the conditions of our people, we have been called upon, as a result of events not of our making, to divert resources to the national defence. This we are doing to the extent called for while desiring at the same time a peaceful and honourable settlement of all outstanding issues with our two neighbours-Pakistan and China. We should rule out reprisal, revenge and hatred and work for honourable settlement of our conflicts on principles of tolerance. friendship and understanding. If we attempt to fight fire with fire, we will all be burnt up. We have been till now expressing the voice of mankind, the conscience of humanity and attempting to bring about an era of relaxing tensions. We should do nothing which will go against this basic commitment of ours.

If there is any lesson which the diverse and complex problems facing the nation at home and abroad have for us it is the need for calm and dispassionate thinking as well as decisive and courageous action. The heart of the people of this country is sound; and they expect their chosen leaders to lead them wisely and well. If we evade issues, compromise with basic principles and allow saboteurs to undermine the economy of the country, our minds will get confused and distracted and our people will become frustrated. This we should prevent at any cost. The challenge to statesmanship now is to provide cohesive thinking, a firm Government and an efficient and clean administration.

The consolidation of political democracy, the building of social equality, the promotion of economic growth and the maintenance of the integrity of the country call for co-operative endeavour of all sections of our people. Disciplined behaviour and hard and honest work are expected from the Government, from the administration, from the political parties, from the farmers, from the students and from every section of our community. As we enter another year in our Republic's life, let us resolve to apply ourselves to these tasks with self-discipline and determination, courage and character.

I wish you all well.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA PAKISTAN **Date :** Jan 01, 1965

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Statements in the General Assembly in reply to Pakistan's Allegations against India

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative in the United Nations, made two statements in the General Assembly on January 26 and 27, 1965 in reply to the Pakistan Foreign Minister's statements in the general debate making allegations against India:

The following is the text of Shri Chakravarty's statement on January 26:

It is a matter of deep regret to my delegation that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan should have used this forum once again for making wild and patently absurd allegations against India. The attack is all the more wanton since my Foreign Minister did not say a word against Pakistan when he made his statement in the general debate on the 14th December. Not that India has no complaints against the policies pursued by the Government of Pakistan, but we avoided any reference to them as a gesture of goodwill which, however. has not met with a proper response. The Foreign Minister's performance is an annual ritual with which the Assembly has by now become familiar. Similar allegations were made in the XVII and XVIII sessions of this Assembly and during the debate in the Security Council in 1964. They were fully replied to by my delegation at the time. The distinguished Foreign Minister apparently, believes that distortions and misrepresentation of facts, if repeated often enough, may leave some impression on the audience, while the refutations may be forgotten.

While listening to the Foreign Minister I wondered for a moment if he had forgotten that be was addressing the General Assembly and not a mass rally in Karachi or Rawalpindi. In this forum too he has revealed his bitter hostility towards India which has become an obsession with him and which makes any kind of rational dealing with Pakistan impossible. Pakistant's foreign policy revolves only round India and it is no wonder that half the statement of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan contains nothing but fulminations against India.

3

We do not wish in any way to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan. Because of Pakistan's attack on our internal affairs, I may, however, be forgiven if I have to depart from this policy in replying to the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has made a crude and mischievous attempt to drive a wedge between India and its neighbours as well as other Afro-Asian countries. he has drawn an imaginary picture of Indian imperialism. He says a dangerous situation is being created in South and South-East Asia by India's attempt to set herself up as a successor to colonial regime. He blames India for having started an arms race in the Indian sub-continent. He charges India for having added tension to the tension. May I ask the distinguished Foreign Minister, who introduced tension in this area and who aspired and was groomed to succeed to the British power in the East? This is what Hansen Baldwin wrote in the New York Times of 22nd December 1953:

The problem which the Pakistan arms aid programme is intended to relieve stems chiefly from the decline in power of the British empire.... British power, exercised largely by the British-led Indian army, once dominated the entire strategic are from the Suez and the Persian Gulf eastward to Burma and Malaya But the post-war rise of nationalism in the Middle-East plus the increasing threat of Communism and Mr. Nehru's antiwesternism altered the entire strategic picture".

Pakistan, Mr. President, was the direct beneficiary of the so-called westernism of the late Mr. Nehru. It was Pakistan which was chosen to succeed to the British power in the East.

In February 1954, the United States announced its decision to grant arms aid to one State in our region. Was it India ? No, no. It was Pakistan. A little later, regional military alliances were established in South-East Asia and West Asia and one State in the sub-continent became a member of the SEATO and CENTO. Was it India? No, it was again Pakistan. It still is a member of those regional alliances, and still participates every year in the naval and military manoeuvres of the CENTO and SEATO. From which country did U-2 planes take off? Was it from India' No, it was from Pakistan. Who has brought about tension and arms race in the region, is it India? No, it is Pakistan. It is indeed ironical that having derived immense benefits in military terms from these pacts and alliances, having been a party to western military presence in this region, the distinguished Foreign Minister should now turn round and accuse India of causing tension and forcing an arms race. He complains of Indian military missions going to the "capitals of obliging great powers seeking supersonic planes. Submarines and tanks in order to strengthen India's fighting capacity", now Mr. President, Pakistan long ago obtained all these equipments, supersonic planes at least one submarines And tanks from United States, and has been. keeping them up-to-date. Why did Pakistan acquire them for use against whom ? And why is it that she should object if India were even to ask for them for defence against China?

Pakistan has been complaining of massive military aid received by India. Let us took at the facts. The total value of the assistance received by India up-to now from the USA, half in credit and half in aid, is 165 million dollars. Pakistan seems to have forgotten the military aid it had received from the United States over the last ten years. The credits and gift given to India are open and known to everybody. The military aid given to Pakistan-not on credit but as outright gift-has been kept a secret-we are told at Pakistan's request. If American newspapers are, however to be believed, this military aid, as distinct from economic aid, is said to be of the order of three thousand million dollars, of which the actual military hardware is said to be worth 1300 million dollars. Pakistan hoped that with its SEATO and CENTO credentials, it would be immune from the charge of being the voice of Peking and by raising the bogey of an Indian threat, would succeed in putting a veto on the supply to India of sophisticated weaponry from USA. By so doing, Pakistan has indeed served the best interests of its friend and ally, the People's Republic of China.

The Foreign Minister soars into the realm of fantasy and with vivid imagination, says: "India has embarked on a programme to extend her hegemony across the length and breadth of the Indian Ocean from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong". He has drawn, a picture of the smaller neighbours of India, living in constant terror. I am amazed at his moderation. Why only from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong? Why not from the Atlantic to the Pacific or from China to Peru? Be that as it may. there are at least seven countries in this region besides Pakistan who are represented in the United Nations : Afghanistan. Nepal. Ceylon, Burma, Laos, Thailand and Cambodia. We are not aware that any of these countries has authorised the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan to speak on its behalf. Not being content with being the spokesman of Pakistan, not being content with being the self-appointed guardian of 50 million Indian muslims, he has now arrogated to himself the right to speak on behalf of all these countries. Perhaps, the Foreign Minister presumes to think that the accredited representatives of these countries are not competent enough to speak for themselves. There should be some limit to arrogance. We have the most cordial and friendly relations with each one of these countries and none of them has ever told us that they have any reason to fear India.

ŀ

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, with an air of injured innocence, has sought to create the myth of the little Pakistani lamb living under the constant threat of the big bad Indian wolf. Now, let us see what the facts are. If Pakistan is really afraid of India, why has it consistently refused India's offer of a 'No-war' pact ? Pakistan's security is guaranteed through military pacts such as the SEATO and the CENTO in which the UK, the USA as also France, not to mention the other members of the SEATO and the CENTO, are committed to come to the assistance of Pakistan in the event of an attack from some country. It has got a separate military aid agreement with the United States. Not content with the assurances from merely the Western great powers, Pakistan asked for and has now obtained the protection of another newly-found ally-the People's Republic of China. On the 17th of July 1963, initiating a foreign policy debate in the Pakistan National Assembly, Mr. Bhutto said that "In the event of war with India, Pakistan would not be alone ...

Pakistan would be helped by the most powerful nation in Asia". This was confirmed by the Chinese Vice-Minister of Foreign Trade, Mr. Nan Han Chen, during his visit to Pakistan in December 1963. He told his Pakistani audience, "If ever there was a war between India and Pakistan, China will surely support Pakistan and not India."

Many countries are non-aligned as between the USA and the People's Republic of China. Pakistan is the only country that has succeeded in performing the seemingly impossible feat of aligning itself militarily with one and getting assurances of military support from the other. After this unique achievement, after receiving all these assurances, can Pakistan expect anyone to believe that it is still afraid of India-a country which is now threatened by 'the People's Republic of China which has the largest conventional army in the world, estimated to be 3 million strong? On the contrary, it is because she knows very well that an attack from India is impossible that Pakitan can afford to, spurn the offer of a 'no war' pact. Mr. Bhutto. in his statement has sought to create an impression that his country fears India. This is however what his own President. Field Marshal Ayub Khan said at Rawalpindi on 8th December, 1964 which was published in the Dawn of Karachi dated the 9th December, 1964 :

"If there is ever a war between Pakistan and India, India will learn the lession of its life. Pakistan has a wonderful army".

President Ayub again said at Multan on December 13, 1964 published in the Dawn of December 14, 1964 :

"Should India embark in military ventures, it would be suicidal for her. She will have to pay through her nose. Our army today is amongst the best in the world their know-how and ability to fight has been increased manifold."

Both these statements were made only a few weeks back, after we have, in the words of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, created "A vast and fearsome panoply of war".

Now, fellow delegates, whom are we to believe! Both are honourable men. I hope the Foreign Minister will forgive me if I were to show greater respect for his President's view than he is prepared to do.

India's defence expenditure until 1962 had been the lowest in the world--2 per cent of the gross national product, as against 3.5 per cent in Pakistan, excluding the massive military aid received by it from the United States. It was only in the aftermath of the Chinese aggression and in view of the continued threat that India had to raise its defence expenditure. India has always considered this expenditure as an unfortunate but inevitable charge on its limited resources, but it can no longer neglect the elementary duty of every government to defend the integrity of its territory. Even with this increase in its defence expenditure, proportionately, India spends much less than Pakistan. The gross national product figures for Pakistan for the years 1963 and 1964 are not available to me. I therefore looked into the budgets and I find that Pakistan spent 46.15 per cent of its total revenues, on defence in 1963-64 and 43.59 per cent in 1964-65. The comparable figures for India are 36.18 per cent in 1963-64 and 33.5 per cent in 1964-65. Further comments are superfluous.

The Foreign Minister has distorted the simple proposal made by my Prime Minister in London. He says that the Prime Minister had asked for a nuclear guarantee, a nuclear umbrella or a nuclear shield. He did nothing of the sort. He had discussed the problem as to how best the nuclear threat to non-nuclear countries could be obviated., It is a fact that with every addition to the nuclear club, the problem of general and complete disarmament becomes more complex. It seemed that a joint declaration by all the major nuclear powers might act as a disincentive to non-nuclear countries which may otherwise contemplate the production of nuclear weapons them-elves. It was that such a joint declaration would make it clear that no nuclear State could, with impunity, use its nuclear capacity against a non-nuclear State. There was no suggestion by my Prime Minister that nuclear and nonnucler powers should enter into any treaties of guarantee or that the non-nuclear powers should be placed under a nuclear shield. The danger seen by the distinguished Foreign Minister that India is attempting to, and I quote "Extend nuclear hegemony into the non-nuclear area (Asia) and thereby further complicating the

already complex problem of disarmament",

5

exists only in his warfed imagination. So far India has neither asked for nor received any nuclear guarantee from any one. May I remind him that it is not India but Pakistan which as a member of the SEATO and CENTO military pacts, has attracted a nuclear guarantee or umbrella and has extended nuclear hegemony into this area. If that is not so, and the Foreign Minister says that he does not live under the nuclear umbrella, let him come up here and say so. He has chosen completely to ignore the dangerous implications of the only new nuclear element introduced during the last year in Asia, namely, the Chinese atomic explosion-an explosion which is contrary to repeated resolutions of the UN and is in flagrant disregard of the world public opinion. On the contrary, he seems to rejoice over the fact that a few hundred miles from his and our northern borders, the Chinese are conducting nuclear tests, polluting the atmosphere and making it impossible to make Asia a nuclear free zone. The distinguished Foreign Minister's only object seems to be to divert attention from the Chinese explosion, whitewash Peking's nuclear policy and shift the blame to India.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan does not think that the fear of Chinese aggression and expansionism is illusory. He is, to quote his own phraseology, entitled to his illusion that the People's Republic of China with a conventional army of three million men and now with nuclear capacity, "Radiates a spirit of peaceful benevolence". He Will forgive us if we cannot agree with him, after our own experience with China which is the only country in the world today which believes in the inevitability of war. He has insinuated that it was India which was at fault. This is quite in line with what his Government has been saying ever since the Chinese invasion. I can do no better than quote, once again, what appeared in the Washington Post of 30th December 1963 :

"The aggressive Indians opened fire on China last year the voice of Peking ? Not at all, these are the words of the Speaker of Pakistan's Parliament, Mohammad Afzal Cheema no doubt using this Allice in Wonderland logic, the Chinese troops that occupied vast stretches of land claimed by India, were only pacific tourists seeking rare specimens of botany". The Foreign Minister now joins his illustrious compatriot.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has again referred to Kashmir, self-determination and alleged ill-treatment of Indian Muslims. We have already exposed the distortions and misrepresentations of the Foreign Minister in our interventions in the General Assembly in the XVII and XVIII sessions as also in the Security Council in 1964. I do not want to tire the patience of this august Assembly by repeating them once again. They can be seen in the documents A/PV 1141, dated 3rd October 1962, A/PV 1153, dated 15th October 1962, A/PV 122 1, dated 30th September 1963 and A/PV 1239, dated 11th October 1963 on the General Assembly and S/PV 1088, dated 5th February 1964 and S/PV 1090, dated 10th February 1964 of the Security Council. it is enough for me to say here that while India has been one of the strongest supporters of the principle of self-determination, that principle does not apply in the present case, since it is not applicable to the section of a people. If the policy of selfdetermination were to be applied to parts of constitutionally created states, most of them would be broken up. The plea of self-determination in a plural society, as is the case with most States of Asia and Africa, could mean nothing but disintegration. If Pakistan wants self-determination in Kashmir or Nagaland, constituent States of India, why does it not agree to grant self-determination to East Pakistan, Baluchistan or the disputed territory of Pakhtoonistan?

As regards Kashmir, I need only say that the issue is one of Aggression, of Pakistani aggression, committed in 1947 and 1948 and which continues to this day. To this aggression has been added the aggression by China. Pakistan has made peace with the People's Republic of China by surrendering hundreds of square miles of Kashmir territory which never belonged to it and which it occupied by naked aggression.

Mr. Bhutto has also made crude attempts to secure the sympathy of Muslims all over the world by painting a lurid picture of alleged ill-treatment and eviction of Indian Muslims. He has also patted himself on, the back by saying how well the minorities are treated in his country. This is not the first time that he has made this mischievous statement. Mr. President, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The Indian census figures for 1961 show that there has been an increase of 25.6 per cent in the population of Muslims of India during the period 1951 and 1961 against an overall increase in the population of India of 21.5 per sent. Does this prove that Muslims from India are being driven out? The Pakistan census figures on the other hand show that there were 9.24 million non-Muslims in Pakistan in 1951. The corresponding figures for 1961 is 9.38 million non-Muslims. Isn't it most remarkable that the population of the minority community in Pakistan should have remained almost stationary although the increase in population of Muslims in Pakistan according to its own census figures during this decade was 26 per cent? Had there been similar natural increase in the number of non-Muslims, there should have been an increase of well over 2.5 million. Why has there been no such natural increase ? During the year 1964 alone 900,000 non-Muslims were driven out from Pakistan to India of whom more than 80,000 are Christians and Buddhist. This is how the population of the minority community

6

is kept constant in Pakistan. Which country is evicting its minorities ? Is this the treatment of minorities which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan is proud of ?

The Foreign Minister accuses us of advocating an exchange of population on religious grounds. In support he has quoted the Chief Minister of West Bengal as having stated that "The total evacuation of Hindus from East Pakistan over a period of five years was possible". I do not see the relevance of this quotation in this context. This statement was made obviously on the basis of the experience of last year's exodus of minorities from Pakistan which shows a tremendous increase in the tempo of expulsion as compared to that in the decade 1951-61. How the Foreign Minister could twist this statement to mean exchange of population beats me. I did not know that for him the words evacuation and exchange of population are synonymous.

Pakistan started as a champion of Muslims in Kashmir. It has not extended the scope of its championship to the entire fifty million Muslims of India. This is what President Ayub said on 1st December 1964, which appeared in the Morning News of Dacca on the 2nd December:

"The rights of five crores (50 million) of Indian Muslims could be safeguarded only by a strong centre in Pakistan". President Ayub said here today "The Parliamentary form of Government", the President said, "would weaken the central government in Pakistan thereby endangering the security of Indian Muslims".

Here is a self-appointed guardian of Indian Muslims. Pakistanis must forego their right to democracy for the sake of the rotection and the security of Indian Muslims. En self-denial go any further ? Mr. President, the fifty million Muslims of India certainly do not need anybody's protection," least of all protection by the Government of Pakistan which cannot even protect its own minorities.

Pakistan claims to be the spokesman of Muslims. When Egypt was invaded in 1956 over the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, where was Pakistan's solicitude for their Muslims brethern in Egypt or is it that the Arabs, because they treat their minorities well, are not as good Muslims as the Pakistanis and therefore deserved no support ? On the contrary, Pakistan was one of the few countries whose sympathies were all with the invaders. It was India which condemned the invasion and the loss of some Western goodwill that followed was fully exploited by Pakistan to her advantage.

The distinguished Foreign Minister has insinuated that we are aggravating the situation by trying to make certain constitutional changes. He made a similar allegation in the Security Council and I repeat what I said then:

"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 to make whatever constitutional changes we may consider necessary in a part of our own territory".

Mr. President, the calumny that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has hurled on India here, the hate-India campaign that goes on unceasingly in the Pakistan press and radio to which Pakistan's leaders, including the Foreign Minister himself, contribute substantially, has created an atmosphere in which meaningful discussion with Pakistan have become impossible. As is apparent from the Foreign Minister's statement, Pakistan wants to create trouble between India and her neighbours. It has already entereded into an anti-Indian collusion with China and is inciting the Muslim citizens of India to abandon their loyalty to India. All this amply proves that Pakistan's professions of seeking peaceful settlement of problems with India are by no means genuine but are a sham. Pakistan's main objective seems to be not to reduce tension or seek any solutions of problems with India but to keep them alive and to exploit them for domestic and political reasons. India has always tried to be friendly with Pakistan, but such efforts have to be mutual if they are to bear fruit. My Prime Minister visited President Ayub in October 1964 and had with him what we thought was a most friendly Wk. The atmosphere created then was, however, vitiated by numerous offensive statements made by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Even so, we continued to make friendly overtures to Pakistan. There was, however, no 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 and peace on the cease-fire line and on the international borders with Pakistan, at the last minute decided to postpone the conference indefinitely. Likewise, the Home Ministers' Conference which was to be held towards the end of November was also suddenly postponed by Pakistan sine die. President Ayub was reported to have said that the conference may not be of much value. Despite provocations, we in India are determined to pursue the path of peaceful settlement of all our differences with Pakistan, but we are not prepared to be coerced or blackmailed into submission. We want a just solution with Pakistan. But no right can come out of wrong and justice cannot come by rewarding aggression.

The following is the text of Shri Chakravarty's statement on January 27 :

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, in his address on 22nd January 1965 and made wild and absurd allegations against India. In my rebuttal

1

yesterday, I had shown that Pakistan was trying

to drive a wedge between India and Afro-Asian countries, that it was Pakistan, not India, which started the arms race in the sub-continent and created tension in our region, that it was Pakistan, not India, which had followed aggressive policies, and finally that Pakistan was trying to white wash the implications of the Chinese nuclear explosion by justifying it. Mr. Bhutto has given no answer to these rebuttals in exercising his right of reply. Obviously, he has no answer for them. It is now clear that he made all these charges against India only to mislead this Assembly. I leave it to the good sense of the Assembly to decide what credence it should give to his statements.

Not having been able to meet the facts and arguments cited by me, he has started beating the old drum, once again. There is nothing new on Kashmir that he has said. We have already replied to his wild allegations in the past and I have also given reference to the documents containing these replies. I do not, therefore, feel justified in repeating them once again, except to say that he has quoted the late Prime Minister Nehru entirely out of context.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan asks how a smaller neighbour can try to provoke a larger neighbour. The answer to this query has perhaps been furnished in an article which has been published in the January issue of the Foreign Affairs :

"Pakistan has been able to acquire a disproportionately strong power position relative to that of India through alignment with the United States. Pakistan has commanded from the United States an economic and military aid subsidy much larger than her size would otherwise warrant. Rawalpindi has been emboldened by this to think big and to press for Indian concessions from a position of artificially induced strength."

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan says that Pakistan has never used its armed forces for aggression. Is this true ? Pakistan undoubtedly committed aggression, at least in Kashmir, and still illegally occupies 32,000 square miles of Indian territory. I need give but one quotation from the voluminous records of the Security Council to refresh his memory :

Sir Owen Dixon, the U.N. Representative for

India and Pakistan had this to say :

"Without going into the causes or reasons why it happened, which presumably formed part of the history of the sub-continent, I was prepared to adopt the view that when the frontier of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was crossed on, I believe 20 October 1947, by hostile elements, it was contrary to international law, and that when in May 1948, as I believe, units of the regular Pakistan forces moved into the territory of the State, that too was inconsistent with international law".

The Foreign Minister also says that a no-war declaration is not necessary in view of the provisions of the Charter. How dear he holds the principles of the Charter would be clear from the irrefutable fact that within 20 days-let me repeat within 20 days---of becoming a member of the U.N., Pakistan invaded Kashmir. When we brought the complaint to the Security Council, Sir Zafrullah Khan, the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan, categorically denied that Pakistan had ever invaded Kashmir or that any armed forces of Pakistan were in Kashmir, but when the U.N.C.I.P. came to the Indian sub-continent and facts could no longer be suppressed, the same Foreign Minister informed the member of the Commission and I quote:

"The Pakistan army had, at the time, three brigades of regular troops in Kashmir". Is not this a complete refutation of Mr. Bhutto's claim that Pakistan has "Never deployed a single Pakistani soldier in the use of aggression"? The Foreign Minister talks of duplicity and fraud and I leave it to the Assembly to judge who is guilty of fraud and duplicity.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has complained that India has committed aggresison on Pakistan. He has the temerity to say that "It is Pakistan's territory that India occupies". If, as it seems, he is insinuating that Kashmir is Pakistan's territory, I have two questions to ask him: first, since when and under what constitutional process has Kashmir become part of Pakistan ? There can be no greater travesty of truth and this is the type of statement with which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan tries to mislead this Assembly. Secondly, if be says that Kashmir is Pakistan's territory, how does he reconcile this with his own statement that the future status of Kashmir should be decided by the people and that there should be self-determination in Kashmir ? The cat is really out of the bag. Unable to rebut my arguments, he has now revealed his mind. The plain fact is that Pakistan wants to annex Kashmir. The demand for self-determination of Sudetanland was followed by an attack of Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has urged that there should be no double standards and that the principle of self-determination must not be diluted in regard to Kashmir. Example is better than precept. Why does not he practise what he preaches. I repeat my question : "Why does not he grant self-determination to East Pakistan, Baluchistan or to the disputed territory of Pakhtoonistan ?

8

INDIA PAKISTAN USA BURMA CHINA PERU AFGHANISTAN NEPAL CAMBODIA LAOS THAILAND UNITED KINGDOM FRANCE EGYPT LATVIA GERMANY NORWAY SLOVAKIA

Date : Jan 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

MAURITIUS

Prime Minister's speech at Dinner in honour of Dr. Ramgoolam

The Prime Minister of Mauritius, Dr. Ramgoolam and five other Ministers of the Mauritius Government paid a visit to India from January 15 to 31, 1965. On January 25 the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, gave a dinner in honour of the Mauritius Prime Minister at Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Welcoming the distinguished guest, Shri Shastri made the following speech on the occasion :

Mr. Premier, Your Excellencies, Ladies and

Gentlemen:

I extend to you and to your colleagues a most hearty welcome to our country. I am indeed happy that you and your colleagues have decided to pay a visit to India and I am sure this visit will do good both to Mauritius as well as to our country. Mauritius and India are the closest neighbours and there are many things in common between our two countries. In fact, the majority of the population of Mauritius consists of people of Indian origin and the languages spoken in Mauritius are those which are spoken in different States in India. They have historic relations, past relations and I have no doubt that these relations and bonds will get closer and closer.

You are naturally keen that your country should become fully independent. You are also particular that the talks with the British Government should be held much earlier than it has been proposed. I have no doubt that these talks which would be held between the British Government and your Government would prove fruitful and you will have your independence very soon. Needless to say that Mauritius has the fullest support, moral support, of India in this regard.

It is unfortunate that some colonies still exist in this world and I know there are some islands round about you which are not yet free. There are areas also like Angola and Mozambique which are under colonial domination. There has been terrible suffering on their part and I know how important it is that they should become independent as early as possible. We have always been against colonialism and our policies and principles have been that of anti-colonialism. I do think that the world will rest in peace, only when no colonies exist in this world.

Independence brings forth with it various problems. Naturally, the economic development of the country assumes the highest importance. It raises various problems and yet all those who have become independent recently or during the last decade do realise that there is no go but to undergo suffering in order to build up a new society, a new social order.

The question of unity, solidarity and integration or integrity is another problem which assumes the highest importance. We have had also to face some difficulty in this regard but we are trying to get over the fissiparous tendencies which existed or do exist in some form or the other. I know Mauritius has also some problem of that kind but I am indeed very glad that you have been handling this problem most tactfully and if, I may say so, successfully also, I do wish that Mauritius and India should remain friends and may I say how delighted and honoured we feel to find you and your colleagues in our midst.

May I request you to rise and drink a toast to the health of the Premier of Mauritius.

MAURITIUS USA INDIA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE **Date :** Jan 01, 1965

Volume No 1995 MAURITIUS Reply by the Mauritius Prime Minister

Replying to the Toast, Dr. Ramgoolam said :

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

I and my colleagues and my wife thank you for the very splendid hospitality and cordiality extended to us throughout India and particularly here. We are very conscious of all the friendliness and kindness we have received during our visit. We are a very small country and we always look with gratitude at the friendliness and goodness which we receive from other countries, friendly and very neer to us, even to our heart.

You have just now, Mr. Prime Minister, given us a brief history of our little difficulties and

also indicated to us that in the near future, most probably, we will become a sovereign, State, within the Commonwealth. In Mauritius, we are, as is commonly known, now a multi-racial society. We have people of French origin, of Indian origin and African origin and Chinese origin. We have been put in a small island to find our way of life and we are trying to do it and I think with a certain measure of success.

Just now for nine months we have been operating as an all party government and it is my hope and I am sure the desire of the people of Mauritius, that we should emerge into independence as a united nation fully conscious of the responsibility to which you have just referred so brilliantly and lucidly.

In the short stay that we have had in India my colleagues and myself, there is one thing which has impressed us more than anything else, that you have made democracy and freedom possible in India and that should be a lesson to everybody, small or great. We have learnt the way since independence you have made progress, economic, social and political which could not have been possible without independence.

We have learnt a great deal and I am sure when we return home, we will try to translate into our language and into our new contacts the very great achievement of India. We and my colleagues want to see that the links that exist, links of friendship and concord which exist for many years with India, will grow stronger in the years to come.

We have very close cultural links and blood relations and I am sure this will continue to grow stronger. My friends, whether they are of French origin, African origin or of Chinese origin, we look upon India as a friend, as a neighbour. For, as you have just said, the world is very small today.

One of my greatest personal pleasures has been to see so many friends with whom I studied in London while we were there and it is so good to see here so much friendliness extended to us from every quarter. I and my colleagues are very grateful to you, Mr. Prime Minister, for having extended this invitation to us. We are sorry we did not come earlier but we are gald we have been able to come this year and I thank you on behalf of my wife and my colleagues and myself and my country that we are very very glad to be here and happy to be here and before I sit down, I would like to drink to your health, Mr. Prime Minister.

MAURITIUS USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Jan 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Indo-Pakistan Rice Agreement Signed

An Indian delegation led by Shri Y. T. Shah, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, arrived in Pakistan on January 7, 1965 to purchase Kangani & Joshi rice from Pakistan. The visiting delegation held discussions at the Ministries of Commerce and Agriculture & Works. As a result of these discussions, the Governments of Pakistan and India concluded on January 11, 1965 an agreement under which Pakistan would supply 50,000 tons of Kangani and Joshi rice to India by March 31, 1965. In exchange, India would supply to Pakistan coal, railway equipment and other specified commodities.

A Protocol for the exchange of these commodities was concluded in Rawalpindi on January 11, 1965. The agreement for the sale of rice was signed by Mr. M. Khrusheed, Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Works, on behalf of Government of Pakistan. 'The Protocol for the import of coal and other specified Indian goods was signed by Mr. M. Aslam, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce. Shri Y. T. Shah, leader of the Indian delegation, signed the rice agreement and the trade Protocol on behalf of his Government.

Apart from Mr. Shah, the Indian delegation included Shri Ishwar Chandra and Dr. S. V. Pingale of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and Shri G. P. Mathur of the Indian High Commission.

10

The Pakistan delegation was led by the Agriculture Secretary, Mr. M. Khursheed and the Commerce Secretary, Mr. M. Aslam and included Mr. S. B. Awan, Mr. M. V. Ahmed, Mr. Zafar Iqbal, Mr. Hamid and Mr. A. R. Saddiqui.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Press Conference

The Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, gave a Press Conference in New Delhi on January 20, 1965, at which he dealt with a number of national and international subjects.

The following is the text of the replies the Prime Minister gave to the questions regarding Chinese threat :

Question : There have been some reports that the Chinese threat on the northern border has become very acute. Could you please comment on that ?

Prime Minister : Whether it has become acute or not, I cannot say any thing about that. But the Chinese build-up, of course, is there and it has been there for some time past. We have to prepare ourselves and we are trying to build up our defensive strength. Question : There is a report in the Press today that you are planning to write to the non-aligned countries asking them to get some kind of guarantee from the big nuclear powers against a possible nuclear attack by some other country.

Prime Minister : Well, I have never suggested providing any kind of guarantee to either India or to other countries. As I said, perhaps I have never used that word, either 'guarantee' or some kind of umbrella or shelter. I have never said it. But it is true that I have suggested that it is for the nuclear powers to consider how they can obviate the menace of nuclear weapons. I have not yet made up my mind, but I do want to take into confidence some of the friendly countries who feel strongly against the use of nuclear weapons.

Question : Have you got any response from these big powers?

Prime Minister : No. As I said, I have not written to them but it is true that they were, contacted and we have got no special reactions from them.

Question : option has been given to the nuclear powers, as you have said yourself. it is for them to consider. If they consider that a nuclear umbrella or nuclear shield is the best guarantee or the best way out, would you object to that?

Prime Minister: Why put that hypothetical question ? Let them first meet and discuss among themselves.

Question : There seems to be an ambiguity. The Durgapur resolution merely said that nuclear power will be used for peaceful purposes. it did not say definitely that India would not make the bomb. You are also reported to have said something like that. Does it me-an that in the future this policy would be revised and that we may go in for the bomb ?

Prime Minister: When I say for the present, this present is a very long period. It is not going to be a short one. I merely referred to what I said in the Lok Sabha but I cannot say, anything as to what might happen in the distant future. So long as we are here, our policy is clear that we do not want that atom bomb should be manufactured in India.

Question : You seem to want protection for all the non-nuclear nations, whether Africa. Asia or Latin America, all over the world. I thought you wanted something for India from the nuclear powers, some kind of guarantee or whatever it may be. They cannot give for the whole world.

Prime Minister: In fact this is a menace which concerns the whole world and all the nonnuclear powers, and, therefore, this matter has to be considered, if it is to be considered at all, in a much wider context, in the context of the world and all the non-nuclear countries.

Question : You said it is for the nuclear powers to consider the ways of obviating the menace, but I gather that the powers you have

11

made contacts with are non-nuclear powers, not the nuclear power's but the non-nuclear powers. Is that right? Can you tell us which powers or which countries they are ?

Prime Minister : As I said, we did get into touch with the nuclear powers, but non-nuclear powers I have not contacted them so far. However, the most important forum for this is the United Nations, and in fact it is for the United Nations to consider this matter and take an attitude. I do hope that this matter will be raised at the session of the United Nations.

Question : What kind of action by nuclear powers would remove this fear from, say India's mind, of a nuclear threat?

Prime Minister : I have not referred to India at all.

Question: No, I mean the whole world, the whole non-nuclear world. What are the possible ways by which this can be done by those who want to have it removed ?

Prime Minister: Well, it would mean no further proliferation and dissemination of nuclear weapons and also trying to extend the Moscow Ban Treaty. Underground tests may also be stopped and gradually we can move in the direction of elimination of nuclear devices and nuclear weapons.

Question : If you are unable to secure the joint action you have said with the nuclear powers, will you accept the unilateral protection offered by President Johnson ?

Prime Minister : It is also a hypothetical question; no one has offered it so far.

Question : Is it not a fact that we are mainly concerned with the Chinese bomb and with no other nuclear powers immediately ? How will you expect the nuclear powers to come of their own accord and offer you umbrella Or any Other protection ?

Prime Minister : Well, I do think that even the nuclear powers fully realise the dangers of nuclear weapons and they have been discussing this matter in the Disarmament Committee and. therefore they are very much aware of what their responsibilities are.

Question : We are now concerned with China which is not subject to any international discipline;

Prime Minister : True.

Question : We understand that India would Move the matter at the next session of the United Nations.

Prime Minister: Anyhow, it is an item on the agenda, and as far as I know, perhaps at the initiative of India. I am not quite sure but anyhow it is an item on the agenda.

Question : Will you like to answer the question of my colleague, namely, about the specific situation that we are faced with, that is, the acquisition of nuclear strength by China ? How are you going to meet that situation apart from considering the general question of elimination of nuclear weapons from the world ?

Prime Minister : Well, the other nuclear powers will take steps which would be a move in the other direction. It is bound to have its effect on China also. Even China has suggested that there should be a world conference to consider how to obviate the menace of nuclear weapons. Therefore, it is not that China will not consider the pros, and cons of this. Naturally, if the other countries, the other nuclear powers, have got a particular attitude, it is bound to have its effect on China as well.

Question : India does not want to produce the atom bomb; India does not want any protection from the nuclear powers. How does India propose to meet the Chinese challenge in regard to the atom bomb ?

Prime Minister : The atom bomb is not going to fall on India tomorow and, therefore, we need not consider this matter.

It takes a long time to make an atom bomb.

Question : Many people thought that India will not be attacked by China; everywhere the great people thought that China will not attack India but they did. How. did you meet it in that case ?

Prime Minister : There is a greater danger of their using the conventional army and conventional weapons in attacking India. In fact. it is much more important than the use of atom bomb by China.

Question: Do you support the Chinese proposal for a nuclear powers' conference?

Prime Minister : Well. this conference has to be a really representative conference of the whole world and unless all the bigger countries are agreeable to this proposal, it is hardly for me to suggest that this world conference should be held.

Question : How is it that the Government of India has been advised that the Chinese will prefer conventional weapons to the atom bomb?

Prime Minister: We have not been advised. It is for us, to judge.

12

CHINA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Indo-Polish Credit Agreement Signed

An agreement for a credit of Rs. 10.5 crores for utilisation in power projects was signed between India and Poland in New Delhi on January 25, 1965.

Mr. M. Karezmar, Director of the Finance Department in the Ministry of Foreign Trade and the Leader of the visiting Delegation of the Polish People's Republic, and Shri Y. T. Shah, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, signed the agreement on behalf of their respective governments.

Under this Agreement, Poland will supply two generating units of 125 MW each with necessary auxiliary equipment. Repayment of the credit will be made in non-convertible Indian rupees spread over a period of 12 years. The rate of interest is 21 per cent per annum. Repayment will begin one year after the delivery of the last batch of essential equipment necessary for commissioning the generating unit. The amount so repaid will be used by Poland for buying Indian goods in accordance with the trade and payments agreement between the two countries.

This is the third credit granted to India by Poland. The two earlier credits totalling Rs. 29.80 crores have been given mainly for development of coal mines and for certain industries.

POLAND INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

SWEDEN

Swedish Grants to India

Two supplementary agreements were signed in Stockholm on January 29, 1965 providing for two grants of a total value of Rs. 44 lakhs. One relates to the gift of forestry tools as a contribution to the U.N. Special Fund Training Logging Project in India and the other, to a study of problems concerning the development of an economic and efficient grain storage system in India.

These supplementary agreements were signed, by Shri Khub Chand, India's Ambassador to Sweden, and Mr. Olaf Palme, Acting Swedish Foreign Minister.

These are in pursuance of the financial development cooperation agreement signed between' the two countries in September last year. Under this agreement, Sweden has given a loan of Rs. 2.18 crores and Rs. 1.09 crores as grants-inkind.

SWEDEN INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Agreement on Bokaro Steel Plant Signed

An. Agreement was signed in New Delhi on

January 25, 1965 between the Government of India and the Government of the USSR for cooperation in the construction of an integrated iron and steel works at Bokaro.

The Agreement provides for the construction

13

of a modem steel works at Bokaro with a capacity of 1.5 to 2 million tonnes with provision for expansion to 4 million tonnes. This will be the fourth steel works in the public sector.

The Government of the USSR are extending a credit up to 190 million roubles (Rs. 100.5 crores) for the purpose of meeting the foreign exchange cost of the plant. The credit has been extended on terms and conditions similar to those made available for Bhilai. It bears an interest of 2.5 per cent and is repayable in twelve years.

The Agreement was signed by Mr. V. A. Sergeev, Deputy Chairman of the State Committee of Council of Ministers of the USSR for Foreign Economic Relations, on behalf of the Government of the USSR, and by Mr. N. N. Wanchoo, Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of Steel & Mines, on behalf of the Government of India.

Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, the Minister for Steel & Mines, Mr. Prakash Chandra Sethi, the Deputy Minister for Steel & Mines, Mr. A. A. Rodionov, the Charge d'Affaires of the USSR in Delhi, and Mr. B. Ronmonov, Member of the State Committee of Foreign Economic Relations, were present.

The Agreement envisages that Bokaro, as Bhilai, will be Indian built, with such assistance of Soviet specialists as the Indian organisations may require for the construction. erection and commissioning of the plant. It also envisages that the Soviet organisations will assist in the training of Indian specialists and workers both in the USSR and in India.

The Agreement further envisages that the Indian and the Soviet sides will promote the maximum participation of Indian organisations in the designing of the works, and in the supply of equipment and materials, because in both the fields, there is larger capacity existing in the country today as compared to 1955 when the agreement for Bhilai was signed. It is expected that, compared to Bhilai, Bokaro will use a larger share of Indian equipment. Both the Ranchi plant and other Indian plants like the Heavy Electricals are expected to contribute significantly to the construction of Bokaro. While the design and construction of facilities outside the works will be entirely an Indian responsibility, the Indian organisations will participate in the design and drawing work for a number of units within the plant. The exact scope is to be determined after the detailed project report is ready.

The Soviet organisations are to prepare within nine months a detailed Project Report for the construction of Bokaro. no detailed Project Report will be for a 4-million tonne plant.

Bokaro will produce hot and cold rolled strip and sheet and galvanised sheet. These are products in which there is acute shortage today. The mill complex consists of a 1250 mm Slabbing Mill, capable of rolling ingots over 30 tonnes and 2000 mm wide Continuous Hot and Cold Rolling Mills. Steel is to be made by the basic oxygen converter process. Iron is to be made in 2000 cu. m. furnaces which will be among the largest in Asia. It is also envisaged that the plant will incorporate the latest technological developments in steel production and a large-scale use of automation.

According to the Agreement, the Soviet organisations are to supply such equipment as are not available in India, during the period 1966 to 1969. The commissioning of the plant early in 1970 will contribute in a significant manner towards meeting the capacity target of 16.5 million tonnes set for the steel industry in the Fourth Plan period for the development of the Indian economy.

The signing of the Agreement marks yet another milestone in the growth of Indo-Soviet economic and technical co-operation. It coincides with the 10th anniversary of such co-operation; and it will be recalled that Bhilai Agreement concluded on February 2, 1955 marked its beginning. Other milestones in Indo-Soviet co-operation have been the Barauni refinery, the Neyveli thermal power station, the Ankaleswar oil fields and the machine building plants at Ranchi, Durgapur and Hardwar etc.

After the agreement was signed, the Union Minister of Steel and Mines, Shri Sanjiva Reddy made the following speech :

Sir, I am extremely happy on the signing of the Agreement between India and our friend, Russia. It is good for both the countries. The friendship between the two countries has been very close and intimate since a very long time and, I am sure, this venture of construction of a steel plant at Bokaro, the biggest of its type, will cement the friendship that already exists between the two countries.

It is the goodwill that has been built-up not only between the leadership of these two countries but also between the people. This plant will be the symbol alongwith the other plants that are being constructed in the country. We have been really very very happy on this day and, I am sure, the people will appreciate this gesture of our friends from Russia who have agreed to give us the assistance and see that the Project is completed as, quickly as possible.

14

Russia, naturally, as a very highly-developed country, would give its best help to other friendly nations which are struggling to build-up the economy and eliminate poverty. Poverty in any part of the world would be a danger. To eliminate poverty, industrial schemes of this magnitude are absolutely necessary and completion of this project will be a milestone in the progress of the nation.

I am extremely happy today because of this kind gesture of the Russian people and the Government and the leadership of that country. We convey on behalf of the Government of India and the people of India our heart-felt thanks and greetings to our comrades in Russia to the loaders in Russia and I am particularly thankful to Mr. Sergeev who has come here, stayed here for more than three weeks and has concluded this happy Agreement.

This is an indication of friendship that is existing between the two countries and it will certainly be strengthened in the coming years. I request him to carry our best wishes and greetings and convey them to the people and the leaders of that great country. I thank you Mr. Sargeev for the trouble you have taken.

INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Contracts for Expansion of Barauni Refinery Signed

The Indian Oil Corporation Limited (Refineries Division) and the Soviet Export Organisation "Neftekhimpromexport" executed a contract in New Delhi on January 11, 1965 providing for the delivery of 1,540 tonnes of equipment and materials for the expansion of the Barauni Refinery from 2 to 3 million tonnes crude throughout and deputation to India of the Soviet specialists to assist in the erection and commissioning of expansion facilities. In planning the import of equipment and materials from the USSR for the expansion of the refinery, every effort has been made to maximise the use of indigenous supplies. The total cost of the expansion is estimated to be Rs. 276 lakhs of which the cost of supplies and technical assistance from the USSR will be Rs. 73.29 lakhs.

The deliveries of the equipment and materials from the USSR will be made in accordance with a phased programme so as to enable the commissioning of the expansion facilities during 1966.

The working drawings for the expansion project will be prepared by the Central Designs Organisation attached to the Gujarat Refinery Project. This is the first time that the working drawings for a refinery processing unit will be prepared in India under the overall supervision and guidance of a team of Soviet design engineers. The contract for this technical assistance from the USSR has also been signed today.

The first stage of the Barauni Refinery comprising one million tonnes per year processing capacity was commissioned recently and the second stage of another million tonnes is also nearing completion.

The above contracts were signed by Shri N. N. Kashyap, Managing Director, Indian Oil Corporation Limited (Refineries Division) and Mr. P. Besolov, Acting Counsellor for Economic Affairs, Embassy of the USSR in India.

INDIA ITALY USA

Date : Jan 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Shri M. C. Chagla's Address to Indo-UAR Scientific Cooperation Board

Inaugurating the first meeting of the Indo-U.A.R. Joint Scientific Cooperation Board in Cairo on January 19, 1965, the Union Education Minister, Shri M. C. Chagla, said :

15

This is my first visit to your great country and I am very happy indeed to be here. Your country and mine have had many contacts in the past. Contacts nearly started as far back as 3000 B.C. and with all these years of history, there have been ties of friendship and amity between Arab world and my country.

We exchanged distinguished men from both countries. We had contacts in philosophy, mathematics and various other subjects. Arab thought influenced Indian religion and Indian literature; Indian thought influenced Arab literature and Arab thought. When Egyptian revolution broke out, our late Prime Minister welcomed it as great event of contemporary history and when you had Suez trouble, late Prime Minister of our country stood solidly by you. As you know, Sir, ties between President Nasser and our late Prime Minister were of closest. They were more like brothers than two statesmen working on same policies as were our two civilzations, in the past.

Today, you have new civilzation in this country. Inspired by President Nasser, U.A.R. is the spearhead of Arab resurgence and head of Arab nationalism. We are amidst revolution which is scientific and technological revolution, and to shape our two countries, we can collaborate so that we can take advantage of the results of this Revolution.

Agreement was arrived at in September last year for scientific and technological collaboration between our countries. We are carrying on research, I am sure, you too are doing it. Research is very important, but more important than that is utilisation of research and that is where we have to work together.

We have many things common today. On Political front, we agree on main issues which are facing the world today. We both stand for Positive non-alignment, we both stand for Peaceful co-existence, we both stand for anti-colonialism and we both stand for disarmament. This is wide sphere of our common fields. We have assembled today to extend this wide field to scientific and technological field also. Now what are the Problems that face our two countries today? As I see it, problems are that we have to utilise our research so that we can make most use of our indigenous products. We have to utilise our research so that we have our own indigenous technology; we have to utilise our research so that we shall not depend on foreign countries; we have to utilise our research to raise the standard of living of our peoples and. I am happy indeed that I am inaugurating this Joint Board which has been set up, under the agreement of last September. Main principles of collaboration are laid down.

I think we ought to supplement and complement our work in both our countries. We have to determine the fields for this.

Science and technology is really international and we must pool together not only our research but our knowledge, out information and experience. This mutual exchange of scientific advancement will help us to do that. We have been facing the same problems, as you.

We are not that affluent in foreign exchange and it is difficult for us, as it is, I take it for you to import scientific machinery and scientific instruments. Therefore, we must collaborate. We can manufacture our own machinery so that we have not to go out to import this.

We have to plan our scientific research in order that we shall achieve certain results and also we have to make our mind as to what methods should be, so that those results can be achieved. Now, our work should not be merely of help to our countries. I think it should be of help to all Afro-Asian countries and other developing countries. We should have a feeling while we are sitting on this Board that the work we are doing is not merely for U.A.R. or India, but for other Afro-Asian countries also who have similar problems and who are interested in development.

I am also anxious that we should have conferences of scientists both in this country and India. I may mention that we have agreed to have Afro-Asian Scientific Conference late ibis year and I hope this country will be in a position to send strong delegation to participate in that conference.

Now as regards other item on agenda. If you have exhibition like this in this country and tell us what are your scientific publications, what scientific instruments you manufacture we would do likewise. I think it would go a long way to further cause of scientific collaboration and scientific research. I do not want to take any more of your time but I think this is a very historic occasion because our mutual agreement was signed in 1958. We had this scientific and technological agreement in September 1964 and we have met to implement that agreement. I bone and trust that this Board will have very important results for both our countries. With scientific advancement we can brine out resultthat we expect in both our countries. We want people to have better and fuller life and all this is Possible provided we give certain impetus in our countries to science and technology.

16

EGYPT USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1965

February

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vol. XI FEBRUARY No. 2

CONTENTS

AFGHANISTAN PAGE

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Dr. Mohammad Yusuf 17 Afghan, Prime Minister's Reply 18 Indo-Afghan Joint Communique 19 Indo-Afghan Cultural Agreement Ratified 20 BURMA President's Speech at Dinner in honour of General Ne Win 20

Reply by General Ne Win 21 Joint Communique on General Ne Win's Visit 22

DENMARK

Agreement on Tonnage Certificates of Ships Signed 23

FINLAND

President's Speech at Dinner in honour of Dr. Kekkonen 24 Reply by Dr. Kekkonen 25 President Kekkonen's Speech at Dinner in honour of President Radhakrishnan 26 Reply by President Radhakrishnan 27 Indo-Finnish Joint Communique 28

FRANCE

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of M. Pompidou 29 French Prime Minister's Reply 30 President's Speech at Luncheon in honour of the French Prime Minister 30 Reply by the French Prime Minister 31 Joint Communique on French Prime Minister's Visit 32 French Prime Minister's Farewell Message

33

GREECE

Letters renewing Trade Agreement Exchanged 33 Agreement for avoidance of Double Taxation Signed 33

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament 34

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Speech in the General Assembly on U.N. Peace-keeping Operations 37 NEPAL Joint Communique on Nepal Foreign Minister's Visit 38

VIETNAM

Statement by Government of India on Developments in Vietnam 39 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Developments in Vietnam 40 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on withdrawal of International Control Commission Teams from North Vietnam 40

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

AFGHANISTAN USA BURMA DENMARK FINLAND FRANCE GREECE INDIA NEPAL VIETNAM

Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Dr. Mohammad Yusuf

His Excellency Dr. Mohammad Yusuf, Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan, arrived in New Delhi on February 18, 1965 on a ten-day State visit to India. On February 18, the Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, gave a dinner in honour of the Afghanistan Prime Minister at Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Welcoming the distinguished guest, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri made the following speech :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, we feel extremely delighted to find you and your colleague, the Finance Minister in our midst. We are indeed very happy that you have come here again, of course, in a different capacity now as the Prime Minister of Afghanis-

tan. Your visit is most welcome to us.

Afghanistan has fought for its independence and it has preserved it. I know you are a freedomloving country and you believe in the freedom of all countries in the world. You do not accept colonialism and you are wholly opposed to the colonies existing in this world. It is indeed regrettable that we should still have colonies in this world. There are Portuguese colonies which are a matter of shame to the humanity and for all of us. And we have also in our midst South Africa which is a shame to humanity, which is doing something ununderstandable and unimaginable to all of us. We cannot conceive that the kind of apartheid they are observing should be or would be possible in the present-day world.

You have formed your new Constitution; you have framed it and it is now going to be implemented. You are soon going to have a new election and this election is going to be on the basis of adult franchise. It would be a great experiment and you will now have a full representative Government of the people. We have also had three very big elections on adult franchise and we have found this to be a good process and sound mechanism of democracy.

Naturally having attained our freedom, the most important problem for us is that of economic development, industrial progress and progress in the agricultural sector also. We have been able to make significant achievement in the industrial sector and I am glad that Your Excellency will get an opportunity to see something of what we have done during the last 15 years. Afghanistan and India have many common problems and I know your main problem is also of development, economic development. We can cooperate amongst ourselves in many matters in order to help and assist each other.

In the matter of training of the technical personnel, we can be of help and assistance and we would be most willing to contribute our mite in this regard.

Our trade should also grow and expand. I know you want us to eat your fruits-fresh and dry fruits. They will certainly be good for our health and I, would certainly like to encourage our people to take as much of fresh fruit coming from Afghanistan, as well as your dry fruits which are indeed very tasty.

In international matters we see eye to eye with each other on almost all important problems. You believe in non-alignment and India also strongly believes in it. It was our late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who put forward this idea and pursued it till the end. Inspite of enormous difficulties we have had to face during the last few years, we did not deviate from this policy and I think it has paid us in many ways. But we have accepted the policy of non-alignment not with any selfish motive or selfish purpose. It is acceptable to us because we feel that it means independence in thinking and action. It expands the sphere of peace and it helps in accepting and adopting the policy of co-existence. I know Afghanistan also believes in co-existence and it is important that in pursuance of these policies we should work for disarmament and for peace. What the world needs today and needs it the most is the maintenance of peace, avoidance of clash and conflicts between different nations. Unfortunately the position in South East Asia, specially in the Indo-China sector, is fraught with difficulties and we have suggested that the conflict which is going on there at the present moment should be stopped and the different parties concerned should meet and discuss amongst themselves. We have also suggested that a Geneva type of conference might

17

be held so that there is a dialogue between the concerned countries and others who are interested and this conflict must not escalate. In fact the world as a whole, if I might say so, is full of problems and difficulties and it is most important that every country which loves its freedom and wants to maintain its independence and sovereignty should work for peace and try to see that there is disarmament in the world which alone will lead to real peace. I do not want to take much of your time. We are good and old friends and I am sure this friendship will continue.

May I once again thank you, Mr. Prime Minister, for your very kind visit and hope that your stay here will be good and pleasant.

May I now request Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, to drink a toast to the health of the Prime Minister of Afghanistan.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA SOUTH AFRICA CHINA SWITZERLAND **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Afghan Prime Minister's Reply

Replying to the toast, the Afghan Prime Minister, Dr. Mohammad Yusuf, said :

I wish to express my sincere thanks for Your Excellency's gracious words of welcome and my gratitude for the kind sentiments expressed regarding, my country; and my people.

This evening reminds me so much of February 1959, while I paid a visit to your great country as a member of the Afghan Delegation, and was welcomed here by that great man and humanist Jawaharlal Nehru. Six years have elapsed since that time, and it gives me great pleasure to note that our sentiments of sincere friendship are unchanged and our cordial relations grow from day to day.

My visit to India is the continuation of a tradition of friendly visits of Afghan and Indian leaders to each other's country. His Majesty the King and our former Prime Minister have already visited India. We have had the pleasure of receiving His Excellency President Radhakrishnan and the late Jawaharlal Nehru in Afghanistan. Many of our Cabinet Ministers have visited their colleagues in your country.

I personally had the pleasure of receiving the Indian Minister of External Affairs, His Excellency Mr. Swaran Singh in Kabul when he visited us in August 1964.

In the course of a century when Afghanistan faced imperialism the Afghan people endured

many difficulties and sacrificed much to safeguard their freedom. Understandably it followed that we Afghans were greatly pleased when this great historic land, thanks to the wisdom and the sacrifices of her valorous sons, won its independence, and regained her rightful place in the world.

Ever since that time, our paths have crossed and we have passed many milestones together on the road to national reconstruction and international cooperation. Our policies of active neutrality and nonalignment have echoed time and again in the United Nations and at other international gatherings. We have always been united in our support of freedom and justice for all. Our delegations to the two conferences of the nonaligned nations worked in full harmony; our demand for the independence of the people of Asia and Africa has been met for the most part and both our delegations contributed in formulating the historic Bandung Declaration.

Afghanistan's non-alignment with any power bloc is based on our traditional policy for neutrality. We avoided all involvement in the two World Wars and we have never joined any alliance or any bloc at any time.

Sovereign India has fortunately adopted a similar policy. We are working together for the cause of World Peace and Security, and the wisdom of our common policy is proved each year when more and more nations from all continents join our ranks.

With peace and security in mind, we have devoted all our energies to the acceleration of economic, social and cultural development in our countries. We Afghans are watching with great interest and admiration the progress achieved in India in a relatively short space of time. We wish you well and continued success. Likewise. we are also very happy that our friend; in India are taking such a keen interest in Afghanistan's advancement.

We are devoting all our efforts for the betterment of economic and social conditions in our country. Our problems and efforts are various and manifold. We aim at the utilization of our natural resources in a way which will benefit our people most.

With the guidance and encouragement off our

beloved Sovereign and the whole-hearted cooperation of the nation, we drafted a new constitution which was duly adopted in October last. This sacred document is a milestone in our history; it is a testament which respects freedom of choice, freedom of thought and freedom of work in accordance with our national heritage and our traditional values.

18

Our peoples are now the master of their own destinies and servants only of their own ideals and their own interests.

In Belgrade and in Cairo we affirmed that the preservation of peace and the promotion of the wellbeing of peoples are a collective responsibility deriving from the natural aspirations of mankind to live in a better world. Let us continue our contribution to the establishment of a just and lasting peace; lot us strive, as we can, to better the lot of all our people, and above all let us both do our best to promote goodwill among nations. Let us, therefore, continue our full support of the United Nations in its endeavours to promote international peace and security, to develop international understanding and cooperation, and to uphold human rights and fundamental freedom. The United Nations is the only place of hope for saving mankind from destruction and the member States should render all assistance necessary for the Organization to achieve the aims of the Charter.

In the end I thank you once again, Mr. Prime Minister, for giving me this opportunity to visit India and to find myself once again among our Indian friends. I hope that my visit will contribute to the strengthening of the bonds of friendship between our nations.

I propose a toast for the health of His Excellency President Radhakrishnan. I raise my glass to the health of our gracious host, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA INDONESIA EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

AFGHANISTAN

Ind-Afghan Joint Communique

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on February 28, 1965 at the conclusion of the Afghan Prime Minister's visit :

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, His Excellency Dr. Mohammad Yusuf, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Afghanistan, paid an official visit to India from the 18th to the 28th February, 1965. He was accompanied by His Excellency Mr. Sayed Kassim Rishtiya, Finance Minister of Afghanistan. The present visit of the Prime Minister of Afghanistan to India is in the tradition of the friendly visits exchanged between the Heads of State and Government of the two countries. This visit has afforded a welcome opportunity for renewing the friendship and close associations between the two countries.

Throughout his stay in India, the Afghan Prime Minister was received with spontaneous expressions of warmth and cordiality in keeping with the historical and traditional bonds of friendship existing between the peoples of India and Afghanistan.

The Prime Minister-of Afghanistan had fruitful discussions with the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and other members of the Government of India. These talks, in which the Minister of Finance of Afghanistan also took part, were held in an atmosphere of the utmost cordiality and understanding, reflecting the sincere friendship and natural affinity between the two countries. The discussions covered a wide range of subjects of mutual interest and concern, and revelled a broad identity of views between the two countries.

The Prime Minister of Afghanistan and the Prime Minister of India reaffirmed their firm adherence to the policy of non-alignment and non-involvement in military blocs and they expressed their conviction that such a policy would actively promote the cause of world peace and international understanding.

The two Prime Ministers reiterated their firm support for the United Nations and stressed that all efforts should be made to build up the strength and prestige of the world organization. They felt that the course of events during the current session of the General Assembly of the United Nations had demonstrated the urgent need for an early solution to the problem of sharing outstanding United Nations expenses. They hoped that an immediate and practical solution will be found to this problem so that the General Assembly may be able to resume its functions in the cause of world peace and co-operation.

The two Prime Ministers exchanged views on the forthcoming Afro-Asian Conference at Algiers. They agreed that the principles enunciated in the Bandung Declaration are of continuing validity and they expressed the hope that the Conference will adopt a positive and constructive approach to the issues under discussion. They hoped that the Conference would contribute to the strengthening of Afro-Asian unity and to the realisation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The two Prime Ministers reaffirmed the Declaration of the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Nations in Cairo, in which an appeal was made to the countries participating in the Geneva Conference of 1954 to abstain from any action likely to aggravate the, tense situation in Indo-China. They expressed their earnest hope that there will be a cessation of all armed action in Vietnam and that conditions will be created for the

19

immediate convening of a Geneva-type Conference with a view to finding a peace lasting solution to the problem of Vietnam which would enable the people, of Vietnam to live in peace and independence.

The two Prime Ministers expressed their satisfaction at the steady liquidation of colonialism, and reaffirmed their support of those nations still struggling for their independence. The two leaders reviewed the development of commercial relations between their countries, to problems created by the shortage of foreign exchange due to their efforts to promote the economic growth and well-being of their respective countries, and examined measures necessary to remedy these difficulties in order to ensure a steady increase in their mutual trade.

His Excellency the Afghan Prime Minister was particularly happy to pay a visit to the Visva-Bharati, where at a special convocation an honorary doctorate was conferred on him. The Afghan Prime Minister, during his stay in India, was also pleased to visit some development projects such as the Atomic Energy Establishment, the Durgapur Steel Project, the Indian Telephone Industries, which typify the progress made by India since independence through economic planning and adherence to democratic processes. The Prime Minister of india was happy to note that Afghanistan, which has launched social, economic and constitutional reforms under the leadership (if His Majesty the King, and is also wedded to a policy of progress through peace and democracy, is making rapid strides to ensure to her people material and spiritual progress.

The two Heads of Government expressed pleasure at the satisfactory development of relations between their two countries and affirmed their mutual desire for the expansion of co-operation in the economic, scientific, cultural and technical fields. A major step towards the strengthening of Indo-Afghan relations is the Cultural Agreement that has been recently ratified between the two countries. India and Afghanistan look forward confidently to yet closer co-operation and collaboration in all fields of mutual endeavour.

His Excellency the Prime Minister of Afghanistan extended a cordial invitation to the Prime Minister of India to visit Afghanistan as the guest of the Royal Afghan Government. The Prime Minister of India has accepted the invitation with great pleasure,

AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA ALGERIA INDONESIA EGYPT SWITZERLAND CHINA VIETNAM **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Indo-Afghan Cultural Agreement Ratified

Shri M. C. Chagla, Union Minister of Education and H.E. M. Kabir Ludin, Ambassador of the Royal Government of Afghanistan in India, exchanged at a special ceremony held in New Delhi on February 16, 1965 the instruments of ratification of a cultural agreement between India and Afghanistan.

The agreement was signed on October 4, 1963 in Kabul by Shri Humayun Kabir, the then Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs. on behalf of the Government of India and H.E. Dr. Ali Ahmad Popal, Minister of Education, on behalf of the Royal Government of Afghanistan.

In order to develop on a sound basis mutual cooperation between the two countries in the educational, scientific and cultural fields, the, agree, ment provides for the exchange of teachers, scientists and members of cultural institutions. Fellowships and scholarships will also be instituted by the two Governments to enable scholars and students to pursue their studies and research in scientific. technical or other subjects.

AFGHANISTAN INDIA **Date** : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

BURMA

President's Speech at Dinner in honour of General Ne Win

His Excellency General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma, accompanied by Madame Ne Win, paid a State visit to India from February 5. to February 12,

20

1965. On February 5, the President Dr. Radhakrishnan gave a dinner in honour of General Ne Win at Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Proposing toasts to General Ne Win and Madame Ne Win, President Radhakrishnan said:

General Ne Win, Madame Ne Win, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: Let me express to you on behalf of my Government and people among whom I include myself a very cordial welcome to you and the members of your party. We have been looking forward to this visit for many days and we are happy that you are able to accept our invitation and come here.

Our relations have been very close and intimate for centuries in many ways. Geographically, we are adjacent to each other. It is essential therefore, that we should develop cordial, friendly, good neighbourly relations between ourselves. Culturally there is a strong link which binds us. That is the Buddhist doctrine which has permeated Burmese life and thought. Buddhism had' its root in this country. The Budha told us to practise what he called dharma. It is both individual freedom and social justice. You may disagree with the whole world but you should not disagree with vourself. You must be loyal, steadfastly loyal to the voice, in your mind, to your conscience. That is the first thing. But then he tells also that that kind of loyalty expresses itself in love and brotherhood. It is Dharma that binds society together, that ties up individuals into nations, that ties up nations into one huge world family. We are all comrades in this common quest for human welfare and that is every nation has to regard itself as being partners, so to say, in one common task of promoting human welfare in this world.

You, Sir, in your foreign relations have been adopting a policy of non-alignment. You have been strictly nonaligned. You took some interest in mediating in the problem of the Sino-Indian dispute. You were one of the six Members of the Colombo Powers and you struggled hard so that we might get into an agreement with that country. You signed the Nuclear Test Ban Agreement also. In other words, you cannot contemplate with any equanimity the erasing of human life from the face of this earth by the development of nuclear armaments. On these great fundamentals, we are in perfect agreement.

You are trying to develop a socialistic economy in your country, trying to promote living standards. Your own career is an illustration of how deeply you felt the problems of your country. During your youth you were a youth leader. Then you became a military General, got trained in Japan and took part in the resistance movements and brought your country to independence. You were one of the steadfast workers for the independence movement. It is your deep patriotism that has enabled you to root out evil if there is any and bring about harmony out of disorder. You are drafting a new Constitution. I have no doubt that the new Constitution will give comfort to the people of your country. I should like to say if there are any differences between our two countries, I am sure they can be settled by amity, goodwill and understanding of these problems. I should like to tell you how deeply we appreciate the presence of Madame Ne Win. Well, I beg you to raise your glasses and drink to the health of General Ne Win and Madame Ne Win.

BURMA INDIA USA SRI LANKA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JAPAN

Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Reply by General Ne Win

Replying to the toast, General Ne Win said :

Mr. President, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : I feel highly honoured by the kind words that you have just spoken about me and our country. These words, as well as the most cordial welcome accorded us and the many kindnesses shown us since our arrival, testify to the goodwill and friendship of the people of India towards the people of Burma. For all this, I wish to express our sincere gratitude to you, Mr. President, and to the Government and the people of India.

The people of Burma cherish the long association between India and Burma based on their geographical proximity and their common cultural heritage. it was greatly strengthened by our common struggle for independence. Following the accession of our two countries to independence, it has been further strengthened by our mutual understanding and friendly cooperation in many fields, notably in the field of international affairs.

At a time when feverish attempts were being made to get the countries of the world into opposing Power Blocs. India and Burma, along with others, chose to follow an independent foreign policy, now generally known as the policy of nonalignment. An increasing number of newly independent countries, who cherish their national independence and who need peace to pursue their economic and social advancement, have since adopted the policy of non-alignment. This development has considerably contributed to the maintenance of international peace and security and has served the cause of friendly relations and cooperation among nation. Here, I should

21

like to pay my humble homage to the memory of a great Indian leader and a world statesman, the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, who had contributed much to the promotion of the policy of non-alignment.

Our two countries, like all developing countries, face the urgent task of raising the living standard of our peoples; and unless we succeed in this, independence will not mean much to our peoples. To achieve this objective, we may employ methods best suited to the conditions prevailing in our respective countries. These methods may not be similar, but this should not prevent us from cooperating with mutual advantage.

I am very glad to have come to India on a visit again to renew old friendships and seek new ones. I trust that our present personal contacts, friendly exchange of views on matters of mutual interest will prove to be a valuable contribution to the further strengthening of the relations of friend-: ship, mutual understanding and cooperation between our two countries.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I now request you to join me in a toast to the health and happiness of His Excellency Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India, to ever increasing welfare and prosperity of the people of India, and to everlasting friendship and understanding between India and Burma.

BURMA USA INDIA **Date** : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Joint Communique on General No Win's Visit

The following is the text of a Joint Communique between the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma, and the Prime Minister of India, issued in New Delhi on February 12, 1965 :

At the invitation of His Excellency, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India, His Excellency General Ne Win. Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma, paid a State visit to India from the 5th to the 12th February 1965. His Excellency General Ne Win was accompanied by Madame Ne Win, His Excellency Brigadier Sein Win. Member of the Revolutionary Council and Minister for Public Works and Rousing, His Excellency U Thi Han, Minister for Foreign Affairs, and officials of the Government of the Union of Burma.

The Chairman called on the President of India and also had talks with the Prime Minister of India. The talks. which were held in an atmosphere of friendliness and mutual understanding, covered matters of common interest to the two countries as well as important international issues.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister took the opportunity of informing each other of the efforts that were being undertaken in their respective countries for the improvement of the standards of living of their peoples and for economic development in accordance with their basic policies of building a society based on socialist principles.

The two leaders reaffirmed the faith of their countries in the policy of not aligning themselves with military alliances but seeking the friendship of all countries, even though they may not agree with their policies. They agreed that the policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence had made a remarkable contribution to the maintenance of world peace and to the creation of international harmony. They expressed their adherence to the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, which were further elaborated in the Declaration of the Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned Nations in October, 1964. They welcomed the growing recognition of this policy, which is pursued by most of the developing nations in Asia and Africa.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister reaffirmed the dedication of their peoples to the cause of peace and freedom in the world, and expressed their conviction that general and complete disarmament under effective international control was vitally important for the survival of mankind and peace and progress in the world. They reaffirmed their resolve to continue to cooperate towards the attainment of these objectives. In this context, they considered that the Partial Test Ban Treaty, which both Burma and India have signed along with many other countries, is an important step towards prohibition of nuclear tests and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. The two leaders noted that one of the most striking features of our age has been the reawakening of hundreds of millions of people in Asia and Africa and their struggle for political freedom and economic and social betterment. They expressed their satisfaction at the attainment of independence by an increasing number of countries in Asia and Africa, and reaffirmed the full support of their countries for those who are still struggling for their independence. They felt that their Governments and all other Governments of Asia and Africa should

22

unite their, efforts to secure the elimination of colonialism and racial discrimination from the world.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister viewed with concern the situation in South East Asia. They hoped that all concerned will bend their efforts towards finding solutions which will permit the people of Indochina, so long the victims of war and internal strife, to enjoy their independence without an interference from outside. They agreed that the Geneva Agreements concerning the States of Indochina provided a good basis for peace in Indochina and they supported the convening of Geneva type Conferences with a view to arriving at lasting solutions which would ensure peace in Indochina and in South East Asia. They also hoped that the dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia will be peacefully resolved.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister discussed the problems which have arisen in connection with the departure of a large number of persons of Indian origin from Burma. The Prime Minister noted with satisfaction the assurance of the Chairman that the nationalisation laws promulgated by the Government of Burma were non-discriminatory, and that resident foreigners who could play a useful role in the new social order that Burma is building would be given facilities to enable them to live and to work in Burma as citizens, should they so desire. The Prime Minister expressed the hope that the problems affecting such persons that have arisen in this connection would be settled between the two Governments in a spirit of mutual understanding and with sympathy. The Chairman

fully reciprocated these sentiments. The two leaders agreed that the problems should continue to be discussed between the two Governments with a view to reaching early solutions.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister agreed that the economic progress of developing countries depended largely on the adoption of modern methods of science and technology. The two leaders, conscious of the imperative need for scientific and technological advance in their respective countries, agreed that there should be close collaboration. in these fields between the two Governments. They further agreed that the facilities available for training and research In the scientific and technological institutions in either country would be made available to the maximum extent possible to the nationals of the other. The Prime Minister offered facilities for training to Burmese nationals in the Atomic Energy Establishments of the Government of India, The Chairman acknowledged the offer with appreciation.

Both leaders expressed the desire of their Governments to expand trade and commerce between the two countries. They also considered that there was scope for economic and technical as well as cultural co-operation between Burma and India. They agreed that the possibilities of collaboration in these fields and of expansion of trade should be explored by the Governments of the two countries.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister noted with satisfaction that the relations between Burma and India have always been characterised by friendliness and mutual understanding. A common outlook on international issues resulting from the pursuit of the policy of non-alignment has helped in the development of close and good neighbourly relations between the two countries. The two leaders are determined that these should be further strengthened and developed through mutual co-operation. They considered that there should be initiated a frequent exchange of visits by the Ministers and officials of the two Governments for the purpose of exchanging views on matters of common concern to both the countries.

The Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma conveyed to the Presi-

dent of India his sincere thanks for the friendly. welcome and hospitality extended to him, Madame Ne Win, and members of his party. The President of India, on behalf of the people and the Government of India, expressed great pleasure at the visit. The Chairman invited the President of India and the Prime Minister to visit Burma. The invitations were accepted with much pleasure.

BURMA INDIA LATVIA USA EGYPT CHINA SWITZERLAND INDONESIA MALAYSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

DENMARK

Agreement on Tonnage Certificates of Ships Signed

An agreement between India and Denmark on recognition of tonnage certificates of merchant ships was signed in New Delhi on February 6, 1965, Dr. Nagendra Singh, Special Secre-

23

tary, Ministry of Transport. signed On - behalf of the Government of India, and His Excellency Mr. A. Bogh Anderson, Ambassador of Denmark, for his country.

Under the agreement, India and Denmark would recognise certificates of registry or other national documents denoting tonnage of merchant ships issued by the competent authorities of the two countries. This would enable ships to enter the ports of the two countries without their being re-measured.

DENMARK INDIA Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

President's Speech at Dinner in honour of Dr. Kekkonen

His Excellency Dr. Urho Kaleva Kekkonen, President of the Republic of Finland, accompanied by Madame Kekkonen and Foreign Minister, Mr. Ahti Karjalainen, arrived in New Delhi on February 12, 1965 on a ten-day State visit to India. On February 13, the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, gave a dinner in honour of the Finnish President at Rashtrapati Bhawan.

Speaking an the occasion, President Radhakrishnan said :

Mr. President, Madame President, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : It is a great pleasure for me to express to you, Mr. President and the Members of your party a very cordial welcome of our Government and people of whom I am one. It is our earnest hope that you and the Members of your party will have an enjoyable, interesting and somewhat useful time during the few days you spend here.

There are several points of similarity between your country and ours though the size, population, etc., may be very different. You passed through a period of subjection to the Swedes for five centuries until 1809. Then you came under Russian rule and attained your independence in 1917. Thereafter, you established yourself as a parliamentary democracy. You, Mr. President, are the living symbol of the several changes through which your country passed after the second World War. You were the Minister for Justice. you were the Prime Minister and then President; you are now for the second term. You represent the leadership of your country which has exerted a great influence in the shaping of your country. As a parliamentary democracy you have allowed a number of parties to flourish. I was pleased to

hear that the Communists are 40 out of 200 and you get on wonderfully with them. That shows your diplomatic skill and adaptability. Again you have given equal rights to women. They take part in almost all undertakings including war. In war preparations also your women take an active part. Your members belong to different religious persuasions, 95% Luthren, the rest Catholic Church and the orthodox church. But you have given them complete freedom of thought, expression, belief and practice with the result that they are all dedicated to the wellbeing of your country. You have also accepted two languages, the Finnish and the Swedish. You have accepted them though swedes constitute only 7% of your population. You are interested in their well-being and in the welfare of their language, their literature, etc.

In cultural matters we are now establishing some relations. Your Government was pleased to institute four scholarships for architecture for our students who are specialising in that subject. tenable for a year. In the Nepa paper mills you have assisted us considerably and it is my hope that our relations which are tiny at the present moment will grow big, and strong in the years to come.

Most important of all, we appreciate your great interest in this policy of non-alignment. You have dissociated yourselves from any military groups. Though you have powerful neighbours like the Soviet Union on the one side and the Scandanavian on the other, you have steered a middle course between them. Both of them trust you, respect you and you have not aligned yourself with any military group. You have sent a thousand troops to Cyprus and you have a regular combat-force ready to undertake peace-keeping operations whenever necessary. You signed the Partial Nuclear Ban Treaty and in 1964 you proposed an atom-free

24

zone for your area--the Baltic area--at the same time the Soviet Premier proposed a similar free zone for the Baltic area. So you are attempting to free your country from the menace of a nuclear war. It is essential if we are to progress in this world, if we are to establish human dignity and decency that this menace should be driven out. We have power, we have resources, we have energy, we have ability and yet we are threatened by this nuclear thing. What is it due to, when all the available resources are there which will enable us to establish a world free from war, free from any kind of menace, what is it that prevents us from achieving that goal? It is nothing else than pride. love of power, love of nationality, love of aggrandisement, love of dominating other people. It is this which is there at the centre of our hearts-this natural sin this pride, so to say, which has ruined nations, which has brought individuals and nations down to the ruin whenever they fell victims to it. It is that that has to be turned out. In each man's heart, there is a living Centre, a Centre of stillness, Of sanctity, of holines, of truth, of sanity, really you have there. But in this revolving world, we forget the existence of that still, small spark. If we attend to it, if we listen to its voice, it will be possible for us to discipline ourselves and make this world a happy place for human being%.. to live in decency and dignity. What we need is self-discipline, national discipline. This are the things which we need most. And I know, Mr. President, you are interested in all that.

In that field we can all cooperate and bring about a better world. No higher purpose can be thought of for our generation. Every generation has its destiny. This particular generation is charged with the task of bringing about a world without wars. If it is possible for. us to cooperate, we should do so.

I have great pleasure, Mr. President, in proposing a toast to your health and for Indo-Finnish friendship.

FINLAND INDIA USA RUSSIA CYPRUS **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

Replying to the toast, Dr. Kekkonen said :

Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the feelings of friendship and understanding towards Finland and the Finnish people, which vou expressed in your speech, as well as for the kind words you addressed to my wife and to myself personally. I can assure you, that I was very glad to accept your invitation to visit your country. For my wife and myself, it is a deeply moving experience to see India, where an ancient ant] noble culture, its roots deep in the shadows of history, still has the strength to give creative force to the modern, present-day India. The vastness of India and the many faces of it have impressed us as they will anyone, who comes here, and I am convinced that the memories which we will bring back with us, will never fade. My visit gives me also pleasure of meeting you again, Mr. President, who in your person unite in a truly Indian manner the qualities of a statesman and a philosopher. Your visit to Finland in 1960 is vividly remembered in our country. At this moment my mind also goes back to that great Indian statesman, the late Jawaharlal Nehru, whom I met during his visit to Finland in 1957, and whose life and achievement are held in great respect by the Finnish people.

Finland and India differ in many respects. Finland is a country of a relatively modest size and population, where as it would be more fitting to describe India as a continent than a country, and where the population, composed of numerous nationalities, represents one seventh of mankind. The historical heritage of our two peoples has in many ways moulded our cultures differently. Nevertheless, far more essential are the similarities which unite us. the similarities of attitude towards the basic problems. which decisively influence the destinies of individuals and also of nations. We are united in our love of freedom, our belief in the right of all countries to judge for themselves what is best for them. But we believe that this right cannot be exercised in violation of the rights of others, that it also

entails the obligation to respect the achievement and national values of other nations. The Finnish people have followed with great admiration the persistent efforts of India to observe the principles of the peace-maker and of the international understanding so deeply rooted in the Indian national character, and so eminently personified in the late Mahatma Gandhi, whose name is indelibly written in the annals of history, The same principles are shown in Jawaharlal Nehru's whole life and his work for the cause of world peace, and his death was felt as a great loss in Finland also.

25

Also we in Finland are firmly convinced that the only basis for the relations between the nations of the world is peaceful coexistence and constructive cooperation regardless of ideological and social systems.

The efforts to lessen international tension have, during the last couple of years, led to important results. They have given rise to cautious hopes that this development would continue. We cannot, however, close our eyes to the fact, that the efforts to halt the armaments race and the further spread of nuclear weapons, which is essential for a real slackening of tension, are still a long way from their goal. As far as disarmament is concerned, we can hardly speak of any tangible results. The solution of the problem is, of course, mainly in the hands of these Great Powers, which possess the nuclear weapons, and these Powers are, in the present situation also primarily responsible for the maintenance of world peace. Nevertheless, no country has the right to keep aloof from the efforts to this end, and no country is too insignificant to be able to contribute to this cause.

As I have already stated I am convinced that between Finland and India there exists a bond of friendship based on the convictions and guiding principles we share. This gives a good basis to develop and enlarge the cooperation already so effective between our countries in the fields of art, science, technology and trade. I sincerely hope that my visit will. for its part, contribute to this end for the benefit of both countries and their peoples.

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

President Kekkonen's Speech at Dinner in honour of President Radhakrishnan

His Excellency Dr. Urho Kaleva Kekkonen, President of Finland, gave a dinner in honour of the President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, in New Delhi on February 14. 1965.

Proposing a toast to President Radhakrishnan, Dr. Kekkonen said :

It gives me great pleasure to be able to welcome you, Mr. President, and all our Indian friends, to this Finnish table tonight. My wife and I have been deeply moved by the warmth of the reception we have had in this city, and by the spontaneous friendliness we have encountered everywhere we have been in these last days. I realise that what we have seen here represents only a very small fraction of this vast country. But' I think we have seen enough to feel the strong spirit of modern India-the spirit of progress, tolerance and freedom that prevails here.

I also highly appreciate the talks we have had, Mr. President. and the exchange of. views I have had with other leading representatives of India. They have confirmed me in my belief that inspite of all the differences between our two countries, we share a common approach to the basic problems of our time, above all, the problem of maintaining peace and developing cooperation between nations. I have been strongly impressed with the earnest desire of the Indian Government to continue its constant search for peaceful solutions of international disputes and thus strengthen the basis of world peace. We, Finns, believe that by following our policy of neutrality we can best serve, not only our own national interest, but also peace and security in Northern Europe. This policy can be described very simply-its purpose is to keep Finland outside the conflicts between the Great Powers. And we have gained the recognition of the Great Powers, the Soviet Union as well as the leading Western Powers, for our neutrality.

By a policy of neutrality we do not mean withdrawal from international cooperation. Among the five Scandinavian or Nordic nations --Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden--there is the most intimate collaboration in practically all fields of human activity. And we share with you in India the desire for active support for the United Nations which we regard as a primary instrument for maintaining peace and international security.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that the neutral and the non-aligned nations have an important role to play in the efforts to secure world peace. They can by their own example demonstrate that active cooperation among all nations, regardless of ideological and other differences, is not only possible, but in conformity with the vital interests of all parties. I know that the non-aligned nations, among which India plays such a prominent part, strive through their cooperation to further the cause of peace. And you may be assured that Finland will continue to give its support to all realistic efforts towards this end.

26

Mr. President, my wife and myself, and our associates, are looking forward with keen interest to our tour of India. I know it will be an unforgettable experience. In thanking you once again, Mr. President, for your hospitality and kindness, I wish to take this opportunity to extend to you a most cordial invitation- to pay an official visit to Finland, at a time convenient to you-as long as it is not too distant. I can assure you that the Finnish people will receive you with the greatest friendship-and respect.

I wish to propose a toast to your health, Mr. President, and the further strengthening and development of friendship and cooperation between the Governments and the peoples of Finland and India.

FINLAND INDIA USA DENMARK ICELAND NORWAY **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

Reply by President Radhakrishnan

Replying to the toast, the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan said :

Mr. President, Madame President, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : I wish to assure you, Mr. President, that we heard with great pleasure that you spent a few days, just two days, this is the third day, in an interesting way in this country. It is my earnest hope that the rest of your tour will also be of some interest.

You spoke about the task assigned to our generation, building of world peace, a world community in which all the nations will be partcipating members. You showed your interest in this matter by sending an observer to the Cairo Conference of non-aligned nations. Your son visited this country to attend the World Peace Conference. That shows the interest you have both in non-alignment and world peace. Non-alignment, as you,, said, is not a negative policy. It is not an abstention. It is not isolationism. It is participation in building up a world community without becoming participants in any military bloc. That is your meaning and that is our interpretation of non-alignment. We speak so much about world peace and international cooperation but if we look around, we see the tendencies are not all very propitious. A poet wrote : "The best lack all convictions while the worst are full of passionate intensity". We

speak of world peace, world community but is there that deep concern, that burning conviction that will enable us to put world community higher than national bigotry, racial passions and religious animosities ?

It is those who are clinging to these latter, they cling to them with passionate intensity. Those who are talking about world peace do not seem to have that burning desire to subordinate all interests and work for a single world community. What is necessary is the best who lack conviction will have to be afforded scope for developing an intense desire and a sense of feeling that we belong first and foremost to humanity as a whole and the worst who are today full of bigotry, passions etc. must be educated out of them into a recognition of a world state, a world community which is the goal that we have all in view. It does not mean the obliteration of States, it means only the participation of all States in one whole, with a common loyalty and develop a sense of belonging to one purpose. That means education. In body we have grown enormously in size. By means of the machines, radio, telephone, etc., we have increased the command of our body as on nature but there has not been any equal development or enlargement of our soul. We have not expanded our vision. We have not trained ourselves to look upon this world as one and ourselves as participating limbs in that one. So it is education in that sense of enlargement of vision and the growth of wisdom. That is what we all need. The best need it, the worst need it. The best to deepen their conviction, the worst to get rid of the passionate attachment to the smaller loyalties.

In these matters, Mr. President, you and I, your country and our country both have the same objectives, have the same purposes and we wish to work, collaborate with each other in the international field to realise this purpose.

You were good enough, Mr. President, to ask me to visit your country. I appreciate your kind thought and may I assure you if and when circumstances permit, I shall avail myself of your cordial invitation.

May I now request you to drink to the health of the President of Finland, Madame President

and the Indo-Finnish Friendship and the world peace.

27

FINLAND USA EGYPT **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

Indo-Finnish Joint Communique

The following is the text of the joint communique issued in New Delhi on February 15, 1965 at the conclusion of the Finnish President's visit to India:

On the invitation of Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India, His Excellency Mr. Urho Kaleva Kekkonen, President of the Republic of Finland, and Madame Kekkonen paid-an official visit to Delhi from February 12 to 15, 1965. The President of Finland was accompanied by the Foreign Minister, Mr. Ahti Karjalainen, and other officials and advisers.

The President of Finland and his party received a warm and spontaneous welcome from the Government and people of India on their arrival. After a three-day stay in Delhi, they are visiting Agra, Bharatpur, Bangalore, Ajanta and Ellora and Bombay, to acquaint themselves with both the economic progress and the cultural heritage of India.

During their stay in Delhi, the Finnish President and Foreign Minister and the President, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of India, assisted by officials and advisers of the two Governments, had several discussions on matters of common interest. These discussions were held in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and friendship, reflecting the existing relations between the two countries.

The President of India, in welcoming the visit of the President of Finland, referred to the fact that it was the first official visit of a President of Finland to India or indeed to any part of Asia. The two Presidents noted with satisfaction the increasingly close and developing relations between the two countries in the political and economic spheres and the existence of a common approach to the basic problems of strengthening peace and international cooperation.

The two Presidents stressed the need for lessening of international tensions and for an improvement of relations among nations. It was essential, in particular, that suspicion and distrust among the Great Powers be removed.

The two Presidents re-affirmed their conviction that all disputes among states should be resolved by peaceful means and that peaceful co-existence and cooperation among states, having different social and political systems, were necessary for the creation of mutual understanding and confidence. Such understanding and confidence are an essential pre-requisite for peace, security and Progress in the world. The President of Finland recalled with appreciation the firm adherence of the Government of India to her long-standing policy of seeking solutions to her problems by peaceful means through direct negotiations.

The two Presidents emphasised the vital role of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and the promotion of international cooperation, despite difficulties and temporary set-backs, which the United Nations has recently had to face. They re-affirmed the determination of the two countries to collaborate in the strengthening of the United Nations and its ancillary bodies.

The two Presidents shared the view that neutral and non-aligned nations have a useful and active role to play, both, within and outside the United Nations, in efforts to secure peace and to strengthen international cooperation. The President of India welcomed, in particular, the positive interest shown by the Finnish Government in the deliberations of the recent Conference on non-aligned powers held in Cairo in October, 1964.

The two Presidents agreed that disarmament, both nuclear and conventional, was an essential means towards reducing the dangers of war, Nuclear disarmament was, in their opinion, a matter of paramount necessity, in view of the threat posed to the very existence of mankind. The two Presidents expressed the hope, therefore. that all nations would take immediate steps to subscribe to the Moscow Partial Test Ban Treaty of October, 1963, which could ultimately lead to the banning of all nuclear tests throughout the world.

The economic and commercial relations between the two countries were also reviewed and it was agreed that the two Governments should undertaken a thorough study of practical measures designed to increase trade between them. Steps should also be taken to strengthen technical, industrial and cultural collaboration between them. It was recognised that there is an imperative need for further cooperation among nations in order to facilitate the expansion of the exports of developing countries.

The President of Finland extended an invitation to the President of India to pay an official visit to Finland. The President of India thanked the President of Finland for his kind invitation and agreed to visit Finland at a mutually convenient date.

28

FINLAND INDIA USA EGYPT RUSSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of M. Pompidou

At the invitation of the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, M. Georges Pompidou, Prime Minister of the Republic of France, and Madame Pompidou, paid an official visit to India from February 8 to 11, 1965. The French Prime Minister was accompanied by the Foreign Minister, M. Couve de Murville.

On February 8, the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, gave a dinner in honour of the French Prime Minister at Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Proposing a toast to M. Pompidou, Shri Shastri said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, we are most delighted on your visit to our country. We are also exceedingly happy to find the gracious presence of Madame Pompidou in our midst. I also extend my hearty welcome to the Foreign Minister and others who are here.

India and France have had very old relationship and we have always remained friends. There was a time when some parts of India were under the French rule. The whole country was under the British rule. We fought for our freedom and I must say that the Britishers parted with great grace and we attained our independence. I must also pay compliments to the French Government for the way they gave up the colonies in India and they became part and parcel of our country. Since then our relations have further improved, in fact, have further strengthened and we have come much closer to each other.

Since independence our main problem is that of the development of our country, economic development. We have made considerable progress since then and yet we have to go very far. We are a poor country and we have to do our utmost to raise the "living standards of our people. We want to build up a new social order in which every man and woman will get the basic necessities of life. We believe in socialism and we do not want that there should be monopolies in our country. In fact, we desire that there should be equitable distribution of our national wealth.

We love democracy and we have a very large franchise in fact, we have adult franchise in our country. We have had three, almost, if I may say so, biggest elections in the world and millions of people have exercised their franchise in these elections. These elections have been peaceful and it has shown that democracy has got a strong foothold in India. We have as our objective democracy as well as a radical economic change so that we have political, social and economic freedom. In this process of development, France has also been very helpful in trade and commerce. We do hope that there will be further expansion and we greatly welcome the cooperation and collaboration we have received from France in connection with different projects and industries.

I am also glad to say that there is a discussion going on for a cultural agreement between France and India and I have every hope that before you leave this country this agreement will be entered into.

I am indeed happy that France which is (nit: of the oldest and one of the greatest countries of the world should have sent its Prime Minister to India and we greatly welcome this opportunity for having mutual discussions amongst us,

In international matters, we believe in peace and disarmament. I know France also believes in these objectives and both of us have to work for these objectives. it is important that countries holding different views should live together. It should be possible for them to coexist and it is therefore that we laid the utmost stress on peaceful coexistence. It is equally important that there should be reduction in conventional arms and the question of total disarmament should be earnestly pursued. It is much more important that the development of nuclear devices should come to a stop and every effort should be made for the elimination of nuclear weapons. It is important if civilisation and humanity has to live and exist.

May I thank you, Mr. Prime Minister, as representative of that great country which gave a slogan, a very old slogan of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity which had a great impact on the minds of our leaders, who fought the struggle for freedom. In fact, it was not restricted to India alone but this slogan had its impact on several countries in the world. I do hope that your short stay here will be pleasant and you will carry happy memories of this country.

May I request you, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, to drink a toast to the health of the Prime Minister of France and also of Madame Pompidou.

29

FRANCE INDIA USA OMAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

French Prime Minister's Reply

Replying to the toast, the French Prime Minister, M. Pompidou said:

Mr. Prime Minister,

I wish to thank you for your very kind words with regard to myself and to my country.

Our first meeting was originally supposed to take place in Paris, since you had accepted the French Government's invitation to stop over in our capital on your way back from London. Destiny would have it, however, that we meet on the soil of your great country.

The welcome I have received here has gone straight to my heart. Its very warmth and simplicity demonstrate, had it been necessary to do so, that we are considered 'here as friends. It is the same feeling that France has towards this Republic, sprung forth from Mahatma Gandhi's deeds and founded by Pandit Nehru.

We have successfully settled the only question arising between our countries: to incorporate the former French Establishments into the Indian Union. Would it have been possible to do that had not the relationship between the two states been mutually trustful ? Would the settlement have been fruitful had not France, under the drive of General de Gaulle, expressly embarked upon the ways of our developing modern world and accepted to forsake the last symptoms of that which was colonisation ? And, conversely; had not your own country, with its deep respect for all cultures, races and religions, understood the interest for the whole Union of having here a centre of French language and culture which, being maintained and developed. would contribute to strengthen our relationship and be of great value in the cooperation of India and France.

Such a mutual understanding became manifest in September 1962 when I had the great honour to receive Pandit Nehru in Paris. The very cordial nature of his talks with General de Gaulle as well as with myself and my colleagues in the French Cabinet brought more than ample proof of the fact that the friendship between France and India was no mere word.

It had been agreed then to increase our cooperation. This cooperation is all the more bound to be fruitful that India and France, on the whole, share the same views in world affairs. in which they both have a part to play, whether it be a matter of peaceful coexistence, more than ever necessary because of the dreadful weaponry of modem forces, or of re-establishing peace in South-East Asia, or, again, of adjusting the relationship between advanced countries and those that are developing in Asia, Africa and America. On all these counts, the aims of our two Governments are not far apart.

That is why such meetings between our Governments and statesmen are so important, in so far as they enable us to improve on our cooperation and to frankly and comprehensively exchange our views on all the important issues of concern to the world. The Indian Union and the French Republic have to bring a major contribution to their solution. May I thank you again for your welcome and drink this toast to the President of the Indian Republic, to your own health, to the friendship between India and France, to the prosperity and happiness of the Indian people.

FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM INDIA USA **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

President's speech at Luncheon in' honour of the French Prime Minister

Speaking at a luncheon given in honour of M. Georges Pompidou, Prime Minister of the Republic of France, at Rashtrapati Bhavan, on February 9, 1965, the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, said:

We are happy to have the Prime Minister of France and Madame Pompidou and the other members of the party here with us. I hope they are enjoying their stay.

France has ben the centre of great gaiety and culture. Art and culture unites us while politics and economics divide us. We Jay stress on cultural aspects of different traditions to establish unity and harmony.

If you turn to our Constitution, you will find there 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' Which are the principles of the French Revolution. We have an addition 'Justice' because we are anxious that these things should be established through the rule of law and judicial processes not through violence or strife. The end of all this is fraternity and fellowship. The nations should work together and regard themselves as members of a world fellowship. Emancipation of man-political, economic and social have been affected by the three revolutions--the French, the American and the Soviet.

If we look at the history of the world, we will find that almost all great wars were caused not by small, backward, impoverished nations of the world but by the great powers which are scientifically well developed and equipped with modern resources. What is happening today in Vietnam is a fight between great Powers, and the people of Vietnam-North and South-are, victims of it. It is my earnest hope that the great Powers will settle this problem in equity and friendship and leave the Vietnamese people alone and safe.

FRANCE USA VIETNAM **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Reply by the French Prime Minister

Replying to President Radhakrishnan, the French Prime Minister said:

Mr. President,

That India's President be a philosopher is in full accordance with tradition in a country where things of the-spirit were always given unquestioned preeminence. There would be no need for me to recall Ashoka, your great Emperor, and his decrees engraved on columns, an element of which still adorns the National Emblem.

More than Moghul Emperors, whose deeds are told by frescoes in this palace and whose forts and tombs stand in this capital, the teachings of this illustrious and remote predecessor, I am sure, inspire your conduct and actions. Does not your every word bear witness to your care to accord politics and philosophy?

Recently, you have noted that we have to face the catastrophe of a world full of knowledge but unbalanced because it is lacking moral Wisdom. Then, in Nagpur, you demanded from the Great Powers, since they have the means to destroy them, that they ensure the security of the world and the protection of lesser States. In other words, you are firmly convinced that states may not evade ethical laws and that the possession of rights, in order to be justified, must be compensated by the consciousness of duties.

Who would dare question such a profession of faith ? France, whose history and culture count many of the most famous moralists in the Western World, France can but endorse it. And she proves it in her policy vis-a-vis her former colonies that she has all led to independence and also young nations less favoured than herself. Of course. France follows this policy because she believes it to be in the interest of world equilibrium and in her own that wealthy nations help hungry ones to live. But she does it also because she is France, that is to say the heir to values thousands of years old and to a culture which has always proclaimed the primacy of man and spirit. "Humani nihil a me alienum puto", said the Latin poet Terentius, nearly 2,000 years ago. Beyond centuries and oceans, to these words respond your own, which you spoke last December to the International Geological Congress, when you alluded to "the state called Ananda in sacred scriptures, where man reaches freedom of the spirit and contemplates all mankind in a spirit of kinship", as the ideal to be reached by us. That is the final answer to be given by man to man, by ethics to science, as alreday expressed by Rabelais five hundred years ago when, aware of the danger in scientific discoveries, he declared: "Science without conscience is but ruin for the soul".

Should I insist, therefore, on how strongly France is attached with all her heart and reason. to keeping "peace on earth unto men of good will". When receiving the wishes of the Diplomatic Corps on January 1st, General de Gaulle has firmly stated that "never before did peace appear so necessary for our world as to-day". And he stressed that "it was especially true with regard to emerging states whose life and progress demand that they enjoy the right of self-determination and may organise themselves and develop notwithstanding external conflicts of interests or ideologies".

Mr. President, how could we fail to see that our two countries, already fraternally united by the traditional links of diplomacy and the more modem ones of cooperation, furthermore profess the same faith in the highest spiritual values ? While conveying to you the greetings of General de Gaulle, President of the French Republic, I drink this toast to the harmonious prosperity in peace through progress of the Indian Nation.

31

FRANCE INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Joint Communique on French Prime Minister's Visit

The following is the text of a joint communique between the Prime Minister of France and the Prime Minister of India, issued in New Delhi on February 10, 1965:

On the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, the Prime Minister of France and Madame Pompidou paid an official visit to New Delhi from 8 to 11 February 1965. The French Prime Minister was accompanied by the Foreign Minister. M. Couve de Murville, and their officials and advisers. During their stay in Delhi, the), were received in audience by the President of India, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan.

The two Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers, and the Indian Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, assisted by the officials and advisers of the two Governments, had several detailed discussions on matters of common interest. These discussions were conducted in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and friendship which reflects the relations between the two countries.

The Prime Minister of India, in welcoming M. Pompidou's visit, referred to the fact that it was the first official visit of a Prime, Minister of France to India. The Prime Minister of France thanked the Indian Prime Minister for his invitation and said he was happy to find himself on Indian soil and to have had this opportunity of acquainting himself personally with India. The two Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the increasingly close and developing relations between their two countries in the political, economic and cultural spheres and the existence of a common approach to many questions. The Prime Ministers emphasised the community of ideas and interests which bind the two countries together, in particular, their attachment to democratic institutions.

The Prime Ministers expressed their determination to cooperate in the maintenance and promotion of world peace. They discussed the different issues which threatened peace and international security and the methods of dealing with them. In this context, they considered the problems of disarmament, the role of the United Nations and the need for seeking peaceful solutions to all outstanding problems.

The Prime Minister noted with particular concern the deteriorating situation in Indo-China and agreed that it required the effort of all the parties concerned to seek and try for a political rather than a military solution. The Prime Minister of France noted with interest the statement issued by the Government of India on 8 February 1965 on the subject of Vietnam.

With reference to Kashmir and other related matters the Prime Minister of India emphasised that it has always been the policy of the Government of India to strive for the creation of an atmosphere of understanding, tranquillity and peace. The two Prime Ministers stressed that a peaceful and equitable solution should be found in a calm and friendly atmosphere through direct negotiations. The economic and commercial relations between the two countries were reviewed. It was agreed that trade between them should expand. It had been recognised in the GATT and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development that the expansion of exports from developing countries necessarily led to larger imports from developed countries. Joint machinery already exists between France and India for reviewing trade, and it was agreed that efforts should be made on both sides to further develop trade between the two countries and, in particular, facilitate the increase of Indian exports.

The Prime Minister of India expressed appreciation of the financial assistance being afforded by France to India's development plans, both through the Aid India Consortium and outside it. The Prime Minister of France assured the Indian Prime Minister of, France's continuing interest in providing assistance to India and noted the great effort being made to achieve development through planning. He added that France was collaborating with India in some of her projects and would be prepared to consider the widening of the area of this collaboration in the context of India's Fourth Five-Year Plan.

The Prime Minister noted that a cultural agreement between the countries is now under discussion and will be concluded shortly. The agreement will include provision for scientific and technological co-operation. They agreed that the present arrangements for such co-operation and for cultural exchanges need to be enlarged in scope and size. There already exist centres and institutions in both countries which are devoted to acquainting the respective peoples with each other's culture, civilization and languages, and the Prime Ministers are confident that these will serve as suitable basis for the Promotion of a real understanding between the two peoples.

32

The Prime Minister agreed that the two Governments should henceforward have regular periodical consultations in Paris or in New Delhi at appropriate levels, including those of Ministers whenever possible, on political as well as all other matters of mutual interest. They are confident that such consultations will lead to a continuance of their understanding of each other's points of view on various questions and to even wider co-operation.

FRANCE INDIA USA CHINA VIETNAM **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

French Prime Minister's Farewell Message

The following is the text of the farewell message sent by the French Prime Minister M. Pompidou to the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, on the eve of his departure from India:

At the time of leaving the soil of the Indian Union I would Re to communicate to your Excellency my warmest gratitude for the most cordial welcome which you have extended to me. Our meetings have greatly contributed to reaffirm the ties of traditional friendship between our two countries. Despite the shortness of my stay I have been able to appreciate the great courtesy of the Indian people, the exceptional richness of their artistic creations and the extent and diversity of their modern achievements. I leave India even more convinced of the importance of the contributions which your large magnificient country has made to the building of the world of tomorrow. My wife and I send you expressions of our most cordial considerations.

FRANCE INDIA **Date** : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

GREECE

Letters renewing Trade Agreement Exchanged

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on February 25, 1965 between Shri D. S. Joshi, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, and Mr. George Warsami, Ambassador of Greece, extending the validity of the Trade Agreement between India and Greece up to the end of December, 1965.

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

The principal items of export from India to Greece are jute products, iron ore and concentrates, coffee, coir products and spices. Imports into India include gum resin, abrasives and cinematograph films (exposed).

GREECE INDIA Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

GREECE

Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation Signed

A comprehensive agreement for the avoidance of double taxation of income between India and Greece was signed in New Delhi on February 11, 1965. The Greek Ambassador to India, Mr. G. Warsami, and Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Deputy Minister of Finance, signed it on behalf of their respective Governments.

The agreement is based on the principles followed by India in similar agreements with other countries. It will come into force after it has been ratified by both governments and a notification issued by the Government of India.

Similar agreements have been signed with 8 countries : Ceylon, Denmark, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Norway, Pakistan and Sweden. An agreement limited to income from operations of aircraft has been signed with Switzerland. Draft agreements have been initialled with France and U.A.R.

33

GREECE INDIA DENMARK FINLAND GERMANY JAPAN NORWAY PAKISTAN SWEDEN SWITZERLAND FRANCE

Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, delivered the following address to the Members of Parliament on February 17, 1965 :

Members of Parliament,

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

During the year which has just ended the nation went through its severest trial in recent years when the people lost their beloved leader Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, their friend, philosopher and guide. There were other stresses and strains also. We were greatly distressed by the serious loss of life and property unfortunately caused in South India by unprecedented cyclonic conditions. Relief measures were promptly, taken. Some of our difficulties continue and we have to face them with courage and determination. At the same time the country has made significant progress in many directions.

Looking back on the past twelve months, notice can be taken of several achievements which should inspire hope and confidence. National income had increased at the rate of only 2.5 per cent per annum during the first two years of the Third Plan. In 1963-64, with an increase of 9.2 per cent in industrial output, the figure rose to 4.3 per cent. An increase of about 8 per cent in industrial production is expected during the current year.

Many public sector undertakings in which heavy investments have made during the Third Plan, have commenced production. They include the Heavy Engineering Plant at Ranchi, the Mining Machinery Plant at Durgapur, the Refinery at Barauni and the Machine Tool Factories at Pinjore and Kalamasseri. Although production in some of these establishments is still at a pilot stage, we can look forward to a steady increase in their contribution to our economic development in the years to come.

In power and transport, the country his been making steady progress. The number of electrified villages has gone up from 4,002 at the beginning of the First Plan to nearly 40,000. Power generation by the end of the Third Plan is expected to amount to 11.7 million k.w. as against 5.6 million k.w. at the end of the Second Plan. Shipping tonnage at about 1.4 trillion GRT has already exceeded the Third Plan target. Railways have adequate capacity to meet our current needs and further development is in progress.

New oil discoveries were made in Gujarat and Assam and India has secured rights of exploration in the off shore islands of Iran. New and workable deposits of uranium have been found and our reserves of uranium are substantial. A Plutonium Plant, entirely designed and built by the scientists and engineers of the Trombay Establishment is now in operation. The construction of Atomic Power Stations at Tarapur and Rana Partap Sagar has commenced. The use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes will steadily expand in the future based increasingly on indigenous supplies, technology and research.

Another significant feature has been the greater availability of certain consumer goods of interest to the common man. The production of millmade cloth alone rose by another 210 million meters in 1964.

As you are aware, the production of foodgrains did not show any appreciable increase during the three preceding years. In a number of States the availability of foodgrains became inadequate and there were periods of deep anxiety. To meet the situation the import of foodgrains was increased and other measures were taken to ensure as equitable a distribution of the available supplies as possible. There has recently been some easing of the situation and food prices have registered some decrease. Government are keeping a close watch on the situation and they propose shortly to. review the food distribution policy.

Apart from the measures adopted to deal with the food problem that emerged in recent months, a long term policy of increasing food production has been adopted. A number of steps have already been taken and some are in the process of implementation. The farmer has been assured of minimum prices which have been fixed at economic levels and an Agricultural Prices Commission has been set up to keep the situation tinder constant review. Special attention is being given to the timely supply of fertilizers and other requirements to the farmer. Quick maturing minor irrigation schemes will be implemented on a priority basis.

We are beginning this year with the biggest Kharif harvest on record. The Rabi crop also

34

is expected to be appreciably better than in previous years. With these favourable trends and the efforts being made to increase production, our Government are taking all possible steps to achieve long term stability in agricultural prices. To guard against all eventualities, however, a programme of building up buffer stocks in the country out of domestic production and imports has been formulated. The Food Corporation, which has been set up in the public sector will help to ensure orderly marketing and check anti-social trends in the trading community.

In the industrial sector, although our past record is an impressive one, a fresh momentum is required. This is necessary not only in the interest of stability of prices, but even more for accelerated growth.

While higher production is the best answer to the threat of inflation, the monetary pressures on the price level and on our external payments cannot be ignored. Part of this pressure comes from unaccounted and undisclosed money. Stringent measures are being taken to unearth such money and there can be no relenting in this effort. At the same time, those who are prepared to mend their ways and make a full disclosure of their illegal earnings, should be encouraged to do so.

Further, our Government have already announced that there will be no more deficit financing. This will necessitate curtailment of public expenditure. The expansion of bank credits will also have to be kept in check. A tighter monetary discipline is essential not only to achieve stability of prices but also to secure a better balance between our imports and exports.

In recent months, Government have had to make substantially large repayments of loans and interest and also to pay large amounts for imports. This has led to a decline in our reserves of foreign exchange despite an increase of nearly 50 crores of rupees in our export earnings during 1964. Measures for remedying the situation are being considered by Government.

We are now engaged in the formulation of the country's Fourth Five Year Plan. This will be a crucial task. It will cover a vital period. A memorandum on the Plan has been considered by the National Development Council and has been laid on the Table of Parliament. The most important objective of the Fourth Five Year Plan would be a substantially higher rate of growth with the most effective utilisation of resources. For this task, the Government propose to strengthen the machinery of planning. Emphasis in the Plan will be on agriculture, a balanced development of heavy and other industries, creation of large employment opportunities, advancement of the rural sector and. narrowing down of social and economic disparities. Special attention is proposed to be given to schemes which will mature quickly. We, have to aim at a minimum level of living for every family in this vast country. The implementation of such a Plan will need a dedicated and sacrificial response from ail sections of society. I am sure such a response will be forthcoming under your guidance.

Public sector Projects will be implemented with greater speed and they will be designed to give quick returns to the community in the shape of production and profits. Advance action in respect of many Fourth Plan projects will be taken in the course of this year. To meet shortages in the supply of cement, a Corporation for the production of cement has been set up in the public sector. The role of the private sector in the Fourth Plan will also be important. It will be Government's endeavour to provide reasonable facilities to the private sector to enable it to fulfil its assigned role efficiently and effectively.

The importance of accelerating the rate of growth in both agriculture and industry is heavily underlined by the increase in our population. Between 1951 and 1961, the population of the country increased from 360 million to 440 million. At the present rate of growth, the population will be 490 million by the end of the Third Plan and 550 million by the end of the Fourth Plan. Family Planning has become an urgent necessity for the nation. An integrated family planning service, involving family planning and maternity and child welfare measures, has been evolved. About 12,000 Family Planning Centres have already been set up.

Sound planning is extremely important. It is, however, the result that matters so far as the common man is concerned and results can be obtained in a satisfactory manner only if the administrative machinery for the implementation of plans and policies functions with efficiency, speed and integrity. Improvement of the administrative machinery will, therefore, be one of the principal objectives of Government's endeavours.

The Government are conscious of the need to expand and improve the social services, particu-

larly for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. An Educational Commission has been set up to advise the Government on the national pattern of education at different stages. Steps are being taken to expand the housing programme through allotment of more funds and by coordinated action for which Housing Boards are being set up. It is also proposed to make land available at reasonable rates to lower income groups.

Our Government attach the greatest importance to the maintenance of industrial peace

35

through the code of discipline and through the various instruments of negotiation, conciliation and adjudication which exist. Fullest attention is also tieing paid to measures to promote labour welfare by setting up new Wage Boards for industries and deciding on the recommendations of the Bonus Commission, and by the establishment of consumer co-operatives and fair price shops in industrial establishments and the expansion of the workers' education programme. It is unfortunate that industrial relations in certain sectors during 1964 were sowewhat disturbed. It is our Government's earnest hope that both employers and employees will recognise the supreme importance of maximising output by working together with a sense of national purpose.

We are greatly distressed by the events in South India. We deplore the acts of violence which have occurred, and extend our deep sympathy to those who have suffered, Doubts about the language issue seem to have agitated the minds of the people there. We wish to state categorically that the assurances given by the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and re-affirmed by our Prime Minister will be carried out without qualification and reservation. This is essential for the unity of the country. While Hindi is the official language of the Union, English will continue to be an associate official language. This will continue as long as the non-Hindi speaking people require it. We earnestly hope that this will allay me apprehensions of the people and lead them to return to their normal work. Members of Parliament will no doubt consider this whole policy which has been affirmed and re-affirmed often, in all its aspects, legal, administrative and executive. The Chief Ministers will be meeting

at an early date to consider the situation.

The Chinese threat on our Northern borders continues unabated. To strengthen our defences, a Five-Year Defence Plan covering the years 1964 to 1969 is being implemented. New Divisions are being raised and equipped according to schedule. The output of Ordnance Factories. last year was nearly double of what it was three years ago. Our Air Force is being expanded to provide better protection against hostile air attacks and ground and logistical support to our troops. Steps to strengthen our Naval defences have also been initiated.

The increase in defence expenditure imposes an additional burden on the community and diverts our resources from development. We are not engaged in an arms race with any country At the same time, we are determined to be strong enough to repel any attack On our borders.

The explosion of a nuclear device by China has shocked peace-loving people all over the world. Another explosion in China may not be far off. We have decided that despite this development, we shall not embark on the manufacture or atomic weapons. We shall, instead, continue to strive for international understanding which will eliminate the threat of nuclear war.

Our relations with countries near and far, large and small, in the East and in the West, continue to be friendly. Only China continues to adopt a hostile attitude. There has also been unfortunately no improvement in our relations with Pakistan.

Non-alignment and co-existence remain the essential planks of our foreign policy. We have always firmly believed that peace is essential for the progress of mankind. It is even more necessary for the developing nations of the world who have to tackle enormous problems. For these reasons and because of our natural interest in our neighbourhood, we have felt greatly concerned over the recent events in South-East Asia. Our Government have suggested that a Geneva type conference should be held early, to arrest the dangerous trends which have been developing in Vietnam, in particular, so that a political solution to the problem can be found. We are also in touch with friendly countries in regard to this matter.

The election of Mr. Harold Wilson as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, of Mr. Kosygin as the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and of Mr. Johnson as the President of the U.S.A. have been significant events. All the three leaders are old friends of India. For the first time, a French Prime Minister has visited India and understanding between the two countries has grown as a result. The visits to our country of the Prime Minister of Ceylon, the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Burma, the King of Bhutan, Their Majesties the King and Queen and the Foreign Minister of Nepal bear testimony to the growth of friendship between India and her neighbours. We have also had the privilege of welcoming Their Majesties the King and Queen of Belgium, the President of the Republic of Iraq, the President of the Supreme Council for the Armed Forces of the Republic of Sudan, the President of Finland, the Prime Minister of Singapore, the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Kuwait and the Premier of Mauritius.

Special mention has also to be made of the visit of His Holiness Pope Paul VI who came to Bombay in December 1964 to participate in the Eucharistic Congress. In the spirit of our traditions, people belonging to all religions gave him a rousing reception during his short stay in the country.

As a nation fundamentally opposed to colonialism. we have rejoiced in the emergence

36

of Malawi, Malta and Zambia as sovereign countries. Tomorrow, the Gambia will be a welcome addition to this list.

During the past year, I paid State visits to the U.S.S.R. and Eire. The warm reception I had in both these countries was an ample tribute to the goodwill that exists for India and her people in these countries.

The Prime Minister led the Indian delegation to the Conference of Non-aligned Nations at Cairo. A fundamental unity and similarity of approach manifested itself in the Conference and gave overwhelming evidence of the continuing validity and relevance of the policy of non-alignment. Twenty-two Bills are already before the Parliament for your consideration. Among the new Bills which the Government propose to introduce during the year, are the following :

(i) The Payment of Bonus Bill. (ii) The Factories (Amendment) Bill. (iii) The Import and Export Control (Amendment) Bill. (iv) The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill. (v) The All-India Handloom Board Bill. (vi) The Seamen's Provident Fund Bill. (vii) The Rice Milling Industry (Regulation) Amendment Bill. (viii) The Patents Bill. Ox) The Income Tax (Amendment) Bill.

A statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the financial year 1965-66 will be laid before you.

Members of Parliament, you have a full and strenuous programme ahead of you. The development of a prosperous socialist society and the expansion of friendly co-operation with other nations of the world remain the basis of our policies. Our objectives are known and our goals are clear. To their attainment you 'have to guide the nation with unflinching faith and firm resolve.

USA INDIA IRAN LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA RUSSIA PAKISTAN SWITZERLAND VIETNAM BHUTAN BURMA NEPAL BELGIUM IRAQ SUDAN FINLAND REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE KUWAIT MAURITIUS MALAWI MALTA ZAMBIA THE GAMBIA EGYPT

Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Speech in the General Assembly on U.N. Peace-keeping Operations

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations. made the following statement in the General Assembly on February 10, 1965 on the U.N. peace-keeping operations:

Mr. President,

My Delegation is extremely concerned at the course the events have taken since the beginning of the session and the steps which appear to be now under consideration. The situation continues to deteriorate and today the very future of the United Nations appears to be in danger. Our worst fears are being justified. This Assembly cannot be oblivious to the voices which are being raised outside seeking to exploit, the situation and to denigrate the United Nations and all that it stands for. I feel it is time to take stock of the situation so that no incalculable damage is caused to our organization.

Our declared aim has been to uphold the letter and the spirit of the Charter and to maintain the authority of the United Nations. What we see, however, is that many articles have been violated at least in spirit, the Assembly is paralysed and its authority weakened. In an attempt to deprive some members of their vote, the entire membership has been deprived of its vote.

I do not wish at this stage to raise the question of whether or nor article 19 is applicable in the case of these members who for political reasons found themselves unable to share the cost of U.N. peace-keeping operations in the Congo and Gaza. The views of my Delegation have already been expressed elsewhere and we stand by them. We are anxious to avoid a confrontation and therefore I am not going to go into the substantive question. The need to-day, as on December 1, is still for a compromise and not for confrontation.

On the other hand, I must clearly state That in our anxiety to avoid a confrontation in the interests of the organisation, we should not adopt a course of action which might equally damage the Organisation.

The Afro-Asian group had suggested a formula which would have enabled the 19th session to continue normally and at the same time fully respected the juridicial stand of all member states with regard to the question. Simultaneously, an attempt was to be made to find a solution to the financial as well as to the political and constitutional aspects of the problem of peacekeeping machinery in future. I wonder whether there is still time to retrace the course of our action and consider a solution on these lines. I repeat without prejudice to the legal stand taken by different member states. The Secretary Gene-Pal speaking on February 8 said :

"I believe, Mr. President, that at the present stage the general feeling amongst Delegations is favourable to the Assembly recessing once it has agreed upon the machinery for the comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects, and after having disposed of the important items to which I referred at the last meeting. The Assembly could, of course, be reconvened as soon as the machinery thus set up for the review of peacekeeping operations has been able to report a substantial measure of agreement on the point at issue."

We had consistently maintained that it is more a political than a financial- crisis and this view now seems to be generally accepted. How else can one justify a long recess except on the basis that there is no immediate financial crisis and as such we can wait for sonic more months? My Delegation has serious doubts whether further adjournment woud necessarily bring about a solution of the crisis facing us. At any rate, before we can give thought to the question of adjournment, we would at least like to know what this machinery would be and what would be its terms of reference. Then alone the General Assembly will be in a position to decide whether an adjournment would indeed be fruitful.

To sum up, we wish to record our concern at the way, this Assembly has functioned so far and in the manner we have tackled the problem before us. We feel that the Afro-Asian proposal could have been given a much more careful consideration than it received. In any case, we hope that the Assembly will not decide to adjourn before the modalities for further negotiations and discussions have been properly worked

INDIA USA CONGO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Joint Communique on Nepal Foreign Minister's Visit

The following is the text of a joint communique issued on the occasion of the visit to India of His Excellency Shri Kirti Nidhi Bist, Vice Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Foreign Minister of Nepal, from January 25 to February 7, 1965 :

At the invitation of the Minister of External Affairs in the Government of India, Sardar Swaran Singh, His Excellency Shri Kirti Nidhi Bist, Vice Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Foreign Minister of His Majesty's Government of Nepal paid a visit to India from January 25 to February 7, 1965. After a short stay in New Delhi, his Excellency the Foreign Minister, accompanied by the Royal Nepalese Ambassador to India and officers of His Majesty's Government visited some development projects and industrial establishments and other places of interest in India.

While in New Delhi, His Excellency Shri Kirti Nidhi Bist witnessed the Republic Day celebrations on January 26. He was received by the President and had a friendly and informal exchange of views with the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the Commerce-Minister of India on Subjects of mutual interest to the two countries.

The talks between His Excellency, the Foreign Minister and the Indian Minister of External Affairs covered a wide variety of subjects of interest and concern to the governments and peoples of India and Nepal. The two Ministers exchanged views about the current international situation as it affects India and Nepal. Questions pertaining to the maintenance and strengthening of world peace, with special emphasis on developments in Asia and South-East Asia figured prominently in these talks, which were marked by cordiality and understanding and a broad measure of unity and identity of purpose and approach which characterise the relations between Nepal and India.

38

Various aspects of Nepal's development programmes and India's economic and technical assistance and cooperation in His Majesty's Government's endeavours to accelerate the pace of Nepal's economic and industrial progress and social advancement were also discussed between the two Ministers. His Excellency the Foreign Minister mentioned His Majesty's Government's desire for India's cooperation and assistance, in appropriate ways, to ensure further progress on the Karnali Hydel Project. His excellency also raised the question of the free flow of goods manufactured by Nepal's newly established industries into India. The Minister of External Affairs re-assured His Excellency of India's desire and anxiety to extend cooperation and assistance to His Majesty's Government in all possible ways. It was agreed that the manner and extent to which the two countries could cooperate in carrying forward the work on the Karnali Project should be discussed between the experts of the two countries at a suitable time. The Minister of External Affairs further suggested that the two Governments should jointly consider ways and means of harnessing, to the maximum advantage of both countries, the natural resources of which they are joint beneficiaries.

His Excellency the Foreign Minister recalled the traditional bonds, of fraternal kinship between the two countries and gave expression to the determination of the Government and people of Nepal under the leadership of His Majesty, the King to nurse and strengthen these historic ties in all possible ways. The Minister of External Affairs reciprocated these sentiments on behalf of the Government and people of India and further assured His Excellency of India's abiding interest in the welfare, progress and prosperity of Nepal. The Minister of External Affairs gave expression to Government of India's gratification that it had been possible for His Excellency, the Foreign Minister of Nepal to visit India and hoped that other Nepalese dignitaries would also visit India from time to time as these visit help further strengthen the cooperation and the most cordial and friendly relations subsisting between the Governments and peoples of Nepal and India.

NEPAL INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

VIETNAM

Statement by Government of India on Developments in Vietnam

The following is the text of the statement issued by the Government of India in New Delhi on February 8, 1965 regarding the developments in Vietnam :

The Government of India have learnt with grave concern of the developments in South Vietnam and North Vietnam within the last two days, which create danger of a full-scale war in Vietnam with disastrous consequences. As an Asian country in this region, these developments are a source of great anxiety to the Government and people of India.

For the sake of peace in Asia and the world, a war in Vietnam must be avoided. All countries which are peace-loving should immediately bend their efforts to ensure that there is no escalation of conflict and that steps are initiated immediately which will lead to a' peaceful solution of the problem of Vietnam and enable the people of Indo-China States, as envisaged in the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962, to enjoy their independence without interference from any quarters.

It is obvious that in Vietnam one thing has led to another, and there has been interference from many quarters. The Government of India consider that as a first step there should be an immediate suspension of all provocative action in South Vietnam as well as in North Vietnam by all sides involved in the Vietnam situation, and nothing should be done to aggravate the situtation. This will create the necessary atmosphere for the immediate convening of a Genevatype Conference for Vietnam, which the Government of India consider as essential for a peaceful and enduring solution to the problem of Vietnam.) The convening of a new Conference on Indo-China would be in conformity with the Declaration of the Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned Nations in October. 1964.

The Government of India make an earnest appeal to all concerned for the creation of the necessary atmosphere which would enable a Geneva type of conference to be held with the least possible delay.

39

VIETNAM INDIA USA CHINA SWITZERLAND EGYPT **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

VIETNAM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Developments in Vietnam

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on February 25, 1965, in reply to a calling-attention notice regarding the Developments in Vietnam :

As the House is aware, certain serious incidents

took place in Vietnam during the second week of this month, which have been fully reported in the newspapers. These incidents have created danger of a full-scale war in Vietnam with disastrous consequences.

In a joint announcement issued at Saigon on 7 February 1965 the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and the United States Government, announced that military action had been taken against military installations in North Vietnam. A communique issued by the Ministry of Defence of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on 7 February 1965 protested against the unjustified air raids launched by the American forces. The International Control Commission is considering these and other documents issued by both the parties.

On 8 February 1965, the Government of India issued a statement expressing its grave concern at the developments in Vietnam. We consider that as a first step there should be an immediate suspension of all provocative actions in Vietnam by all sides involved in the situation and that nothing should be done to aggravate the situation. What is necessary is that the principal powers concerned should get together in search for a peaceful solution of the Vietnam problem. In the present situation prevailing in Vietnam, when the risk of confrontation between various powers has increased, the convening of a Geneva-type Conference on Vietnam has become a matter of urgency. We are in touch with a number of friendly countries in this matter. We are convinced that there can be no military solution to the problem of Vietnam and that patient efforts must be made to seek a political solution and also towards strengthening the machinery for controlling the implementation of the Geneva Agreement.

In this connection I would like to inform the House of certain recent developments regarding the functioning of the International Control Cornmission in Vietnam. On 13 February, 1965, the Hanoi authorities requested the International Commission to withdraw its Fixed Teams in North Vietnam, as they were unable to ensure the security of the members of the Commission Teams due to the bombing and strafing raids by the U.S.A. and South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese reiterated their demand for the withdrawal of the Teams leaving no option to the I.C.C. except to withdraw the teams. The Commission's Fixed Teams in North Vietnam were withdrawn-three teams on the night of the 20th/21st February and two on the following day. Thus by the 22nd all the teams had been withdrawn to Hanoi from their locations in North Vietnam.

As an Asian country of this region we can only view the serious developments in Vietnam with grave concern. We would like to see the people of Vietnam enjoy their freedom and independence without any interference from outside, from any quarters whatsoever. We hope that all powers who are interested in the freedom and independence of Vietnam will make sincere efforts to find a political solution of Vietnam and will arrest the present situation, which is a danger to world peace, from deteriorating any further. To this end the parties concerned should get together in a con-ference and try to solve the problem peacefully.

VIETNAM USA INDIA SWITZERLAND **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

VIETNAM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on withdrawal of International Control Commission Teams from North Vietnam

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, placed on the table of the Rajya Sabha on February 25, the following statement on the withdrawal of the International Control Commission Teams from North Vietnam :

Under the Geneva Agreement for Vietnam of 1954 fixed teams each composed of the three delegations constituting the I.C.S.C. were located in North and South Vietnam for supervising the execution of the Agreement. In addition to these fixed teams mobile teams were also operative for carrying out similar controls over other parts of the territory of the PAVN and the SVN. One of the specific tasks of these teams was to control and report on any unauthorised import of war material and equipment as well as ether violations of the provisions of the Geneva Agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.

These teams were accordingly set up at ports, frontier points, and similar strategic locations.

40

Mobile elements of thew teams or other mobile teams made controls in more distant parts of both the territories.

Till recently there were five fixed teams in the territory of the DRVN and five in SVN together with separate mobile teams to cover the demilitarized zone.

Under the Geneva Agreement the fixed and mobile teams of the I.C.S.C. constitute the most importint basis and apparatus for the work of the I.C.S.C. in Vietnam. The logistic requirements and the security of all personnel and particularly I.C.S.C. fixed teams in Vietnam is the responsibility of the parties concerned that is to say North Vietnam and South Vietnam.

On the 13th of February 1965 HANOI Radio broadcast that it had requested the International Commission to withdraw its fixed teams in North Vietnam owing to the DRVN authorities' inability to ensure the security of the members of the I.C.S.C. fixed teams in North Vietnam due to the bombing and strafing raids by the U.S. and the SVN. The DRVN however reiterated its intention to respect and implement the Geneva Agreement.

The Government of India viewed this request with considerable concern as it meant the withdrawal of an important part of the Commission's work and apparatus from the whole territory of North Vietnam. The Government of India naturally expect that in the duties of peace-keeping in Vietnam its officers will face certain risks which have to be taken in the wider interests involved.

Under the Geneva Agreement it is laid down that fixed teams shall be located at stipulated

places and that any alteration in these locations will be agreed to both by the party concerned and the International Commission. This in fact is the only provision in the Geneva Agreement on Vietnam which refers to alterations in the location of the fixed teams. In view of the far-reaching character of the step proposed which could conceivably amount to a cessation of a major part of the work of the Commission in North Vietnam the Government of India felt that the matter should be reconsidered not only by the party concerned but also by the members of the Geneva Conference through the Co-Chairmen.

The Government of India's views were pressed in proper quarters and in the I.C.S.C. which has been in touch with the DRVN authorities on this matter. The DRVN authorities reiterated their demand and their reasons for it leaving no option to the I.C.S.C. Three fixed teams were withdrawn on the night of 20/21 February and the other two were withdrawn on the following day. Thus by 22nd February all the five fixed teams of the I.C.S.C. have been withdrawn to Hanoi from their locations in North Vietnam. The Government of India views this withdrawal as purely temporary and expresses the earnest hope, that the DRVN authorities will in the light of prevailing circumstances and their announced intention of the correct implementation of the Geneva Agreement see their way to ensuring security sufficiently for the teams to return to their most important functions under the Geneva Agreement as early as possible. In the meanwhile the Government of India hope that mobile teams will be allowed to continue their operations as required.

41

VIETNAM SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA INDIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1965

March

Volume No

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vol. XI MARCH

No. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Mr. Lenart 43 Czechoslovak Prime Minister's Reply

44

Indo-Czechoslovak Joint Communique

- 44
- Indo-Czechoslovak Agreements on New Projects Signed 46
- INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the Security Council on Constitutional Changes in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir

46

- Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the Security Council on Sino-Pakistan Border Agreement
 - 48

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on Pakistan Rangers' intrusions

in Kutch 49

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Concentration of Pakistani

Forces near Dahagram 51 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Dahagram Enclave 52 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Dahagram Enclave 54

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Developments oil Cooch-Behar Border

56

SPAIN

1995

Indo-Spanish Agreement on Development of Atomic Energy 58

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Indo-Soviet Agreement on Bokaro Project 58

VIETNAM Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Use of Gas in South Vietnam 63

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA PAKISTAN USA SPAIN VIETNAM

Date : Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Mr. Lenart

His Excellency Mr. Jozef Lenart, Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, accompanied by Madame Lenart and the Foreign Minister, Mr. V. David arrived in New Delhi on March 2, 1965 on a five-day State visit to India. On March 2, the Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri gave a dinner in honour of the Czechoslovak Prime Minister at Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Welcoming the distinguished guest, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : I feel honoured to extend to Your Excellency a cordial welcome as well as to Madame Lenart. I am also very glad that your Foreign Minister, Mr. David and his wife have also been able to come here. India and Czechoslovakia have had very old relationship. They had come closer to each other long, long back, I mean about a century before. It was in Czechoslovakia that quite a large number of people learned Sanskrit and propagated it in other European countries. Professor Hindsay came to India and delivered lectures in Santiniketan, a great scholar of Sanskrit as he was. Our distinguished leader and one of the greatest figures India has produced, Shri Rabindranath Tagore went to Prague twice and delivered speeches there. Our late Prime Minister, one of the greatest sons of India, also visited Czechoslovakia twice. We have during the last ten or fifteen years drew closer and have come hearer. Our trade between the two countries has doubled and we have had a number of collaborations in various fields of industries. Your contribution of about 100 million dollars for the setting up of heavy industries is something of which we are exceedingly thankful. I am glad you will be going to Ranchi and seeing some of the plants which have conic up or coming up with your help and co-operation, specially the Heavy Machine Building Plant and some other plants. You would also be going to Bangalore where you will see some other industries which we have built up, the Heavy Machine Tool Plant, the Indian Telephone Industries and others. You will get some idea of what progress we have made in the industrial field.

I know that Czechoslovakia has made tremendous progress during the last 15 years. We know what devastation took place during the war in your country and it is indeed remarkable the way you have built up the new Czechoslovakia. Your country is one of the most highly industrialised in the world and I, have no doubt that it will continue to progress not for itself but with a view to help and assist the other countries.

We are a country which is undeveloped and it has remained undeveloped because we were not free. Since the attainment of our independence, we have been trying to build up our country economically. Our effort is to help the common man, the weaker section of our community. We want to build up a new social order and bring about a transformation in our rural areas and also in smaller towns and cities.

We are generally in agreement on important

international matters. We stand for the principle of coexistence and peace. We both fully agree with the objective that different countries having different patterns of Government and holding different views should live peacefully amongst themselves. These differences should not come in the way of peaceful coexistence. In this world there are bound to be differences in approach between countries and countries and between peoples and peoples. It would therefore be not at all correct that there should be an effort to bring about some kind of regimentation. I therefore greatly welcome your approach towards peaceful coexistence. What the world needs today is disarmament and peace. We have to work for disarmament in the world so that peace is maintained and there are no wars and conflicts. Just now we are faced with a difficult situation in South Viet Nam and I know you entirely agree with us that there should be cessation of hostilities in South Viet Nam and there should be a talk and discussions between the countries concerned. I have every hope that with the efforts of all the countries who want peace, there would be a satisfactory development in South East Asia and especially in South Viet Nam where the parties concerned will meet and the conflict will come to an end

43

It is a very delicate situation and therefore every effort has to be made to see that there is no escalation of the present clash and conflict.

I know that we attach the highest importance to the organisation of the United Nations. It is the hope of the world and in spite of its shortcomings it has done tremendous services. It would be a mistake to think in terms of some other world organisation and I consider it essential that the present United Nations should be further strengthened. If there are differences on certain matters, they will have to be settled by discussions and persuasion.

I do not want to take more of your time. I am very glad that Your Excellency will be able to find some time to visit some parts of India. May I once again extend to you all a very hearty welcome. I do hope your short sojourn here would be useful and enjoyable.

May I now request you to drink a toast to

the health of the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA CZECH REPUBLIC USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Czechoslovak Prime Minister's Reply

Replying to the toast, His Excellency Mr. Jozef Lenart said:

Mr. Prime Minister, ladies and gentlemen, in the first place I would like to thank with all my heart Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri for his warm words. We are grateful that we could make use of the invitation to visit the Republic of India. Though thousands of kilometers far away, she is near to our minds and hearts. Our people greatly esteem the long and self-sacrificing struggle of your people for freedom as well as the millennium of history and culture of your country. They cherish the names of her great sons, of Mahatma Gandhi and Shri Jawaharlal Nehru whom we have commemorated today. In Czechoslovakia we follow with great interest the lives and the achievements of our Indian friends. We highly appreciate the foreign policy of India which contributes considerably to the strengthening of peace in the world, to the furtherance of international cooperation and to the understanding between peoples. This policy will be linked inseparably with the name of Jawaharlal Nehru whose work is now being continued by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri.

The peoples of Czechoslovakia and of India have much in common. The bitter experience from the past, the dark times of foreign oppression have taught us and you to respect our own freedom as well as the freedom of other nations. Both our countries are linked together with the interest of safeguarding peace throughout the world, to do completely and definitely away with the colonial yoke and to promote equal cooperation and understanding among nations. We are of opinion that at present there is no more important task than the effort to avert the danger of war, to put an end to aggressive provocations of imperialist forces and to apply consistently the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations among nations with different social systems, to reduce the feverish arms race and to bring about the prohibition of nuclear weapons and a general and complete disarmament.

May I be permitted to toast in honour of the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, to the friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and India and to the peace among nations.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA USA INDIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czechoslovak Joint Communique

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on March 6, 1965 at the conclusion of the Czechoslovak Prime Minister's visit :

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Jozef Lenart, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Vaclav David, paid an official visit to India from 2nd to 7th March 1965. During their stay the guests were received in audience by the President of India, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan. In the course of their visit to India, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister and other representatives of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic visited, besides the Capital, Agra, Ranchi, Bangalore and Bombay. They saw places of historical interest, as well as modern industrial enterprises, scientific and other institutions. They

44

highly appreciated the progress achieved by the Indian people and its Government in the economic development in this country.

The Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers, with their aides, had discussions on matters of common interest. These discussions were held in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and friendship, reflecting the cordial relations and firm understanding between the two countries. They noted with satisfaction the progressive development of relations between their two countries in the political, economic and cultural spheres and the existence of a common approach to the basic problems of strengthening peace and international cooperation. The Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia expressed appreciation for the contribution that India's foreign policy had made towards the strengthening of peace and for promoting international cooperation and understanding.

The Prime Ministers reiterated their support for the principles of peaceful co-existence, which are of cardinal importance. They recalled with satisfaction that during the consideration of this whole question in the General Assembly and its Special Committee, there was basic accord and close cooperation between Czechoslovakia and India. In this context, the Prime Ministers welcomed the Declaration adopted by the conference of non-aligned nations in Cairo. The Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia appreciated the positive contribution of the Cairo Conference with regard to the strengthening of cooperation among all anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces in the interest of promoting world peace and ensuring the progressive development of mankind. Consequently they expressed their desire for a speedy liquidation of colonialism and reaffirmed their support to those nations still struggling for their independence.

The two Prime Ministers agreed on the urgent need to reach agreement on general and complete disarmament covering both conventional and nuclear disarmament. They reaffirmed their determination to intensify their efforts in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference and elsewhere for the elimination of the threat which nuclear weapons pose for the very existence of mankind. They agreed that pending the achievement of agreement on general and complete disarmament various steps should be taken to reduce international tensions, in this connection they reiterated their support for all constructive proposals calculated to prevent the direct or indirect dissemination and proliferation of nuclear weapons. They reaffirmed their view that all States should endeavour for the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and that all States should endeavour for the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and that those States which have not already done so should take steps, with all possible speed to subscribe to the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. They reiterated their opposition to all nuclear weapons tests and agreed that urgent steps should be taken to extend the Moscow Treaty to cover the prohibition of underground nuclear weapons tests. The two Prime Ministers agreed that the creation of effective nuclearfree zones would contribute to the reduction of international tension and that urgent steps should be taken to secure agreement on the establishment of such zones in various parts of the world.

The two Prime Ministers discussed the question of security in Europe and they stressed the necessity of a peaceful settlement of the German problem. They agreed that any unilateral attempt to change the present borders would have dangerous consequences.

The two Prime Ministers expressed grave concern about the deteriorating situation in Indo-China and exchanged in great detail their views on its speedy solution.

The two Prime Ministers stressed the important role of the United Nations in promoting international cooperation and in maintaining international peace and security, despite difficulties and temporary set-backs. They reaffirmed the determination of the two countries to collaborate in the strengthening of the United Nations in accordance with the basic principles of the Charter.

The two Prime Ministers condemned the policy of racial discrimination which is being followed by the Republic of South Africa. They recalled the U.N. resolutions on the subject of apartheid and expressed the hope that those States which have not yet complied with these resolutions would speedily take measures to implement them.

The two Prime Ministers exchanged views on the question of Kashmir in the context of its consideration in the Security Council last year. The Czechoslovak Prime Minister reconfirmed that the Czechoslovak position on Kashmir remained unchanged. The Czechoslovak Government expressed its confidence that the existing differences between India and Pakistan will be solved by peaceful means, by direct, patient negotiations between the Governments of the two countries without any interference and in a calm atmosphere.

The Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the considerable development of friendly relations and cooperation between India and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in economic,

45

cultural, scientific and technical matters which have greatly benefited the peoples of the two countries. They noted with particular satisfaction the considerable progress which has been made in Indo-Czechoslovak economic and technical cooperation. It was emphasised that the two countries desire to expand cultural exchanges within the framework of the Cultural Agreement concluded in 1959. They have agreed that the possibility of having a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between the two countries will be explored. Similarly, an agreement, for further collaboration in scientific and technical matters as well as the peaceful uses of atomic energy and a consular agreement will be explored.

The two Prime Ministers expressed the conviction that the visit, the established personal contacts and the discussions contributed to the strengthening of traditional friendship and cooperation between the two countries. The Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has highly appreciated the friendly reception in India given to him and to his party. At the same time, he-invited the Prime Minister of the Republic of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, to visit the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic at their convenience. Both the Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs accepted the invitations with pleasure.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT RUSSIA CHINA SOUTH AFRICA PAKISTAN

Date : Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czechoslovak Agreements on New Projects Signed

Two agreements were concluded between India and Czechoslovakia in New Delhi on March 25, 1965.

One relates to a project for the manufacture of steel castings and forgings which is proposed to be established in the public sector at Wardha, Maharashtra State. The second relates to the manufacture of iron castings for defence requirements and is proposed to be established at Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh.

The agreements were signed by Shri H. C. Sarin, Special Secretary, Ministry of Defence and Shri R. V. Raman, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Industry, on behalf of the Government of India and by Mr. Chocholous of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, Czechoslovakia, on behalf of the Government of Czechoslovakia.

These projects have been included in the second Czechoslovak credit. Earlier, a proto-

col had been signed between the Governments of India and Czechoslovakia defining the general scope of these two plants. In pursuance of the provision of the protocol, agreements for the preparation of detailed project reports have been negotiated with the Czechoslovak Government and have been executed today (March 25).

The Wardha project envisages the setting up of a capacity of manufacturing 12,000 tons of steel castings including alloy steel castings, and 8,300 tons of steel forgings per year.

The Jabalpur project envisages the setting up of capacity for manufacturing about 15,000 tons of finished castings per year to be principally Used in the vehicles undertaken for manufacture in the defence sector.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA RUSSIA USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Utter to the Security Council on Constitutional Changes in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, sent the following letter dated March 5, 1965, to the President of the Security Council, regarding the

46

recent constitutional changes made in Pakistanoccupied Kashmir by the Government of Pakistan :

I have been instructed by the Government of India to enclose copy of a protest which it lodged with the Government of Pakistan against the latter's attempt to integrate part of the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir with Pakistan in violation of the Security Council Resolution of January 17, 1948, and the assurances that the Government of Pakistan gave to the UN Commission, the Security Council and its representatives. No reply has been received to this protest from the Government of Pakistan.

The situation has been aggravated by further unlawful acts which the Government of Pakistan have taken to promote integration of Indian Union territory with Pakistan. The Pakistan Government promulgated a new Act known as the 'Azad Kashmir Government Act of 1964', by which the Pakistan Government have strengthened their stranglehold on the "State Council" and the procedure for the election of the socalled President. Under the new procedure, the so-called President and his Government can hold office for an indefinite period, provided they continue to dance to the tune of Pakistan rulers.

These high-handed activities of the Pakistan Government have come in for criticism in Pakistan and Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. Thus, according to the Karachi political weekly 'Outlook' of 15th August, 1964, the only factor to limit the so-called President and his Government holding office for an indefinite period is "the pleasure of the Ministry I of Kashmir Affairs (Pakistan)". The 'Khyber Mail' of Peshawar dated 27th August 1964, commenting on the subject in an editorial stated :

"From the available reports it seems that the future Presidents of Azad Kashmir would be put in place not by the people but by officials sitting in Rawalpindi".

The Rawalpindi correspondent of the Daily Telegraph, London, observed in a report entitled "Pakistan 'Setback! to Kashmir" in its issue dated September 14, 1964 :

> "Drastic changes made by Pakistan in the constitution of the Government of Azad, the part of Kashmir controlled by Pakistan, have caused dismay among Kashmir leaders in exile.

They consider that the changes, made last week. strike at the roots of Pakistan's demand for self-determination for Kashmir..... The changes vest with the Pakistan-appointed Chief Adviser the supreme authority to hire and dismiss the Azad Kashmir President, and prevent any legislation by the elected State Council which does not have his prior approval.

The changes, generally ignored in the Pakistan press, have been bitterly criticised by the Executive Council of the Kashmir Moslem Conference.

It said that whatever semblance there may have been of independence, or popularly elected and Representative Government there may have been in Azad Kashmir during the past 17 years had now been removed".

According to a report published in the 'Statesman' of November 9, 1964, Mr. Ghulam Abbas, a former "President" of Pakistan occupied Kashmir, criticised the Pakistan Government in a public speech in Muzaffarabad. He accused Pakistan of having a design to "grab" the occupied territory. He said that his patience was now exhausted. He would never permit Kashmir's integration with Pakistan.

It is thus clear that the Pakistan Government have been busy annexing and integrating with Pakistan that part of the Indian Union territory of Jammu & Kashmir which their troops occupied by aggression in 1947-48. With no locus stand in Jammu & Kashmir and working behind a smoke screen created by a false propaganda about the Kashmiris' right of self-determination, the Government of Pakistan, in the teeth of opposition in the Pakistan occupied territory, have been engaged in bringing about a progressive annexation of the area.

The Government of India would like to make it clear that all these acts are illegal and unconstitutional and can in no way affect the sovereignty of India over the territory concerned. Pakistan's latest activities in this region as well as its agreement with China under which it has given away to China over 2,000 square miles of Indian Union territory in the State of Jammu and Kashmir amount to further aggression against India. It is requested that this communication be circulated to members of the Council.

The following is the text of Government of India's protest note to Pakistan dated September 23, 1964, handed over to the High Commission for Pakistan in India:

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the High Commission for Pakistan in India and has the honour to bring to their notice the following report which appeared in Hindustan Times on 9 September 1964 :

47

"The `AZAD' Kashmir flag on the President's House in Muzaffarabad, headquarters of Pak-occupied Kashmir, has been hauled down and replaced by the Pakistan flag, according to reports reaching here.

Similarly the 'Azad' standard has given place to the Pakistan flag on all Government buildings in Muzaffarabad according to these reports."

As this report has not been contradicted by the Government of Pakistan, it is presumed to be correct. The Ministry is surprised that the Government of Pakistan should have taken a step which is a blatant infringement of the sovereignty of India and a further act of aggression on its territory. The Government of Pakistan will recall that the United Nations Commission at its 29th meeting held on 5 August 1948, decided that "it should avoid any action which might be interpreted as signifying de facto or de jure recognition of the 'Azad Kashmir Government" (S/1100, para. 69). The United Nations Commission also recorded that the Government of Pakistan itself had not granted recognition to the so-called `Azad Kashmir Government, "in view of the implications which might ensue" (S/1100, para. 132). It now appears that let alone recognizing an unlawful authority called the Azad Kashmir Government, the Government of Pakistan itself has taken the place of that authority.

In other words, the Government of Pakistan which is required to vacate aggression on the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir has now chosen to incorporate it into Pakistan in violation of the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948, and the assurances which the Government of Pakistan gave to the United Nations Commission, the Security Council and its representatives. The Government of India strongly protest against this high-handed and unlawful seizure and appropriation of Indian territory and would like to make it clear that the Government of India can never accept such a blatant infringement of Indian sovereignty.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the High Commission for Pakistan the assurances of its highest consideration.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA UNITED KINGDOM CHINA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Utter to the Security Council on Sino-Pakistan Border Agreement

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, sent the following letter dated March 17, 1965, to the President of the Security Council protesting against the reference to the so-called Sino-Pakistan border agreement in the recent China-Pakistan joint communique :

In continuation of my letter dated 7 October 1963 (S/5435) addressed to the then President of the Security Council, I have the honour, under instructions from my Government, to forward to you a copy of the Government of India's Note of 13 March 1965 delivered to the High Commission for Pakistan in India at New Delhi. This Note protests against the reference to the socalled Sino-Pakistan border agreement concerning the boundary of the Indian Union State of Jammu and Kashmir, in the Joint Pakistan-China Communique issued in Peking, on the conclusion of the Pakistan President's recent visit to the People's Republic of China. The Joint Communique was signed by Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. and Marshal Chen-Yi. Vice-Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, in Peking on 7 March 1965.

I shall be grateful if this letter and its enclosure are circulated to the members of the Security Council as an official document.

The following is the text of Government of India's protest note to Pakistan dated March 13, 1965 :

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the High Commission for Pakistan and has the honour to invite attention to the China-Pakistan Joint Communique signed by Marshal Chen-Yi. Vice-Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

The Communique states :

"The two parties noted with pleasure the completion of the work of boundary demarcation in accordance with the boundary agreement concluded between the two countries in March 1963. They were pleased that this task had been carried out by the Joint China-Pakistan Boundary Commission in a spirit of unfailing friendship and cooperation and that the China-Pakistan boundary protocol is to be signed shortly in Pakistan by the two Foreign Ministers."

48

It is common knowledge that Pakistan and the People's Republic of China have no common border, the two countries being separated by the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The presence of Pakistan in the northern part of Kashmir is based on aggression and illegal occupation and Pakistan has no locus standi whatsoever to enter into negotiations or conclude agreements with any country regarding the boundaries of Jammu and Kashmir. The boundary agreement entered into between China and Pakistan in March 1963 is, therefore, altogether illegal and invalid. The Government of India has, on several occasions, pointed out this fact to the Pakistan Government and protested against the action of the Pakistan Government in concluding an agreement with the People's Republic of China. Notwithstanding these protests, the Government of Pakistan has, under the pretext of entering into a provisional agreement with the People's Republic of China, gone ahead with the appointment of a Joint Boundary Commission and the demarcation of the boundary. These measures taken by the Pakistan Government belie the Pakistan claim that the so-called boundary agreement with the People's Republic of China is a provisional one. Indeed, in the joint communique issued in Peking on 7 March 1965. It seems that even the pretence that the agreement is a provisional one has been abandoned. It is obvious that Pakistan's motive in concluding this agreement is to share the fruits of aggression with the People's Republic of China and to exploit Sino-Indian differences in the pursuit of Pakistan's hostile policies against India.

The Government of India strongly protest against the reference to the illegal activities ofthe Joint China-Pakistan Boundary Commission in the Joint Communique. As repeatedly stated by the Government of India in the past, they affirm once again that the completion of the work of the so-called boundary demarcation of Jammu and Kashmir borders with Sinkiang is a violation of international law. This collusive attempt to demarcate and annex part of the Indian Union territory in Jammu and Kashmir will never be accepted by the Government of India.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the High Commission for Pakistan the assurances of its highest consideration.

INDIA PAKISTAN CHINA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

1995

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on Pakistan Rangers' intrusions in Kutch

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in Parliament on March 3, 1965, regarding the intrusions by Pakistan Rangers in the Kutch District of Gujarat :

There have been intrusions of Pakistani personnel into Indian territory south of the Kutch-Sind border in the Kanjarkot area. This area has been regularly patrolled by our border police forces. The intrusions first came to the notice of the Gujarat border police on January 25 and are still continuing. These consist of the use of a new track by Pakistan vehicles south of Kanjarkot fort, well within Indian territory, patrolling by Pakistan border forces up to this new track, and obstruction to our patrol's proceeding north of this track. Concentration of Pakistani forces in Pakistan across the frontier has been reported at Maro, Bedin and Rahim ki Bazar.

As soon as the intrusions became known, a protest was lodged locally with the Pakistan authorities. At the same time our border police were asked to undertake vigorous patrolling of the area right up to our border. When our patrols encountered Pakistani armed personnel belonging to the Pakistan Rangers, the latter claimed that the area belonged to Pakistan and that our Patrol was in the Pakistani area illegally. Subsequently the Gujarat Government asked for an immediate meeting with the Pakistan Rangers at the highest level possible. The Gujarat Government continued patrolling of the area. On February 12, 1965, we also lodged a protest with the Government of Pakistan, through the Pakistan High Commissioner in Delhi, against violation of Indian territory. The Government of Pakistan were requested to issue instructions to their forces to withdraw the intrusion and agree

to our request, which had already been pending with them since October 17, 1964, for immediate demarcation of the Kutch-Sind border. On February 15 a meeting was held at a place south of Kanjarkot between D.I.G., Rajkot, and Commandant of the Indus Rangers, Hyderabad Sind. This meeting came to nothing since the Pakistani party refused to study the map which the Indian party produced at the meeting showing clearly that Kanjarkot was well within the pre-partition boundaries of Kutch. The Commandant, Indus Rangers, maintained that the area in question was Pakistan territory. They had not occupied the Kanjarkot fort but were patrolling the area south of this fort since there was a customary track joining the two Pakistani customs posts of Ding and Surai.

In view of the unsatisfactory outcome of this meeting and continuing Pakistani intrusions into Indian territory, it was decided to instruct our High Commissioner to see the Pakistan Foreign Minister immediately and to bring to his notice the gravity of the situation. A note was handed on February 18, 1965, by our High Commission to the Pakistan Foreign Office requesting for the withdrawal of Pakistani forces to their previous positions and for agreement of the Pakistan Government to our proposal of October, 1964, for a meeting of Surveyors-General of the two countries for the purpose of demarcation of the Kutch-Sind border. On February 19, our High Commissioner saw the Pakistan Foreign Minister and urged on him to issue instructions for immediate demarcation of the border. The Pakistan Foreign Minister said that he was not aware of the facts and promised to look into the matter.

On February 20, 1965, a senior official of our High Commission again approached the Pakistan Government and pressed for the acceptance of our proposals. The Pakistan Government take the line that the Pakistani personnel south of the Kutch-Sind border in the Kanjarkot area are on their own territory and that Pakistan has always exercised de facto control up to the new Customs track. They further contend that there is nothing much to talk about but that if our border forces have any doubt they should ask for a meeting between D.I.G., Rajkot, and D.G., West Pakistan Rangers.

Yesterday evening, we received from our High Commission in Karachi the text of a Note received by them on 1st March, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Pakistan. The Note repeats the stand of the Pakistan Government that Kanjarkot lies Well within the area of the Rann of Kutch which, the Pakistan Government claims, has been in the de facto posession of Pakistan since August, 1947. The Note points out that while Kanjarkot is being patrolled by the Pakistan Rangers, the old fort in the area has not been occupied by the Pakistan forces. The Now asserts that there has been no violation of Indian territory by Pakistan and makes the allegation that India's border police has intruded into the area and Indian aircrafts have been violating Pakistan air space. It is stated in the Pakistan Note that this matter is for discussion and agreement between the two Governments and that until this agreement is reached, the Surveyors-General of India and Pakistan cannot proceed with demarcation of the Kutch-Sind border.

The position taken by the Government of Pakistan in their Note is wholly untenable. It is not correct that the Pakistan Rangers have been in de facto possession of Kanjarkot and Rann of Kutch, or that it was being patrolled by the Pakistan Rangers until they intruded in this area, in some force, in January this year. The Government of Pakistan, it is regretted, have adopted a most unhelpful attitude. We should have thought that if the Pakistan Government genuinely desired to avoid a serious situation, they would agree to an immediate meeting of representatives of two sides for the purpose of demarcation or to a high level conference. The Pakistan Government's attitude is unreasonable and totally contrary to the pre-partition maps which conform with the actual situation, namely, that Kanjarkot fort is well within our territory 1300 yards south of the Kutch-Sind frontier. The Government of India take a serious view of the Pakistani intrusions. The Kutch-Sind border, though not demarcated with pillars, is well defined. If there is any difference of opinion about where the border exactly is on the ground, this is a matter of demarcation of the border in the course of which any differences can be sorted out. The Government of India will never accept the unilateral assertion of any claims by Pakistan Government on this border or elsewhere. They will continue their diplomatic efforts to bring about a demarcation of this border. At the same time they must insist on restoration of status quo ante and the withdrawal of Pakistan intrusion, to be followed by talks between the two Governments.

The Pakistan Government's plea that the D.I.G., Rajkot Rangers and D.G., West Pakistan Rangers, should meet if there are any doubts does not take the matter much further; there has already been such a meeting before which produced no result. However, in consonance with our general policy of trying to solve problems by peaceful methods, we are asking for such a meeting. We hope that the meeting will result in the elimination of tension that has been created by Pakistan's unilateral action and intrusion into

50

our territory and lead to discussions between the representative of the two Governments in regard to demarcation of the frontier. The House may rest assured that the Government will take every possible step to protect the integrity of our border.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Concentration of Pakistani Forces near Dahagram

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in, Lok Sabha on March 19, 1965 on the concentration of Pakistani forces near Dahagram, enclave :

From time to time there have been reports of concentration of Pakistani forces within

Pakistan territory near Dahagram enclave. Taking advantage of the narrowness of the strip of Indian territory separating the Pakistan mainland from this enclave, illegal movement of Pakistani nationals has been taking place between the enclave and the Pakistan mainland. Patrolling in the adjacent Indian area of Tin-Bigha was intensified to prevent unauthorised passage of goods and movement of Pakistani nationals over Indian territory from the Pakistan mainland to the Dahagram enclave. With the intensification of patrolling in Tin-Bigha by our border police for ensuring that Pakistani infiltration across the Indian border does not take place, the East Pakistan Rifle Units came in strength on the Pakistani side of the border and dug themselves in opposite to the West Bengal outpost of Jhirsingheswar.

Patrolling by the West Bengal police in the area to prevent unlawful movement of Pakistani nationals between the Pakistan mainland and the Dahagram enclave, was given the colour of an economic blockade of the enclave by the East Pakistan Government. Pakistan concentrated its forces all along the border in this sector which gave rise to tension. On the 18th February, 1965, the Deputy Commissioner of Cooch-Behar met his counterpart, the Deputy Commissioner of Rangpur, in order to review the cause of tension prevailing in this border area. Both agreed that all possible steps should be taken to case the situation.

The Pakistani press, however, came out with baseless stories of India having imposed an economic blockade of Dahagram. The allegations of the East Pakistan Government were denied by the Government of West Bengal, who in their telegram dated the 12th March, 1965, drew the attention of the Government of East Pakistan to the concentration of Pakistani forces on the border. On the 13th March, at about 5 P.M., some residents of Dahagram tried to lift cattle belonging to Indian nationals at a place called Phulkabahri. They were backed by armed personnel of the East Pakistan Rifles from this enclave. The West Bengal police, rushed to the scene and prevented the Pakistani nationals from lifting the cattle. There was a brief exchange of fire. Shortly afterwards, a large number of Hindu houses in Dahagram were set on fire and there were reports of some gun

shots inside Dahagram. This was followed by Hindu exodus from the Dahagram enclave to the adjoining Indian territory; about 150 Hindus fled Dahagram, and came to Cooch-Behar in search of shelter and security. At about midnight on the 13th/14th March, 1965, some residents of the Pakistan enclave assembled around the Tin-Bigha area and tried to break through across Indian territory to-the Pakistan mainland. Pakistan policemen-from the enclave started firing to give cover to these Pakistani nationals, and one Indian policeman was injured. In selfdefence, fire was opened by West Bengal police also.

On the basis of interrogation of the Hindu refugees from Dahagram who had come away to the Indian territory, it was learnt that they had been subjected to oppression and harassment. This was taken up with the Government of East Pakistan in a telegraphic protest by the Government of West Bengal where it was mentioned that unless effective steps were taken by the Government of East Pakistan to ease tension in this area, there was likelihood of serious repercussions. There has been no reply to this telegram dated 14-3-65.

Reports have reached the West Bengal Government that inside Dahagram on the 13th night there was a conflict between the local muslims and the Bhatia Muslims, as a result of which some houses were set on fire and a large number of Bhatia Muslims decided to leave Dahagram for the Pakistan mainland.

Finding that the situation in the border of the Cooch-Behar district was becoming more tense because of the concentration of Pakistani forces along the border, despite protest lodged by the Government of West Bengal, and of the reported persecution of Hindu residents of the enclave, the Chief Secretary, West Bengal Government. sent an immediate telegram on the 16th March evening, to his counterpart in East Pakistan drawing

51

his attention to the baseless accusations that were being made against Indian authorities for alleged atrocities perpetrated in the area and also to the false and highly provocative and inflammatory version of the Dahagram incidents which were appearing in East Pakistan newspapers. The Chief Secretary, West Bengal, suggested that the two Chief Secretaries should meet immediately and discuss the situation. To this a conditional acceptance was received from the Chief Secretary, East Pakistan, late last night. The Chief Secretary, East Pakistan, while persisting in the baseless allegation of aggression against Dahagram has stated : "We welcome your proposal for meeting at Dacca but consider restoration of status quo in Dahagram essential before we can hold any fruitful discussions".

The situation took a turn for the worse with commencement of continuous firing from across Pakistan territory by Pakistani forces from 3.30 district of Cooch-Behar : Phulkabahri, Tin-Bigha, Bagdokra, Kharkharia. a.m. on 17-3-65 in the following areas of the

Heavy and intensive firing by Pakistan Forces is continuing in this area resulting in some casualties amongst the civilian population of the Indian areas mentioned above. Indian border police has had to return fire when it was indispensably necessary to maintain its posts. According to the latest information, Pakistan forces are using mortars and hand grenades.

The Chief Secretary and the Inspector General Police, West Bengal, have proceeded this morning to the site.

A strong telegraphic protest has been lodged with the Government of East Pakistan by the Government of West Bengal, on the 17th March, urging upon that Government to issue instructions to its forces to stop firing forthwith and to desist from further aggressive activities. On the 17th March, a note was also handed over to the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi refuting allegations of alleged occupation of Daharam by the Indian forces. The note urged the Pakistan Government to instruct the Chief Secretary of East Pakistan to agree to meet the Chief Secretary of West Bengal immediately to discuss the situation. If was further stated in the note that the Government of Pakistan should curb anti-Indian and communal propaganda in the Press and over the Government Radio since this propaganda can have serious repercussions on the minorities in East Pakistan.

There is no truth whatsoever in the wild

Pakistani allegation that Indian troops have committed aggression by marching into the Pakistan enclave of Dahagram. There are no Indian troops in the area. Only personnel belonging to the West Bengal Police are patrolling the Indian mainland in Tin-Bigha and they have never entered the Pakistani enclave of Dahagram. Strict instructions have been issued that neither our armed police nor Indian nationals of Cooch-Behar district should be allowed to go inside the enclave. Instructions have also been issued to the local officers that those of the residents of the enclave who wish to go to East Pakistan should be allowed to do so without let or hindrance. There can, of course, be no objection to genuine residents of Dahagram. who have gone into Pakistan, returning to their homes. The Pakistan forces have to stop firing into Tin-Bigha to enable them to do so.

It is extremely regrettable that the Pakistan Government should do nothing to prevent the wild and irresponsible propaganda in the Pakistani Press and over the Pakistan Government Radio. both in East and West Pakistan, calculated to rouse communal passions. The Government of India have urged the Pakistan Govt. to do everything in their power to see that such false propaganda is stopped, as otherwise there are likely to be serious repercussions on the minorities in East Pakistan. Furthermore, the Government of India are surprised that the Pakistan Government should come out with allegations of Indian occupation of the Dahagram enclave, which are entirely without foundation. The Government of India hope that the Pakistan Government will, as provided in the Ground Rules, refrain from aggressive acts, such as, firing into Indian territory and instruct the Chief Secretary, East Pakistan, to accept the offer of the Chief Secretary, West Bengal, for meeting of the two Chief Secretaries at which any differences and difficulties could be peacefully sorted out.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Dahagram Enclave

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on March 22, 1965 regarding the Dahagram enclave :

On Friday, 19th March, I made a statement in this House on developments on the Cooch-Behar border which had led to firing by the East Pakistan Rifles from the morning of 17th March,

52

at Phulkabahri, Tin-Bigha, Bagdokra, Kharkharia and other points on this border. In giving the House detailed background of the events, I refuted the baseless allegations that were being mad-by Pakistan of Indian aggression in Dahagram and the alleged occupation of this enclave by Indian forces. I told the House that we had made enquiries and were convinced that there was not the slightest justification for the allegation of aggression by our Border police in the area of Dahagram. I informed the House that the Chief Secretary and the Inspector General of Police, West Bengal, had proceeded to the disturbed area for an on-the-spot inspection. The report of the Chief Secretary was not available when I made the statement on 19th March. On his return from the area, the Chief Secretary has reported that there is not the slightest basis for the Pakistani allegation that Indian forces have aggressed against Dahagram or that they have occupied this Pakistani enclave. The Chief Secretary has further reported that firing in the area was started by personnel of the East Pakistan Rifles and that the West Bengal Border police returned the fire in self-defence.

Firing by East Pakistan Rifles has continued on the Cooch-Behar border for 6 days and some loss of life has also been reported. The East Pakistan Rifles are aiding and assisting Pakistan nationals who have made intrusions in this area. Late last night, a message was received from the Government of West Bengal saying that Pakistan Ansars--who are really a paramilitary organization trained by Pakistan Army officialsbacked by personnel of the East Pakistan Rifles made raids on Indian territory in the Bagdokra area and began looting and burning the houses of Indian nationals in this area. The Pakistani raid was met by the West Bengal Border Police and some of the raiders who were indulging in looting, arson and other such nefarious activities on Indian territory, were killed. We are watching further developments. I can assure the House that such lawlessness and brigandage on the part of Pakistan personnel will, persisted in, be suitably and adequately dealt with.

On the afternoon of 20th March, the Pakistan High Commissioner left a Note Verbale with the Foreign Secretary suggesting that a party of Pakistan officials' should be allowed transit facilities over Indian territory so that they could proceed Dahagram to verify India's assertion that their forces have not committed any aggression on Dahagram. In this Note, our proposal for a meeting between the Chief Secretaries of West Bengal and East Pakistan was sidetracked. Our reaction to this Note was conveyed to the Pakistan High Commissioner within two hours. We informed him that there could be no question of the Government of India agreeing to an investigation by Pakistani officials into the alleged aggression which had in fact never taken place. Simultaneously, the Government of India made the following concrete suggestions :

(i) Immediate stoppage of firing for which orders should he given by both East Pakistan and West Bengal Governments.

(ii) Residents of Dahagram, who have come away to East Pakistan, and Pakistan officials, may apply for permits to the local authorities for transiting through Indian territory.
(iii) Simultaneously. the East Pakistan and West Bengal Governments should specifically agree to a meeting of the Chief Secretaries at a very early date.
(iv) The grant of permits to Pakistani residents and officials would be without prejudice to the procedures to be mutually agreed upon by the Governments

of East Pakistan and West Bengal in regard to transit facilities to each other's enclaves.

The Pakistan High Commissioner has just informed the Foreign Secretary on behalf of his Government that the proposals made by us are acceptable. In fact, this information has just come. When I made a statement in the Rajya Sabha by that time, this information had not been conveyed to us by the Pakistan High Commissioner. They propose to issue instructions to the Commandant of their local border police to contact the Commandant, West Bengal border police in the area to arrange for an immediate ceasefire. The West Bengal Government are instructing their border police to respond to proposals by the Pakistan border police to this effect. The Pakistan Government have also agreed to it Chief Secretaries meeting, an announcement concerning which is likely to be made tomorrow. They have informed us that it is proposed to send a party of Pakistan officials to Dahagram. Indian Deputy High Commissioner, Dacca, will be approached by East Pakistan authorities for the necessary visas to enable the officials to transit across Indian territory. We are instructing our Deputy High Commissioner to grant the visas when approached.

In regard to the residents of Dahagram who may have crossed over into East Pakistan, as I stated before the House on the 19th March, there could be no objection to the return of Dahagramis to their homes. The necessary arrangements in regard to this should be made between local officials of the two sides. Future arrangements relating to transit of Pakistan nationals into Pakistan enclaves in India and vice versa will be the subject matter of discussion between the Chief Secretaries.

53

PAKISTAN USA INDIA LATVIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Dahagram Enclave

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on March 22, 1965 regarding the Dahagram enclave :

From time to time there have been reports of concentration of Pakistani forces within Pakistan territory near Dahagram enclave. Taking advantage of the narrowness of the strip of Indian territory separating the Pakistan mainland from this enclave, illegal movement of Pakistani nationals has been taking place between the enclave and the Pakistan mainland. Patrolling in the adjacent Indian area of Tin-Bigha was intensified to prevent unauthorised passage of goods and movement of Pakistani nationals over Indian territory from the Pakistan mainland to the Dahagram enclave: With the intensification of patrolling in Tin-Bigha by our border police for ensuring that Pakistani infiltration across the Indian border does not take place, the East Pakistan Rifle Units came in strength on the Pakistani side of the border and dug themselves in opposite to the West Bengal outpost of Jhirsingheswar.

Patrolling by the West Bengal police in the area to prevent unlawful movement of Pakistani nationals between the Pakistan mainland and the Dahagram enclave, was given the colour of an economic blockade of the enclave by the East Pakistan Government. Pakistan concentrated its forces all along the border in this sector which gave rise to tension. On the 18th February, 1965, the Deputy Commissioner of Cooch-Behar met his counterpart, the Deputy Commissioner of Rangpur, in order to review the cause of tension prevailing in this border area. Both agreed that all possible steps should be taken to ease the situation.

The Pakistani press, however, came out with baseless stories of India having imposed an economic blockade of Dahagram. The allegations of the East Pakistan Government were denied by the Government of West Bengal, who in their telegram dated the 12th March, 1965, drew the attention of the Government of East Pakistan to the concentration of Pakistani forces on the border. On the 13th March, at about 5 p.m. some residents of Dahagram tried to lift cattle belonging to Indian nationals at a place called Phulkabahri. They were backed by armed personnel of the East Pakistan Rifles from this enclave. The West Bengal police rushed to the scene and prevented the Pakistani nationals from lifting the cattle. There was a brief exchange of fire. Shortly afterwards, a large number of Hindu houses in Dahagram were set on fire and there were reports of some gun shots inside Dahagram. This was followed by Hindu exodus from the Dahagram enclave to the adjoining Indian territory; about 150 Hindus Rod Dabagram and came to Cooch-Behar in search of shelter and security. At about midnight on the 13th/ 14th March, 1965, some residents of the Pakistan enclave assembled around the Tin-Bigha area and tried to break through across Indian territory to the Pakistan mainland. Pakistan policemen from the enclave started firing to give cover to these Pakistani nationals, and one Indian policeman was injured. In self-defence, fire was opened by West Bengal police also.

On the basis of interrogation of the Hindu refugees from Dahagram who had come away to the Indian territory, it was learnt that they had been subjected to oppression and harassment. This was taken up with the Government of East Pakistan in a telegraphic protest by the Government of West Bengal where it was mentioned that unless effective steps were taken by the Government of East Pakistan to ease tension in this area, there was likelihood of serious repercussions. There has been no reply to this telegram dated 14-3-1965.

The Chief Secretary, West Bengal Government, sent an immediate telegram on the 16th March evening, to his counterpart in East Pakistan drawing his attention to the baseless accusations that were being made against Indian authorities for alleged atrocities perpetrated in the area and also to the false and highly provocative and inflammatory version of the Dahagram incidents which were appearing in East Pakistan newspapers. The Chief Secretary, West Bengal, suggested that the two Chief Secretaries should meet immediately and discuss the situation. To this a conditional acceptance was received from the Chief Secretary, East Pakistan, on the, 18th night. The conditions informed by the Pakistan Government were the vacation of the so-called aggression and occupation of Dahagram by Indian forces and assurance to the residents of Dahagram who had crossed over into East Pakistan to return to Dahagram.

The situation took a turn for the worse with commencement of continuous firing from across Pakistan territory by Pakistani forces from 3.30 a.m. on 17-3-65 in the following areas of the district of Cooch-Behar: Phulkabahri, Tin-Bigha, Bagdokra and Kharkharia.

Heavy and intensive firing by Pakistan forces is continuing in this area. Indian border police has had to return fire when it was indispensably necessary to maintain its posts. Pakistan forces are using mortars and hand grenades.

54

The Chief Secretary and Inspector-General of Police, West Bengal, nave visited the area for an on-the-spot inspection of the situation. The Chief Secretary has reported after this visit that there is not the slightest basis for the Pakistani allegation that Indian forces have aggressed against Dahagram. or that they have occupied the Pakistani enclave. The Chief Secretary has further reported that firing in the area was started by personnel of East Pakistan Rifles and that the West Bengal border police returned the fire in self-defence.

A strong telegraphic protest was lodged with the Government of East Pakistan by the Government of West Bengal on the 17th March, urging upon that Government to issue instructions to its forces to stop firing forthwith and to desist from further aggressive activities. On the 17th March, a note was also handed over to the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi, refuting allegations of alleged occupation of Dabagram by Indian forces. The note urged the Pakistan Government to instruct the Chief Secretary of East Pakistan to agree to meet the Chief Secretary, West Bengal, immediately to discuss the situation. It was further stated in the note that the Government of Pakistan should curb anti-Indian and communal propaganda in the press and over the Government radio, since this propaganda could have serious repercussions on the minorities in East Pakistan. On 19th March, 1965 the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi left a note verbale with the Foreign Secretary, repeating the conditional acceptance of the proposal made by the Chief Secretary, West Bengal, for a conference with his counterpart in East Pakistan to discuss the situation on the Cooch-Behar border. On the afternoon of the 20th March, the Pakistan High Commission left another note verbale with the Foreign Secretary, suggesting that a party of Pakistan officials should be allowed transit facilities over Indian territory so that they can proceed to Dahagram to verify India's assertion that their forces have not committed any aggression on the Pakistani enclave of Dahagram.

In this note verbale our proposal for a meeting between the Chief Secretaries of West Bengal and East Pakistan was sidetracked. Our reaction to this note was conveyed to Pakistan High Commissioner within two hours. We informed him that there could be no question of the Government of India agreeing to an investigation by Pakistani officials into the alleged aggression which had, in fact, never taken place. The Government of India made the following concrete suggestions :

(i) Immediate stoppage of firing for which orders should be given by both East Pakistan and West-Bengal Government.

(ii) Residents of Dahagram, who have come away to East Pakistan, and Pakistan officials, may apply for permits to the local authorities for transiting through Indian territory.

(iii) Simultaneously, the East Pakistan and West Bengal Governments should specifically agree to a meeting of the Chief Secretaries at a MY early date.

(iv) The grant of permits to Pakistani residents and officials would be without prejudice to the procedures to be mutually agreed upon by the Governments of East Pakistan and West Bengal in regard to transit facilities to each other's enclaves.

Late last night a message was received from the Government of West Bengal saying that Pakistan Ansars-who are really a paramilitary organisation trained by Pak Army officials -backed by personnel of the East Pakistan Rifles, made raids on Indian territory in the Bagdokra and other areas and began looting and burning the houses of Indian nationals in these areas. The Pakistani raid was met by the West Bengal Border Police and some of the raiders who were indulging in arson and other such nefarious activities on Indian territory were killed. We are watching further developments. I can assure the House that such lawlessness and brigandage on the part of Pakistani personnel will be suitably and adequately dealt with.

There is no truth whatsoever in the wild Pakistani allegation that Indian troops have committed aggression by marching into the Pakistani enclave of Dahagram. There are no Indian troops in the area. Only personnel belonging to the West Bengal Police are patrolling the Indian mainland in Tin-Bigha, and they have never entered the Pakistan enclave of Dahagram.

It is extremely regrettable that the Pakistan Government should whip up wild and irresponsible propaganda in the Pakistan press and over the Pakistan Government Radio, both in East and West Pakistan, calculated to rouse communal passions. The Government of India have urged the Pakistan Government to do everything in their power to see that such false propaganda is stopped, as otherwise there are likely to be serious repercussions on the minorities in East Pakistan. The Government of India have also impressed upon the Government of Pakistan the need for immediate stoppage of firing, on both sides, so that the matter could be considered in a calm atmosphere between the Governments of West Bengal and East Pakistan. The Government of India are surprised that Pakistan Government should persist in their accusation of Indian occupation of Dabagram enclave in spite of our categorial denial.

55

PAKISTAN INDIA USA LATVIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singhs Statement in Rajya Sabha on Developments on Cooch-Behar Border

The following is the text of a statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the Rajya Sabha on March 31, 1965 on developments on the Cooch-Behar border :

On 22nd March a report was received from the West Bengal Government that personnel of the East Pakistan Rifles were massed opposite South Berubari in Jalpaiguri District. It was reported that there had been rumours in the area that the East Pakistan Rifles were about to organise raids on South Berubari since its transfer to Pakistan was being delayed by India. It was further reported that on 3rd March some members of the East Pakistan Rifles had crossed the Sui River in Jalpaiguri and had trespassed into the adjacent Indian territory. The East Pakistan Rifles threatened some Indian nationals who were cultivating land there and claimed that the territory was Pakistan's. When the West Bengal Border Police reached the area, the Fast Pakistan Rifles men fled and crossed over into Pakistan territory. Although the intrusion was easily vacated, the East Pakistan Rifles were reported in some strength on Pakistan territory, opposite South Berubari. At one time it was even feared that they would make an attempt at sustained intrusion into Indian territory in that area.

A message received from the West Bengal Government on 30th March stated that they had received no report that any portion of Indian territory in that area, was under Pakistan's occupation. The West Bengal report further stated that there was some tension at Kajaldigi Paranigram on the Berubari border but no Indian land had been encroached on or occupied

by Pakistan.

I will now report to the House the developments on the Cooch-Behar border, further to what I had stated here on 22nd March.

On 20th March the Pakistan High Commissioner had sent a Note suggesting that a party of Pakistan officials should be allowed transit facilities over Indian territory so that they could proceed to Dahagram to verify India's assertion that their forces had not committed aggression on the Pakistani enclave. As I had stated, our reaction to this Note from the Pakistan High Commission was giver, out within 2 hours. We made 4 concrete suggestions to end the firing on the Cooch-Behar border, conclude an effective cease-fire there and arrange for a meeting between the Chief Secretaries of East Pakistan and West Bengal.

The acceptance of the Government of Pakistan of our 4-point proposal. was conveyed to the Foreign Secretary by the Pakistan High Commissioner on the afternoon of 22nd March. Our first proposal to which effect was to be given immediately, was that there should be stoppage of firing on the border without any loss of time. It was made clear that once firing had stopped and the cease-fire had become effective, an announcement would be made for a conference between the Chief Secretaries of West Bengal and East Pakistan, at which details for maintaining tranquillity on the border and for ensuring the return of such residents of Dahagram as had left the enclave, would be worked out. It had been agreed that the Commandant of the East Pakistan Rifles would approach the Commandant of the West Bengal Border Police immediately, to effect a cease-fire, on which action would be taker, by our Deputy High Commission at Dacca to issue visas etc. to a party of Pakistan officials who intended to transit through Indian territory to proceed to Dahagram.

From our side there was no ambiguity about this understanding. Unfortunately, the Government of Pakistan delayed giving instructions to the Commandant of the East Pakistan Rifles to make contact with the Commandant of the West Bengal Border Police, to effect a cease-fire. As the House is aware, firing has continued on the Cooch-Behar border since 17th March and the agreement of 22nd March did not put an end to the firing as it should have done. Indeed, later day reports from the West Bengal Government indicated that not only had the firing not stopped but that its intensity and extent had increased. Intermittant firing by Pak forces continued on the 22nd and 23rd March in Jikabari, Tinbigha, Bagdokra, Kharkharia and Permekliganj. The East Pakistan Rifles made use of light machine guns, mortars and grenades. For some time thereafter, firing was subdued but from the night of 24th March, it again became more intense in the Tinbigha area. There was again some relief on the 25th March but on the 26th Tinbigha, Bagdokra and Kharkharia sectors were again scenes of firing by the East Pakistan Rifles, who later extended their activities to Satirpul and Phulkabahri. On the 27th March, the Pakistan forces continued to fire and up to the 29th March firing was intense and continuous at Kharkharia, Bagdokra, Jikabari and Tinbigha.

The West Bengal Border Police naturally returned the fire in self-defence and thus foiled all attempts by the East Pakistan Rifles to dislodge our border posts. Encroachment on Indian territory by personnel of the East Pakistan Rifles was effectively prevented through the

56

action of the West Bengal Border Police who gave a good account of themselves in a trying situation.

The intensification of firing surprised the Government of India as much as the Government of West Bengal. We had been led to believe that the delay in the non-implementation of the agreement of 22nd March, was not due to any substantive decision by the Government of Pakistan not to honour this agreement, but to the temporary absence from Dacca of high officials of the East Pakistan Government who, we were told, were away to Rawalpindi to attend the inauguration ceremonies of the Pakistan President. The impression was conveyed to us that as soon as senior officials of the East Pakistan Government returned to Dacca there would be no difficulty in implementing the agreement of 22nd March and an immediate cease-fire would be ordered. As an earnest of their intention to

abide by the agreement of 22nd March, a group of East Pakistan officials put in visa applications with our Deputy High Commission at Dacca on 24th March. Our Deputy High Commissioner stressed that before facilitating the transit of a party of East Pakistan officials through Indian territory by granting them visas etc., an announcement about the cease-fire should be made and indication given of the date of a conference between the Chief Secretaries of West Bengal and East Pakistan. The question of granting visas and of working out arrangements for the return of such inhabitants of Dahagram as had left the enclave, could only be taken up after the cease-fire had become effective and an announcement of an agreed date for the conference between the Chief Secretaries of West Bengal and East Pakistan had been made.

By 25th March it had become clear that difficulties were being created in Dacca due to which implementation of the agreement of 22nd March was being impeded. From what we could make out here of the local difficulties in Dacca, we came to the conclusion that an argument had developed in Dacca as to whether visas could be given to Pakistani officials desirous of proceeding to Dahagram, even before a cease-fire had been fixed or announced.

To break the deadlock and to put an end to the wanton firing which is causing unnecessary tension and harassment to the civilian population, discussions have taken place with the Pakistan High Commissioner here. It has been agreed that the important thing is for the ceasefire to come into operation at the earliest possible time. Steps would accordingly immediately be taken to fix a time by mutual agree ment. Transit visas would be issued by that time, and they would of course become effective from a practical point of view, only when the firing stopped. It was also agreed that negotiations should take place without delay to fix an early date and time for the Chief Secretaries' Conference. That conference would consider the question of future transit facilities to enclave residents on both sides of the border as well as other matters connected with reducing tension.

It is essential, in order to put an end to the unfortunate situation which has been thrust upon us, and to pave the way for the restoration of normal conditions in the area, for an early announcement to be made of the coming into force of the cease-fire and of the Chief Secretaries' Conference. It was mutually agreed that this could be facilitated by the two High Commissioners themselves proceeding to Dacca to work out the arrangements after necessary consultation.

Members of this House must have read in the Press this morning that the presence in Dacca of the two High Commissioners has helped to bring about implementation of the decisions taken here on 22nd and 29th March, to end firing on the Cooch-Behar border and to arrange for a conference of the Chief Secretaries of West Bengal and East Pakistan. We have not so far received a report on the discus-, sions that took place in Dacca on the 30th evening, but it is clear that the cease-fire will become effective as from today afternoon, and the two Chief Secretaries will meet on 9th April to discuss wider questions such as future transit facilities for residents of Indian enclaves in East Pakistan and Pakistani enclaves in West Bengal; the ending of tension all along the border; and the establishment of tranquillity there. We have agreed to give facilities to officials of the Fast Pakistan Government to transit through Indian territory on their way to Dahagram. It is obvious that the movement of Pakistan officials over Indian territory will take place only after the cease-fire has become effective.

We hope that with these arrangements, the extremely regrettable and wholly unnecessary conflict on the border will come to an end. I would like to say, in conclusion, that there is no reason at all for such situations to arise, given the minimum of goodwill and good faith and the modicum of restraint. These are matters which can and should be settled around the conference table and not by resort to force, as that only exacerbates the situation and creates tension and excitement, and causes much harm and suffering to the inhabitants of the area.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

SPAIN

Indo-Spanish Agreement on Development of Atomic Energy

The Governments of Spain and India have decided to co-operate in the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. An Agree, ment for collaboration was signed in New Delhi on March 27, 1965.

Under the terms of the Agreement, the Junta de Energia Nuclear of Spain and the Indian Department of Atomic Energy will (a) exchange unclassified information (b) arrange for exchanges of scientists and technical personnel and sanction Fellowships for the training of personnel of either party in the plants, laboratories and facilities of the other (c) assist each other to procure such nuclear materials and equipment which they require from each other and (d) cooperate with each other in joint projects of mutual interest.

The Agreement will remain in force for a period of five years in the first instance. The note on behalf of the Government of Spain was signed by the Spanish Ambassador His Excellency Sr. D. Pelayo Garcia-Olay. Dr. H. J. Bhabha, Chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission, signed on behalf of India.

Prof. Jose M. Otero, President and Prof. Armando Duran, Vice-President, Junta de Energia Nuclear of Spain, visited India in early 1964, when they saw Trombay and a few other scientific institutions and industrial projects. Later in 1964, Dr. Bhabha led a delegation to Spain at the invitation of Prof. Otero and visited the Spanish atomic energy installations and saw the advances made by Spain in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Even before the conclusion of the Agreement the two countries were cooperating. Spain has in the past sold to India Uraniun concentrate. As a result of a formal agreement, the two countries will collaborate in increasing measures to mutual benefit.

SPAIN INDIA USA

Date : Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Agreement on Bokaro, Project

Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy, Minister for Steel and Mines, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on March 11, 1965 the text of the Agreement between the Governments of India and the U.S.S.R. for cooperation in the construction of Bokaro Steel Plant and for extending a credit for this purpose, signed on January 25, 1965.

The Agreement, under Article 4, provides for maximum possible participation of the Indian organizations in carrying out the designing work and in the supply of equipment and materials," for the construction of the-Steel works.

Under the Agreement (Article 2) the Soviet Government will "deliver to India during 1966-69 the equipment and materials which are not available in India". It further provides that "the organizations of the parties shall, within two months from the date of acceptance of the detailed Project Report by the Indian party, agree upon a division list of the working drawings to be done by the Indian and Soviet organisations."

The Agreement provides for industrial and technical training of Indian nationals as specialists and skilled workers. The training will be imparted both in India and Soviet Union.

The Bokaro, Steel Plant, according to the Agree-

ment, will have a capacity of 1.5 to 2 million tonnes of steel per year with a provision for expansion of the capacity of the Works to 4 million tonnes steel per year.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. "shall extend to the Government of India a credit up to 190 million Roubles bearing 2.5 per cent interest per annum and out of this credit shall render technical assistance to India for the construction of the said Iron and Steel Works."

58

The following is the text of the Agreement: The Government of India and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, proceeding from the relations of friendship and crose co-operation existing between india and the USSR, and guided by mutual desire for further developing and strengthening economic and technical co-operation, nave concluded the present Agreement on the following:

ARTICLE 1

The Government of India and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will co-operate in the construction of an Iron and Steel Works at Bokaro with a capacity of 1.5 to 2 million tonnes of steel per year with provision for expansion of the capacity of the Works to 4 million tonnes of steel per year. A list of the main shops and departments of the Works is given in Annexure I to the present Agreement.

With this in view, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall extend to the Government of India a credit up to 190 million Roubles bearing 2.5 per cent interest per annum and out of this credit shall render technical assistance to India for the construction of the said Iron and Steel Works.

ARTICLE 2

For the purpose of rendering the technical assistance stipulated in Article 1 of the present Agreement, the Soviet organizations shall :

1. Prepare the detailed Project Report for the construction of the Works within nine months from the date of the signing of the contract for the execution of the designing work. The scope

of the detailed Project Report is given in Annexure If to the present Agreement.

2. Prepare the working drawings for the construction of. the works within the scope and the time to be determined by the Soviet and Indian organizations. The organizations of the parties shall, within two months from the date of the acceptance of the detailed Project Report by the Indian party, agree upon a division list of the working drawings to be done by the Indian and Soviet organizations.

It is understood that the detailed Project Report shall be prepared for the Works with a capacity of 4 million tonnes of steel per year and the working drawings shall be prepared for the complex of shops and units for production of 1.5 to 2 million tonnes of steel per year.

The technical documents handed over by the Soviet organizations to the Indian organizations shall be used by the latter exclusively at enterprises in India. Such documents shall not be transferred to tiny foreign physical or juridical entities without prior consent of the Soviet organizations thereto.

3. Deliver to India during 1966-69 the equipment and materials which are not available in India.

4. Render assistance to the Indian organizations in :

-the construction of the Works by carrying out;

-the designers' supervision and by providing the advisory services during construction;

-the erection, adjustment and commissioning of the equipment.

For these purposes, Soviet specialists shall be deputed to India in number, specialities, for the periods and on the terms and conditions to be agreed upon between the organizations of both parties.

5. Recommend to the Indian organizations schemes and programmes of industrial and tech-

nical training of Indian nationals with the view of training specialists and skilled workers required for the operation of the said Works.

6. Depute Soviet specialist instructors, in number and for periods to be agreed upon with the Indian organizations, for rendering assistance in the training of specialists and skilled workers in India for the operation of the Works.

7. Receive in the USSR Indian specialists and skilled workers, in number, specialities and for periods to be agreed upon between the organizations of both parties, for industrial and technical training at the appropriate enterprises.

ARTICLE 3

For the purpose of implementation of the cooperation mentioned in Article 1 of the present Agreement, the Indian Party shall :

1. Furnish to the Soviet organizations all the initial data required for the designing of the Works (in the site selected by the Indian Party.

2. Consider the detailed Project Report of the Works within two months from the date of its submission by the Soviet organizations and approve it with such modifications, if any, as may be agreed upon between the parties.

3. Prepare reports on and working drawings for all the facilities located outside the Iron and Steel Works site, which are necessary for its normal operation, e.g. the townships, power and water supply, ore mines and quarries, the ropeways for the transport of coal. sewerage system, marshalling yards, etc.

59

The data for these outside facilities shall be prepared by means of mutual consultations between the two parties to the extent necessary. For these purposes, the Soviet organizations shall, at the request of the Indian organizations, depute Soviet specialists to India on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the organizalions of the two parties.

4. Ensure preparation by the Indian organizations of the working drawings of various units located within the boundary of the Iron and Steel Works, the list of these units being agreed upon between the Indian and the Soviet organizations. The Indian Party will be responsible for the conformity of the working drawings of such units prepared by the Indian organizations to the requirements of the detailed Project Report.

5. Purchase in third countries, as may be agreed upon between the parties, some equipment and materials which are not manufactured in India and in the USSR.

6. Execute all the construction and erection work necessary and provide all facilities and services for such construction and erection in accordance with the recommendations, advice and requirements of the Soviet organizations concerned.

7. Purchase licences for technological processes and equipment, wherever necessary.

ARTICLE 4

The Indian and Soviet Parties shall promote maximum possible participation of the Indian organizations in carrying out the designing work and in the supply of equipment and materials for the construction of the Works.

ARTICLE 5

For the purpose of establishing direct contact with the Administration of the Works tinder construction and for prompt and effective solution of all the problems which may arise, the Soviet organizations shall set up a Representation of the Supplier in the construction area of the Works.

ARTICLE 6

The Soviet organizations shall, at the request of the Indian Government, render assistance to the Indian organizations in attaining the designed capacities and operation of the said Iron and Steel Works by deputing Soviet specialists, delivering spare parts and necessary materials on terms and conditions to be additionally agreed upon between the two parties.

ARTICLE 7

The credit to the amount up to 190 million Roubles envisaged in Article 1 of the present Agreement (one Rouble contains 0.987412 grams of fine gold) shall be used by the Government of India starting from the 1st January 1966, in payment for :

-the designing work carried out by the Soviet organizations;

-the equipment and materials which are not available in India and delivered from the USSR c.i.f. Indian ports when carried by Soviet ships and f.o.b. Soviet ports when carried by Indian ships.

Prices for the equipment and materials shall be fixed on the basis of the world market prices;

-the expenses connected with deputing Soviet specialists to India for rendering technical assistance in the establishment of the Works envisaged by the present Agreement, except for expenses within the territory of India which will be reimbursed by the Indian Party in rupees;

--the expenses connected with the stay in the USSR of the Indian nationals sent for technical and industrial training at the corresponding enterprises in the USSR.

Should the costs of the supplies and services of the Soviet organizations for rendering technicat assistance in the establishment of the Works envisaged in Article 1 of the present Agreement exceed the amount of the said credit, the amount of such excess shall be repaid by the Indian Party by the deliveries of Indian goods to the USSR on the terms and conditions of the Indo-Soviet Trade. Agreement in force. The nomenclature and quantity of such goods shall from time to time be agreed upon between the parties.

In case of any change of the gold parity of Rouble indicated in the present Agreement, the sums of the credit evaluated in Roubles (the utilized and unutilized parts of the credit. balance of arrears on the principal and on the interest accrued thereon but not yet paid) shall be recalculated in accordance with such change. Reimbursement of the expenses of the Soviet organizations connected with rendering all kinds of technical assistance to the Indian organizations within the period up to January 1st, 1966, shall be effected by the Indian Party in accordance. with the Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement in force.

ARTICLE 8

The Government of India shall each calendar year repay utilized parts of the credit extended under the present Agreement during 12 subsequent years in equal annual instalments paid up to or on October 15th of each year starting from the year following the. year during which the corresponding part of the credit has been utilized.

60

Interest on the credit shall accrue from the case on which the corresponding part of the credit has been utilized and shall be paid during the first three months of each year following the year during which it accrued, the final payment being effected simultaneously with the final payment of the principal.

The date of the utilization of the credit for making payments for the equipment and materials shall be considered the thirtieth day from the date of the Bill of Landing and for the expenses incurred in connection with deputing Soviet specialists to India and other expenses to be covered from the credit-the last day of each three month period during which these expenses were incurred.

The Government of India has the right to repay the principal and pay the interest on the credit ahead of the due date of payment.

ARTICLE 9

Repayments of the credit and payment of the interest accrued thereon shall be effected in Indian Rupees (one Indian Rupee contains 0.186621 grams of fine gold) to a special account to be opened with the Reserve Bank of India, Bombay, in favour of the Bank for Foreign Trade of the U.S.S.R.

Conversion of Roubles into Rupees shall be effected on the basis of the above mentioned gold content of Rouble and Rupee. The amount credited to the said account may be used by the Soviet organizations for purchasing the, goods in India in accordance with the Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement in force and/or may be freely converted into pounds sterling.

In case of any change of the gold parity of Indian Rupee, which at present contains 0.186621 grams of fine gold, the Ministry of Finance, of India and the Bank for Foreign Trade of the USSR shall recalculate the balance of the special account in proportion to such change.

ARTICLE 10

For the purpose of keeping records of the utilization and repayment of the credit extended under the present Agreement and payment of the interest accrued thereon, the Ministry of Finance of India on behalf of the Government of India and the State Bank of the USSR on behalf of the Government of the USSR shall keen special credit accounts and shall jointly establish the technical procedure for keeping the said accounts and the settlement of the credit.

ARTICLE 11

The Government of India shall reimburse the Soviet party for the expenses of the Soviet organizations incurred in connection with the stay of Soviet specialists in India, beginning from January 1st, 1966, in Indian Rupees by crediting the corresponding amounts to the special account indicated in Article, 9 of the present Agreement.

ARTICLE 12

The Soviet organizations shall guarantee that:

1. The detailed Project Report of the Works, prepared by the said organizations, shall conform to the production capacity stipulated in the present Agreement.

2. The equipment delivered by the Soviet organizations shall be in conformity with the above said detailed Project Report.

3. The performance. of the equipment shall be in accordance with their stated capa-

cities.

The periods of the guarantees, the order of their fulfilment and other conditions shall be provided in the, contracts to be concluded in accordance with the present Agreement.

ARTICLE 13

The conditions of the fulfilment of the commitments of the Soviet organizations under the present Agreement shall be determined in the corresponding contracts to be concluded between the Indian and Soviet organizations.

The Soviet organizations shall furnish to the Indian organizations within one month of the acceptance of the detailed Project Report offers in the form of a draft contract for the supply of equipment and materials.

The contracts for the supply of equipment and materials shall be concluded within two months from the date of submission of the corresponding offers by the Soviet organizations

The Soviet organizations may co-operate in carrying out the designing work, the deliveries of equipment and in the implementation of other forms of technical co-operation for which the Soviet Party is responsible, with the corresponding organizations of third countries, but in case the need arises for deputing specialists to India from the, said third countries, the Soviet organizations shall obtain prior consent of the Indian party thereto.

ARTICLE 14

The Indian and Soviet organizations shall exchange all the information and render assistance which may reasonably be required by

61

either party in relation to the present Agreement and shall in particular furnish each other with progress reports and other information as may he required in regard to the programme of work for the construction of the Iron and Steel Works mentioned in Article 1 of the present Agreement and other matters connected therewith.

ARTICLE 15

The Government of India and the Government of the USSR shall in the shortest possible time after signing the. present Agreement inform each other of the corresponding Indian and Soviet organizations to be authorized for the implementation of the present Agreement; it is hereby understood that the said Government may authorize one or several organizations.

Should it be found necessary subsequently to substitute the organizations authorized for the implementation of the present Agreement. such substitution shall be deemed possible.

The Government of India and the Government of the USSR reserve. the right to transfer any or all rights and liabilities arising out of the present Agreement to such Indian and Soviet organizations as the respective Governments may consider necessary.

ARTICLE 16

In case the performance of the present Agreement is infringed for a certain period of time as a result of war, hostilities, embargo, blockades or any other contingency beyond the control of either party. the representatives of the Government of India and the Government of the USSR shall immediately consult with each other and come to an agreement with regard to the measures to be taken and if such agreement cannot be reached within a reasonable period of time, the Indian organizations may complete the designing and construction of the aforesaid Works in the order which may be considered necessary, but even in this case the rights and liabilities of the parties arising from the present Agreement prior to that moment shall remain in force.

ARTICLE 17

In case of any disagreement between the Indian and Soviet organisations on any matters arising from or connected with the implementation of the present Agreement, the representatives of the Government of India and the Government of the USSR shall immediately consult with each other and endeavour to reach a mutual settlement of such disagreement.

ARTICLE 18

All correspondence on the matters connected with the implementation of the present Agreement shall be in English.

The present Agreement shall come into force. on the date of its signing.

Done on this twentyfifth day of January, 1965, in New Delhi, in two original copies, each in the Hindi. Russian and English languages, the texts in Hindi and Russian being equally authentic and the English text being the operative one.

On behalf of the Government of India

N. N. Wanchoo.

On behalf of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. V. Sergeev

ANNEXURE I

To the Indian-Soviet Agreement of 25th January, 1965

The Main Shops and Departments of the Iron and Steel Works at Bokaro

1. Coke oven plant with coke ovens of 30.3 cu.m. capacity each with the necessary by-product plant.

2. Sintering plant for production of fluxed sinter.

3. Blast furnace plant with 2,000 cu.m useful capacity of the furnaces.

4. Steel plant with the capacity of the converters 100 tonnes each.

5. Hot rolling plant with slabbing mill and with 2,000 mm. continuous mill for production of hot rolled sheets 1.5 to 10 mm. thick.

6. Cold rolling plant with 2,000 mm. continuous mill for production f sheets and coils

62

0.4 to 2.00 mm. thick and with the equipment required for finishing hot rolled and cold rolled

sheets and with the equipment for production of galvanized sheets 0.4 to 1.2 mm. thick.

7. Shops for calcinating limestone, dolomite and production of resin-dolomite materials for converter lining and for production of refractory stock.

8. Maintenance facilities to provide the Works with spare parts and replaceable equipment except for rolls, heavy steel castings, nonferrous casting over 1 tonne and forging over 3 tonnes. Construction of a steel structural shop is envisaged.

9. Power and air blower stations.

10. Training Centre for the training of engineers, technicians and workers.

11. Units within the boundary of the Works for the supply of the Works with power, water, gas, compressed air, oxygen as well as communications and storage facilities.

ANNEXURE II

To the Indian-Soviet Agreement of 25th January, 1965

1. The detailed Project Report of the Works shall be prepared in sufficient detail in order to:

determine and assess all the main technical and economic data for the Works as a whole;

order the main equipment and prepare the working drawings at the subsequent stages.

2. The detailed Project Report will also include.

General layout of the Works and arrangement drawings for the equipment for the main shops of the Works;

Explanatory note specifying processes and the main equipment required;

Recommendations on the construction of the Works, including the schedule of con-

structing the shops of the Works, the requirements of equipment for construction and erection and the requirements of manpower for construction;

Data on the cost of the Works and the cost of production estimated on the basis of summary indices;

Requirements of manpower necessary for operation and maintenance of the Works; Summary list of equipment indicating the necessary technical characteristics: Summary list of the scope of construction work and main construction materials and structures.

3. The detailed Project Report will include all facilities inside the Works boundary. Facilities outside the Works boundary shall be designed by the Indian organizations, which will consult with Soviet specialists, wherever necessary.

4. The detailed Project Report will be in English and done in the metric system. All costs will be shown in Indian Rupees.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

VIETNAM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Use of Gas in South Vietnam

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in Lok Sabha, on March 26, 1965, regarding the use of gas in South Vietnam:

63 We have learnt with distress and a sense of shock of the disclosure about the use of gas in South Vietnam affecting the Vietcong and the civilian population.

Ever since World War I, civilised opinion throughout the world has condemned gas, chemical and bacteriological warfare. The revulsion of the peoples of the world was crystallised in the Geneva Convention of 1925 against use of gas in war. According to United States' spokesmen the gas used is not lethal. Even so, regard must be paid to world opinion and the danger of the situation escalating into a larger conflict. We consider that the use of gas is against the conscience of humanity and sincerely hope that no further use of it will be made in South Vietnam. We have already given expression to our deep concern at the situation in Vietnam. Arising from our initiative, discussions were held recently in Belgrade and many non-aligned countries will be making a joint appeal with the object of getting negotiations started as soon as possible, so that a political solution to the problem of Vietnam may be found.

64

VIETNAM USA SWITZERLAND YUGOSLAVIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1965

April

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vol. XI APRIL No. 4

CONTENTS

PAGE

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the Security Council on Pakistan's Armed
Aggression on Kutch Border
65
Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Statement on Southern Rhodesia
67

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha 70

NEPAL

Joint Communique on Prime Minister's Visit 77 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Indian Ambassadar's Presence in Royal Banquet for Chinese Foreign Minister at Kathmandu 78 Instruments of Ratification of Postal Agreements Exchanged 79

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha on Pakistan's Armed Aggression on Kutch Border 79 Home Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Kutch-Sind Border Situation 82

VIETNAM

Joint Peace Appeal by Non-aligned Countries 83

ZANZIBAR

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Indian Nationals in Zanzibar

84

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA PAKISTAN NEPAL VIETNAM

Date : Apr 01, 1965

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letters to the Security Council on Pakistan's Armed Aggression on Kutch Border

The following is the text of a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council by Shri B. N. Chakravarty, Indian's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, on April 11, 1965, protesting against Pakistan's unprovoked and aggressive military acts on Indian territory in Gujarat :

I have the honour under instructions of my Government, to bring to your notice the serious situation created by flagrant acts of aggression committed by Pakistan against India in the State of Gujarat.

Prior to the partition of India the province of Sind which now forms part of Pakistan and the State of Kutch and Gujarat had well defined boundaries which were not altered in any way by the partition of India. The boundary between Kutch in the Gujarat State of India and Sind in West Pakistan is clearly depicted in the pre-partition maps published by the Surveyor General of India. The authorities of the State and Central Governments of India have effectively exercised control and jurisdiction in this area and Indian border police have regularly patrolled the area right up to the border.

Some two months ago, Pakistani armed personnel made illegal intrusions into the area south of the boundary between Kutch and Sind, up to a distance of over two miles. They made a new track and claimed to be in occupation of the area up to this new track. Subsequently, they set up two posts--one at Kanjarkot and the other at a place west of Kanjarkot-1300 and 2000 yards respectively to the south of the Kutch-Sind border in the Indian territory. The Government of India protested against these intrusion. They requested that Pakistani armed personnel should vacate these intrusions and that the status quo ante should be restored. Further the Government of India in their notes handed to the Government of Pakistan on the 12th February, 18th February, 11th March and 8th April, 1965, inter alia, proposed to the Pakistan Government to agree to a meeting between the border officials of the two sides. While pointing out that any attempt by the Pakistan Government to disturb the historically established boundary, or to interfere with the status quo through use of threat or use of force was not permissible, the Government of India suggested a very early meeting between the Surveyors-General of the two countries. Since this was not acceptable to the Pakistan Government, the Government of India suggested a meeting at any level acceptable to the Government of Pakistan where a solution to the problem could be found and firm decisions taken for early demarcation of the Kutch-Sind border. The Government of India, in their note of the 8th April, also protested against the massive concentration of Pakistan armed forces along the border in Pakistan territory with a view to backing up and supporting Pakistan's illegal activities in Indian territory.

The Government of Pakistan refused to respond to any of the above proposals of the Government of India. A proposal was made by our border authorities on the 1st March 1965 for a meeting of the Chiefs of the Border police organisations on both sides. No reply was received from the Pakistan authorities until the 31st March. Likewise, the Pakistan Government failed to respond to the Government of India's very reasonable proposal for a meeting between the representatives of the two governments acceptable to the Pakistan Government. Instead of accepting the Government of India's proposals and refraining from the use of force, on the early morning on April 9, 1965, the Pakistan armed forces, including the Pakistan 18th Punjab Regiment, mounted a heavy attack on a small Indian border police post at Sardar, more than two miles within Indian territory. The post was subjected to heavy artillery and mortar fire by the Pakistan army and overwhelmed. There have been many casualties among the Indian border police personnel manning the post. Subsequently, on the same afternoon, the Indian police post at Vigokot, nearly sever. miles south

of the Kutch-Sind border, was also subjected to heavy attack.

65

The Government of India have sent a strong protest to the Pakistan Government. These unprovoked armed attacks by the Pakistan army on Indian border posts, lawfully established and well within Indian territory, constitute a premeditated and unprovoked act of aggression against India, a violation of Indian territory, and a breach of the Ground Rules which were agreed upon between the two Governments as part of the Indo-Pakistan Border Agreement of 1960. The events of the 9th April, referred to above, clearly show that the Pakistan Government is recklessly indulging in provocative and aggressive acts with a view to creating tension and conflict between the two countries. The Government of India have emphatically protested to the Pakistan Government against these attacks and have called upon that Government immediately to vacate its aggression against Indian territory, and to withdraw all its armed forces, including its regular army, from Indian territory, and to disband the posts illegally set 'up by the Pakistan Government in Indian territory at Kanjarkot and another post to the west of Kanjarkot. The Government of India has further demanded adequate compensation for the loss of life and property caused by this illegal action of the Pakistan Government.

The following is the text of Shri B. N. Chakravarty's letter to the President of the Security Council, dated April 28, 1965 :

With reference to the letter from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan of 19 April 1965 in reply to my letter of 11 April, 1965, bringing to the notice of the Members of the Security Council, Pakistan's flagrant aggression on the Indian State of Gujarat, I am instructed to say that the letter of the Permanent Representative of Pakistan distorts facts and makes baseless allegations. It seeks merely to weave out a story which has no relation to facts and attempts to cover Pakistan's aggressive actions. I would refer in this context to the correct position stated in my letter of 11th April which clearly indicated that the area in question lies fully within the territory of the Indian Union. Prior to the Partition of India, the province of Sind, which now forms part of Pakistan and the princely state of Kutch, which is now part of India, had well-defined boundaries. This boundary is clearly demarcated in the pre-partition map published by the Surveyor-General of undivided India.

I have been instructed by my Government to draw your attention to the fact that Pakistan's aggression s continuing and at the present moment, further acts of aggression by Pakistani armed forces, designed to aggravate the situation are taking place on Indian territory.

At 7.00 A.M. on the morning of 24th April, full-scale military attacks with tanks and artillery, were launched by Pakistan armed forces On four Indian posts namely, point 84, Sardar, Vigokot and Chhad Bet, six to eight miles deep into Indian territory south of the Gujarat-West Pakistan (Kutch-Sind) border, and these attacks- are still continuing. Pakistan army has deployed an infantry brigade which is using armoured personnel barriers supported by tanks and heavy artillery.

Behind its forces inside Indian territory, Pakistan has concentrated further armed forces on the border. The 8th infantry division has moved from Quetta and has been reinforced by two armoured regiments namely, the 12th Cavalry (Chaffes) and the 19th Lancers (Pattons). In addition, Pakistan's infantry brigade, various artillery regiments, , namely, the 4th field regiment, the 25th field regiment, the 14th field regiment, the 12th medium regiment and the 83rd mortar battery and infantry battalions, the 18th Punjab, the 6th Baluch, the 8th frontier force and four other battalions have been deployed by Pakistan on the Gujarat border. Pakistan has ordered general mobilisation which includes cancellations of all military leave and recall to duty of all officers and air force reservists. Intensive training of semi-military Pakistani formations known as Razakars and Mujahids in West Pakistan, and in particular in Sind area, is also going on.

The Pakistani attacks were launched at a time when discussions were going on both in Karachi and New Delhi between the representatives of the two Governments. On the 19th April the Government of India proposed once again to Pakistan an immediate ceasefire to be followed by an inter-Government meeting to determine the status quo ante to be restored and a higher level meeting to discuss the entire issue. On the 24th April, the Pakistan Government rejected this proposal and proposed instead an evacuation by the civil and armed forces of India from Indian territory, to which Pakistan has laid spurious claims. This proposal of Pakistan was naturally rejected by the Government of India. Even while these discussions were going on, the very same day Pakistan mounted its attacks on the Indian police posts, mentioned in paragraph 2, deep inside Indian territory. This would clearly show that the discussions undertaken by Pakistan with India were merely a pretence and that Pakistan has no desire to seek a peaceful solution and is determined to continue its aggression against India. The Government of India still hopes that the Government of Pakis-

66

tan will see the error of its ways, cease its aggression on Indian territory, and come to the conference table. If, on the other hand, contrary to its obligations under the Indo-Pak Border agreement and the Ground Rules of 1960 agreed upon between the two Governments and contrary to the UN charter Pakistan continues its aggression, then Pakistan will be responsible for the serious consequences that will inevitably flow from such unprovoked and naked aggression.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA LATVIA **Date :** Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravartys Statement on Southern Rhodesia

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations made the following speech in the General Assembly's Special Committee on Colonialism on April 15, 1965 regarding the situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia :

When the Committee, met for the first time this year, on 6 April, my delegation made a brief statement on the fifteenth report of the Working Group, in course of which the disquieting situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia was briefly touched upon. We had hoped that the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom would throw some further light on the latest developments in Southern Rhodesia and we had expected that he might be able to tell us something about Mr. Smith's proposals regarding the A and B rolls.

The representative of the United Kingdom has given us a summary of the developments since the statement of the-Prime Minister of the United Kingdom made on 27 October last year. He has quoted extensively from the press statement of the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations on 3 March 1965 and from his statement in the House of Commons on 8 March 1965. All these statements had already been publicized at the time. Therefore it is somewhat disappointing to us that the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom has not added much to our knowledge of the present situation in Southern Rhodesia. In reply to a request for details of the proposals reportedly put to the Southern Rhodesian Government by the United Kingdom Government, the respresentative of the United Kingdom explained to the Sub-Committee that the current exchange of communications between his Government and that of Southern Rhodesia was confidential. Only if the confidential character of such exchange was maintained could there be some hope of progress. That is why it has not been possible for the British Government to go beyond making certain broad statements of principle and objectives. My delegation is fully aware of the difficult situation in Southern Rhodesia and the complexities of the problem that face the United Kingdom Government. We can also understand that delicate negotiations have often to be conducted in secrecy. We only hope that these negotiations

will produce some concrete results, and that without much further delay.

The representative of the United Kingdom has repeated that the United Nations has no competence to discuss Rhodesian affairs. This view-of the Government of the United Kingdom has not been accepted either by this Committee or by the General Assembly, and Southern Rhodesia has been included among the Non-Self-Governing Territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter under General Assembly resolution 1747 (XVI). This Committee cannot therefore consider that Southern Rhodesia is anything but a Non-Self-Governing Territory. The representative has reiterated that.

"the authority and responsibility for bringing Rhodesia forward to independence rests with the United Kingdom Government". (320th meeting, Page 412)

To this statement we can whole heartedly agree. In fact, it is our contention in the Special Committee that the United Kingdom has not yet exercised its authority to discharge this responsibility. The British Government has taken legitimate pride that in transferring power it had always ensured rule by the majority, but with adequate protection of the interests of the minority. To this principle again we can give wholehearted support. In fact, what the Committee is wanting is to enforce this principle, namely, rule by the majority with adequate protection for the minority. In Southern Rhodesia what we are witnessing is complete protection for the minority without any regard for the rights of the majority.

This disregard for the rights of the majority is not only contrary to the resolutions of the Committee and the General Assembly, but is also in conflict with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Under Article 21, paragraph (3), the Declaration says :

"The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be

67

expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures".

Article 2 of the Declaration provides that :

"Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, religion", etc.

The second part of Article 2, which incidentally was adopted at the instance of the United Kingdom delegation, reads as follows :

"Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, Non-Self-Governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty".

In a statement made at the 181st meeting of the General Assembly held on 10 December 1948, the representative of the United Kingdom also made it clear that

"at every stage of the preparation of the Declaration, the United Kingdom had consulted its colonial territories, and it would accept the Declaration not only on its own behalf but also on behalf of those territories".

We know that the Declaration is not legally binding, but undoubtedly it is a moral obligation which all Members States have willingly undertaken. By not taking urgent action to bring about an electorate in Rhodesia on the basis of one man, one vote, the large majority of the nonwhite population is being denied elementary human rights.

The declaration of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom dated 27 October 1964, was welcomed by my delegation, by the membership of the Special Committee and throughout the world. It was a forthright statement of British intentions and policies and we believe that this statement was not only timely, but it also had a salutary effect in so far as it prevented any unilateral declaration of independence by Mr. Smith at that time. The effect of that declaration seems to have already been eroded to some extent during the last few months. The repressive legislation has continued. The nationalist movement is being suppressed ruthlessly under cover of unjust laws, and several thousand nationalists are in prison or under restriction including Mr. Nkomo.

From the press statements made by the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, it is encouraging to find that he has once again made clear :

"the steadfast opposition of the British Government, to unconstitutional action in the form of unilateral declaration of independence".

At the same time, however, an assurance was given that the British Government had no intention to impose unilaterally a solution of these problems which :

"would violate the 1961 constitution and the established convention that Parliament at Westminster does not legislate on matters within the competence of the Legislative Assembly of Rhodesia except with the agreement of the Rhodesia Government".

The exact implications of this assurance are not clear to us. We cannot understand how the further constitutional advance, the grant of which is admittedly the responsibility of the United Kingdom Government, can be said to be an interference by the Parliament at Westminster. If it means that unless the minority Government of Southern Rhodesia agrees, no further constitutional advance is possible, then the situation indeed becomes hopeless.

The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations concluded his Press statement by asking all concerned "to address themselves to a sober search for ways by which present uncertainties can be removed; by which current dilemmas can be resolved constitutionally and honourably; and by which the common goal of independence can be achieved". No one can take any exception to these sentiments, but what do they really amount to in the context of the realities of the present-day situation in Southern Rhodesia? We are all for a sober search for ways by which present uncertainties can be removed, but is a sober and meaningful dialogue possible with Mr. Smith or his supporters who have assumed the right to a veto even on the holding of a constitutional

conference?

The African nationalist leaders have made reasonable demands. They have called for the abrogation of the 1961 constitution : they have asked for the release of all prisoners and detenues; they have asked that the British Government should call for an immediate constitutional conference with the representatives of the people to devise a new constitution based upon the principle of "one man, one vote"; they have asked that the granting of independence to Southern Rhodesia should follow and not precede the formation of a majority government. These are sober and eminently reasonable demands. In fact, similar demands had

68

already been accepted in the past by the British Government in its erstwhile colonial territories.

Mr. Smith, however, has different ideas. In a radio interview on 4 March 1965, Mr. Smith is reported to have said : "This question of majority government, as far as we are concerned, is so far away in the dim distant future that it just does not bear examination at the moment," He also said that he had been given to understand that United States thinking has also changed. The statement of the representative of the United States made yesterday in the Committee does not, however, bear this out.

With regard to the holding of a constitutional conference, Mr. Smith said : "Any constitutional conference would have to have my Government's consent. We have made it clear that there will be no constitutional conference and I think they" --he means the British Government--"have accepted this." He was perhaps encouraged in this belief by the Press statement of the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations when he expressed the view that, "It would be useless to call a constitutional conference unless all parties concerned were willing to attend it". While the co-operation of all parties is eminently desirable, we cannot wait indefinitely and for all time to come, We know of at least one recent precedent in which a constitutional conference was held despite the objection of one of the parties concerned.

Mr. Smith confessed that some good had come

out of the visit of the two British Ministers and said that the visit brought the African nationalists "down to earth". He said : "I think the nationalists are now more aware of the facts of life than they were before."

We can understand the reluctance of the British Government not to force the issue. We all want too a peaceful solution. We want co-opera-, tion of all parties concerned. At the same time, the British Government should not rest content with Mr. Smith exercising a permanent veto on all proposals for an advance towards universal adult franchise and independence. All avenues of negotiation seem to have been ruled out. That is certainly not the way to a peaceful evolution. It would only lead inevitably to a violent revolution.

My delegation would earnestly request the British Government to take all possible steps to prevent any such tragedy for which it will have to share the major portion of the blame. It must exercise greater pressure to bring the parties together. A unilateral declaration of independence would, according to British constitutional practice and tradition, be an act of rebellion against the Crown. This the British Government itself has made quite clear both in this Committee and outside. The question that remains unanswered is: Will the United Kingdom Government use force to prevent the unilateral declaration of independence by the Smith Government? The British Government would certainly be on stronger moral grounds to resist such a rebellion than it was when it tried to put down the revolt of the American colonies, a revolt which had the support of all but a small minority of loyalists. In Southern Rhodesia the vast majority of the population is opposed to the unconstitutional unilateral declaration of independence sought by a small minority.

So far as the Government and people of India are concerned. we have made it clear that the only basis on which Southern Rhodesia should gain independence is after the establishment of a duly constituted democratic government elected on the principle of "one man, one vote". Any unconstitutional declaration of independence by the minority government would not be recognized by the Government of India.

It is our earnest hope that a peaceful and ami-

cable solution will be found to this problem. In the view of my delegation there could be an immediate change for the better if certain steps were taken urgently. Mr. Nkomo and the other nationalists who are under arrest or under detention for political reasons should be released. All restrictive and unjust laws should be withdrawn and a constitutional conference of all parties concerned should be called without delay. This constitutional conference could be charged to work out methods for the rapid implementation of the various resolutions of the General Assembly and of this Committee ensuring the establishment of a majority government at the earliest possible date through elections based on the principle of universal adult franchise. Since the 1961 Constitution is not acceptable to the majority of the people of the territory, it would be futile and unrewarding to insist on the sanctity of that Constitution. If these measures are not taken and if Mr. Smith goes ahead with the 7 May elections, then the situation must go from bad to worse with serious and even disastrous consequences. My delegation sincerely hopes that wisdom and goodwill will prevail and that a majority government wil soon emerge through peaceful means.

69

INDIA USA **Date :** Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singhs Statement in Lok Sabha

The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following speech in the Lok Sabha on April 1, 1965 in reply to the debate on budget grants for the Ministry of External Affairs :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the lion. Members who have participated in this debate and have projected various viewpoints about the international 'Situation and have also referred to several issues of an international and global character. A great deal of mention has been made of several problems with which we are more intimately concerned; the problems of our own defence, our own security, relations with our neighbours, etc. have been referred to by lion. Members. I would venture, in the course of my reply, to confine myself to some of the salient points, because it will not be possible within a short time to reply to the large number of points, important no doubt, but of a somewhat local character or involving matters of detail.

ISSUE OF WAR & PEACE

I was somewhat disappointed when in the course of the debate the major stress was confined to some of the issues with which we were immediately concerned; they are important, no doubt, and we have to take note of them, and clarify our ideas and reiterate our position. But at the same time, there are some bigger issues to which it has been customary in this House, on the part of very many lion. Members from various sections of the House, to pay special attention. On this occasion, however, we have been very much obsessed and gripped by certain immediate points, and some of the other important issues have not received the attention that they deserve. These are I think, important considerations which should always be before us when a country of the size and importance of India debates in the highest forum, its national Parliament, the international situation.

What are the basic things before the world ? What are the basic issues that the world faces today ? The most important issue, to my mind, which the world is faced with, ever since the Second World War ended, is the issue of war and pence.

COLONIALISM AND RACIALISM

The other most important issue is the one relating to colonialism and racialism. Then, there is this important question of economic disparities between the richer countries or the advanced countries and the poorer countries. Which is the forum where all these important issues are being discussed? And what is the state of affairs prevailing in that forum? AU these matters have been receiving a great deal of consideration and a great deal of thought in the forum of the United Nations in which our delegations have always played a prominent role.

It was as a result of the great and valiant efforts made by India to end colonialism and the fight that India put up against racialism in all forms and in all shapes that a greater part of Africa, or a major part of Africa, today, is free. Some vestiges of colonialism and racialism still subsist, and it will be good for us to remind ourselves that we owe a great duty to the oppressed People in countries still under colonial domination, under the Portuguese domination in Angola and Mozambique, and in South Africa where racialism of the worst is 'still prevailing. We have to reiterate our determination to end this and to raise our voice very strongly and in a determined manner in support of ending these last vestiges of colonialism and racialism

If there is casteism in our country let us end it. We feel that we have ended it. Our Constitution is such that there is no scope for casteism, and this House itself is having the honour of having these distinguished persons belonging to various castes, various communities and various ways of social life and religious beliefs. I think that it is on account of our determined effort in our own country to end casteism in all its forms, that our voice in this respect has a special force and a special strength, and we should always use it in favour of ending racialism in all its forms. These are matters which require reiteration so that we might pledge our determination in this respect.

ECONOMIC DISPARITIES

On the question of economic disparities in the world, some mention has been made by some hon. Members about the work that has been done by the Conference on Trade and Develop-

70

ment which held long sessions in Geneva. The Indian delegation played a dominant role in that, and the report that has been produced is a very good report, and it can be a charter for further development efforts, particularly in the underdeveloped world. India's efforts are continuing to give content to the various recommendations that have emerged as a result of the deliberations of the Geneva Conference on Trade and Development. These are issues which should always be before us, and we should pay continuous attention to the solution of these problems.

SOUTH EAST ASIA

Quite naturally, our attention was greatly concentrated on, and directed to, the situation in South East Asia. In this respect, the situation in Vietnam, South Vietnam and North Vietnam, the situation in Laos to a certain extent, the situation in Malaysia in the unfortunate' confrontation that exists today between Malaysia and Indonesia-these are, the matters that have been referred to. On these issues, it was quite interesting for me to note that there were certain extreme points of view presented and projected by two or three Opposition sections; and the distinguished leaders representing these Groups when they made their speeches, criticised government action from one angle and also from an opposite angle, the objective being criticism, but everyone thinking that Government is being hustled into taking a particular position, according to Shri Frank Anthony, because of communist pressure, and, according to Shri Hiren Mukerjee, on account of the criticism by Swatantra and by Shri Frank Anthony. I think there is some consolation for me in this. This criticism from the two extremes does create a sense of satisfaction in me that the policy I am pursuing is perhaps a correct Policy, a policy which is also in the interest of peace in this region.

(Interruption).

It requires some careful study and also some thought to follow the policy. It is not an oversimplification of the type suggested by the respected leader of the Group to which the bon. Member belongs, that it should be a straightforward policy of tying ourselves to various defence pacts.

VIETNAM

The point for determination and the important consideration that should be before us is the

ultimate objective we have before us in relation to Vietnam-and then there are the other positions that we take of making strong statements in support of one thing or in condemnation of another, as was strongly urged by the two extremes that I have mentioned. What is our objective, what should be the objective in this areas If we are clear as to what should be the objective, the rest of the thing will be comparatively easy.

I want to make it clear that our objective in this area is to prevent this Vietnamese situation from deterioration. It is our considered opinion that if these activities that, unfortunately, today are there in North Vietnam and South Vietnam continue in the same fashion and in the same manner, if these pains unfortunately continue and prevail there for some time, then there are very grave risks of the situation escalating, and this escalation may result in a major conflagration which ultimately might hurl the world into a major conflict where even atomic weapons might be used. Let us be quite clear in our minds : our objective in a situation like this should be to create conditions where peace might be restored, where there should be an effort at a satisfactory solution on political considerations; any attempt to find a solution by military means it something which is both impractical and unwise. It is quite interesting to note that notwithstanding the supporters who have been quite vociferous in presenting their viewpoint, either the one or the other, there is this all-round appreciation among the main contesting parties in the Vietnamese situation that a military solution of this vexed problem of Vietnam is not possible, and in the long run a solution by peaceful means is the only objective and is the only practical thing possible.

Now, if we are clear that the situation in Vietnam demands that escalation of conflict should be avoided, then obviously efforts have to be directed to creating a situation, an atmosphere, creating the necessary background where negotiations might start. In this respect, we have consistently followed this policy which I would like to enunciate for the benefit of the hon. friend, if he has not cared to follow it. It is that a military solution of the Vietnamese problem is not possible. Secondly, there must be a Geneva-type conference where by negotiations a peaceful solution of the vexed Vietnamese problem should be attempted. The objective is to restore peace and to start negotiations. There can be a difference of opinion. There are many hon. Members in this House who talk of escalation. Escalation can never be planned escalation, and once the forces of escalation are let loose, then it might engulf the whole of the globe into flames of real conflict where it will be difficult to find out as to who is the conqueror and who is the vanquished.

We sometimes are taking these difficult and intricate questions and situations as simple ones and are trying to simplify solutions for these.

71

We have taken this clear decision. Then we have to see as to whether the steps that we have taken are taking us in that direction or not. It is quite correct that if the analysis of some of the friends, whose leadership I would concede to Shri Masani, the hon. Member opposite, is that conflict is the only answer, then there is a basic difference of approach. Therefore, the remedies cannot be identical. I would concede that this is the basic difference. Our objective There is to restore peace and to attempt a political situation.

If this is the objective, have we worked for it? We have done so from a very early stage. When we saw the risk of escalation, we made a very clear statement on 8th February, where the Government of India's position in this respect was. fully clarified. Later on, our Prime Minister addressed several heads of Governments and heads of States, pointing out to them that the situation in Vietnam was such- that there was risk of escalation. of conflict, and therefore we should do something to restore. conditions in which talks might start, negotiations might start. Again, on the initiative taken by our Prime Minister, there has been discussion at Belgrade, and as a result of that it is expected that joint statement subscribed to by important non-aligned countries is likely to be issued, calling upon the parties concerned to start negotiations, so that a satisfactory solution might be attempted.

It will be wrong for anybody to suggest that there is no policy on Vietnam. I concede that the policy is not liked by some hon. Members for one reason, and is not liked by others for a totally different reason, but sometimes in their anxiety to criticise the Government, even extremes can meet and from their own points of view try to project a picture as if there is lack of clarity in our approach.

Our policy is this, and it is our intention to pursue this policy, of peace and conciliation, not only in Vietnam, but in all parts of the world, because we are wedded to pursuing a policy of peace, of conciliation, of easing tensions, rather than adopting a pseudo-militant role and saying brave words and not doing anything concrete. This is the policy that we intend to pursue.

I do not see any strength in the criticism that has been made either by Shri Masani or Shri Anthony or Shri Mukerjee in this respect. Most of their criticisms cancel each other, and in the balance the policy that we are pursuing of bringing about conditions in which negotiations might start is the only constructive role that is good for Soluth-East Asia, for the peace of South-East Asia, and also, in the long run, even in our own interests. I have no doubt in my mind on that score.

CHINA AND PAKISTAN

When we are faced with this difficult situation in relation to China and Pakistan, it is quite interesting to find that the two extremes whom I will not name-it is quite obvious whom I mean-in formulating their attitudes, take note of only one of the two basic difficulties that we face today in our relations. One is our conflict with China which committed the massive aggression against India in 1962, and the other is our troubles with Pakistan. It was suggested by an hon. Member that the best course would be to enter into some sort of collective security arrangements with the Western Powers, and that that would be the end of all our difficulties.

The hon. Member: With your own neighbours and the Western Powers.

External Affairs Minister : All right, with our own neighbours and with the Western Powers. I will not comment upon it, but will leave it to the House and the country to judge whether there is any likelihood of an early satisfactory solution of out differences with Pakistan. We have done our best. We carried on talks about Jammu and Kashmir. Our Prime Minister broke his journey at Karachi on his way back from Cairo and had talks with President Ayub, and we have always expressed our willingness to settle all our differences with Pakistan by peaceful means, by means of negotiations. But you can see the bellicose attitude that is adopted by Pakistani leaders. I do not know how much contact Shri Masani has with the Pakistani leaders, or whether he is in the know of working of the mind of the Pakistani leaders, but does the way they have been hobnobbing with China to spite and to hurt India, leave any doubt in Shri Masani's mind as to whether there is any basis for fruitful talks with Pakistan?

The hon. Member : I suggested Japan and Malaysia, not Pakistan ?

External Affairs Minister : He intervened when I mentioned Pakistan. Now when he finds the position not comfortable, he wants to run away from that.

The hon. Member : I was suggesting a regional pact against the Jakarta-Peking-Karachi axis, and for that I want another conference of Asian powers.

External Affairs Minister : Let us take a realistic view. Does entering into some sort of military pact, which is vaguely in the mind of Shri Masani, help us in the situation in which we find ourselves today in relation to these two

72

countries, Pakistan and China ? The answer is obvious.

Pakistan, as was pointed out by my colleague here, is already a member of SEATO. And what is SEATO? Originally it was conceived as the main rallying ground, as the so-called bulwark or offensive or defensive against China, but at the very first sight of China getting into conflict with India by their wanton and unprovoked attack of India, SEATO melted,, and Pakistan, on account of her hostility towards India, throwing to the winds whatever may be the obligations or the philosophy behind SEATO, started hobnobbing with China.

This is the situation, and in such circumstances it will be extremely unrealistic and not in the national interests to think in terms of military pacts. We want to clarify our position on this without any doubt, because these types of doubts harm us, as Shrimati Pandit rightly pointed out, in our relationship with many friendly countries, particularly in the Afro-Asian world.

NON-ALIGNMENT

Here is this whole continent of Africa. The countries in Africa, the new, independent, resurgent, vigorous countries, all of them are nonaligned. And in Asia, unfortunately there are countries which are aligned in military pacts with one or the other of the major blocs. That is the situation which we have inherited in the post-war, post-colonial era. There are serious efforts going on even amongst the members of these so-called defence pact countries to wriggle out of these pacts on one excuse or the other. The whole concept of the defence pact is really on the wane, on the run. This type of concept can be compared to a sinking ship, and Shri Masani and his friends ask its to jump into this sinking ship. I think it is nothing but a counsel of despair. This country has certain traditions, certain inherent strength with all these vast patriotic people, hardworking people, who value their freedom, who value their independence....

Shri Swaran Singh....who will never fail to shed their blood for the defence of the country. For such a fine country and such a fine people to be misled into a belief or feeling that they cannot defend themselves and therefore they must enter into some sort of security arrangement, will be compromising our sovereignty. We are determined not to compromise our sovereignty. That does not mean that we should not strengthen our defences or that we should hesitate to get help from all friendly countries. The pursuit of our policy of non-alignment, our pursuit of policies for maintaining peace in the world, for working for restoration of peaceful conditions where there are strains, for reducing tensions, has not only helped the world, helped the bigger cause as my respected colleague Mrs. Pandit said, but it has also helped us in

our own national interest. That is apart from high principles.

High principles are something which we should always value and it would not be a good day for India if we were casually to throw aside the good and high principles and lofty principles and if we feel overwhelmed by the intricacies of our immediate problems, and if we throw over the principle to the winds, it will not be good for the world or for us either. But I would say that even from the purely national interests, our own self-interests, this is the only policy that we should pursue. It is our intention to continue to pursue this policy.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION The other attack from my friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee is that we are not very forthright in this. We had perhaps not used strong language. We must remember that in South Vietnam we occupy a special position which we have inherited by virtue of our chairmanship of the International Control Commission. It is our duty to see that the Geneva Agreement is enforced and that the Geneva Agreement is not contravened. Mr. Masani says that we should have sided with Canada on one of the last reports whereas there have been many occasions when we have been criticised that we should have joined Poland and not Canada when making our recommendations. Our effort has generally been to examine the issues that come up before the International Control Commission in a dispassionate manner and objectively and to report to the two Co-Chairmen, namely, United Kingdom and the USSR. Therefore, to a certain extent, uneasy peace was maintained in this part of the world for several years. We ourselves are very unhappy that the Geneva Agreement has not been honoured and there had been lapses from both sides. We have never hesitated to point this out generally, in a vast number of cases, by unanimous reports and sometimes in majority reports where sometimes the Polish representative had been with us and on other occasions the Canadian representative had been with us. When we occupy the position of the chairmanship of the International Control Commission which is functioning in such difficult circumstances, it will be too much for me to say or for any Government to say that they will side with one or the other member of the commission. We take an objective view

and take the responsibility of taking that view. And that is the way we have functioned. It was through the efforts of that Commission that for

73

several years or for about ten years practically, the situation did not deteriorate. There were complaints. There were, lapses; there was contraventions of the agreement but by and large this thing remained on a low key. But the Laos situation that has developed of late is really fought with serious danger and we should continue to exercise our efforts for restoration of peace and for starting negotiations.

INDONESIA AND MALAYSIA

With regard to Indonesia and Malaysia, there is an unfortunate dispute and the House is no doubt aware that we recognise Malaysia and we have got the most friendly relations with Malaysia. The Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tunku Abdul Razack was here and he had very useful talks with the Prime Minister, with me and other members of Government here, and now the Finance Minister is also here, and we are in touch with them and they know fully well our interests and our friendship with them. About this dispute, the Malaysian leaders themselves are anxious that the confrontation should end and that there should be conciliation rather than confrontation and that some Peaceful methods should be found for settling this dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia. The Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman had done a great deal for working towards the creation of the circumstances in which some talks may start. That is the objective of both and some friendly countries have actually made efforts in that direction. At one time there was that proposal of three representatives, one representing each of the three countries, namely, Indonesia, Malaysia and Phillippines and a fourth Asian or African country which could be agreed upon by all these three countries so that they might work out a satisfactory solution of this vexed problem. We are hoping and it is our earnest desire that this confrontation should change into conciliation and we have worked for that. We have made it clear that we are not anxious to jump into this dispute and We are not anxious to assume the role of mediation but if there is anything that we could

do and both sides want us, we will not be found wanting. That is the direction in which we must move. That is our policy in this area.

UNITED NATIONS

Whether it is war or peace, or colonialism or racialism or economic disparities, the United Nations had played a very significant role, and I am sorry that for sometime past, the United Nations itself is facing very grave danger. The last session of the UN General Assembly remained completely paralysed. There was this dispute about financing of peace-keeping operations and about the contributions to be made by the various countries and the bigger issue as to which should be the organ for the control of peace-keeping operations. All these issues have arisen before the United Nations and the UN General Assembly last time was unable to transact any business. I am glad that by the efforts of all countries, particularly, the Afro-Asian group, a committee of 33 had been constituted and they are going into this whole question of peace-keeping operations and the control and financing of these operations and other relevant issues involved. India is a member of that committee and they are now working in New York to find a satisfactory solution both with regard to the financial implications and also the future scope of peace-keeping operations. The entire world, particularly the smaller countries and under-developed countries are anxiously awaiting the result of this because the bigger countries may not be very fond of the UN, and probably they could exist even without the UN. But let us not forget that there are a large number of small countries for whom UN is a very valuable forum; they could assert their sovereignty and project their individual personality and thus contribute for the world getting together. It is a very desirable development in the world and anything that weakens the UN is a matter which should cause concern to this Parliament and to this country. Lot us hope that the efforts of this committee would yield some concrete results and the paralysis from which the United Nations has been unfortunately suffering will end, and the United Nations will be restored to its vigour and strength so that the nations of the world might play their useful role for the achievement of the objectives, which is the only hope if the world is to survive a catastrophe or conflagration and engulfment in

war and destruction.

It was in this respect a matter of great disappointment for us when a friendly country, Indonesia, decided to quit the United Nations. We feel that there was little justification; merely because Malaysia was elected to the Security Council, there was no justification, there was little justification, for Indonesia to quit the United Nations. Then there was the talk of a rival United Nations body. There was some mention of that move being made. but I am glad that on this issue the efforts which were made by certain countries were not at all favoured by the large Afro-Asian nations and they had to abandon that idea of establishing an organisation, rival to the United Nations, and at the moment, it is hoped that the United Nations will be able to come back to its former usefulness and active role.

74

AFRO-ASIAN COUNTRIES

There was one other dung mentioned by hon. Members. It was said that India should play a more decisive role, a more dynamic role, in the Afro-Asian world. These are very good expressions, very catchy words, which can be easily reproduced and easily said, but we have to examine whether they have any content in them or whether they are Just phrases. We claim that in the non-aligned nations' conference in Cairo, India did play a significant role. The dominant note there was that of peaceful co-existence, stress on non-alignment, conciliation rather than conflict. These were the dominant notes of the deliberations and the outcome at the Cairo conference. This matter was discussed in great detail on the last occasion. I have no intention to go into it again in detail, but the outcome of the non-aligned conference really was something very useful, because it again brought into prominence and to the forefront the concept of non-alignment. of conciliation, and of peaceful co-existence, things which are of supreme importance for the world and for us. It will be wrong to belittle the outcome of the conference of the nonaligned countries that took place at Cairo.

I was rather sorry that an hon. Member, who generally makes constructive contributions, today

disproved that, and he was somewhat annoyed for some reasons, and he tried to turn a blind eye to the relations that fortunately exist today between us and our neighbours. I would appeal not only to him but to all sections of the House that we should be very cautious and we should, not use expressions which spoil our relations with our neighbouring countries.

AFGHANISTAN

In that respect, take, for instance, Afghanistan, our neighbour. Unfortunately, we are not making much headway with Pakistan, but take Afghanistan which lies on the other side. Their Prime Minister was here recently. There was complete identity of views on all issues, and from the cornmunique that was issued at the end of the talks --Shri Prakash Vir Shastri might read it again if he has not read it already-he will be convinced that there was complete identity of views on all the issues.

NEPAL

Then the Foreign Minister of Nepal was here, and he had discussions with us on all matters of a bilateral character and also on matters of international nature. I would ask my hon. friend to read the communique that was issued at the end of the visit of the Foreign Minister of Nepal-Our relations with Nepal today are extremely friendly and 'Very close and it is our intention to strengthen them still further. I would appeal to hon. Members, that they should contribute, for the strengthening of these relations and not throw doubts which unnecessarily would create doubts in the minds of the people in this country and others. This is no service to the country or for the relationship which appears to be truly cordial even to the critics. We are strengthening our economic and political relations and all those relations with Nepal, I think are very fine and very friendly.

BURMA

Take Burma, Gen. Ne Win, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers was hem. He toured our country. He had several talks with our Prime Minister and also there were other discussions with him. Our relations with Burma are good. I claim they could be much bettered. We aredoing everything possible to strengthen them still further. But they are definitely towards improvement, and it will be absolutely not in our own interest to talk lightly about these things. Let us agree not to make this as a debating point. But we should have some perspective and view them in that background rather than just try to build any argument to criticise the Government.

CEYLON

Take Ceylon. We had friendly relations with Mrs. Bandaranaike's government. We have, I hope, the most friendly relations with the new government. It will please the House if I were to inform the hon. Members(interruption).

On this issue, I want to be absolutely clear. I would like the hon. House also to bear with me if I were to say that in countries where the democratic set-up is functioning and Ceylon is one-and we are very proud that our neighbour is having a democratic, parliamentary form of government of the same type, which we are following-there can be results in the elections where One party comes into power or the other party comes into power, and we have to deal with a country which is following a democratic set-up. It will be absolutely wrong for us not to like a government which is democratically elected and to prefer another government which might again be democratically elected. We have had good relations, fine relations, with the Ceylon Government when Mrs. Bandaranaike was the Prime Minister. We will continue to have good relations and try to strengthen the relations with the new government also.

75

INDO-CEYLON AGREEMENT

It will be a happy thought for this hon. House to know that India, after several years, has ceased to be an issue in the Ceylon elections, which is a right thing, because we are not interested in boosting one party or the other. Let us not have the attitude that we prefer one or the other group. We scrupulously avoided taking any interest in the elections which went on there in the normal course and India was not a matter of issue. Then, an hon. Member said--I do not know where from he took it-that our High Commissioner or our High Commission must have known that this government was going to lose the elections and that we need not have entered into an agreement with the former government and should have waited for the new government. I am very sorry. We are sometimes accused of indecision. When we take a decision, it is said, "No, you should have remained undecided and should not have dealt with a government that was established by law and the constitution and should have waited for the off-chance of a particular government losing." Ibis is a very funny way of dealing with countries. I think this light-hearted manner in which sometimes we are prone to take our neighbours is a temptation which we should strongly resist, and I would urge the hon. Member.; to do so. In this particular case, Mrs. Bandaranaike made a public statement. In effecting this agreement about the future of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon, Mrs. Bandaranaike herself was in touch with Mr. Dudley Senanayake, who is the present Prime Minister and who was at that time the leader of the opposition. In the course of the talks, he made it clear that this was an agreement, with which even the leader of the opposiion was in agreement. I do not know what is the basis for the statement of Mr. Prakasb Vir Shastri that at some time in London, there was some talk that India might take 50,000 and we did not try to take even. one man. That statement is not borne out by facts. I have not been able to see the source of his information; that is quite incorrect.

The hon. Member: You will come to know when you see the records of Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference held in 1953.

External Affairs Minister : In fact, our revered leader, Nehruji, was always anxious that we should settle this matter by some method and this should not be made an irritant between India and Ceylon. These are matters which are sought to be raked up quite unnecessarily. I had no intention of going into them. because I had already reported to the House on our efforts at improving the relations with our immediate neighbours. Exactly at the time when they are definitely better and more friendly, here comes a statement which tries to criticise them. I think it is very unwise to take that attitude, howsoever one may not agree in this respect. An hon. Member : At one stage, even Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was deadly opposed to the idea of Stateless Indians.

External Affairs Minister: My hon. friend himself had been dealing with this matter at one stage. I think even before he went to Ceylon, he had been dealing with this matter. All this legacy was left to us by persons of his way of thinking. I am happy that we have been able to solve it and remove one thing which stood in the way....

AFRICAN COUNTRIES

Mention was made that we should consolidate our friendship with African countries. I fully agree with that and our relations with African countries are very cordial and good. We are continuing to improve those relations, I also agree that we should also try to have diplomatic missions in as large a number of countries as we can, but finance comes in the way, because it is pretty costly to establish these missions. But our efforts will continue and we will work in that direction.

We are also having closer economic relations and collaborations with many African countries. That is something which is appreciated by the African countries. This is the direction in which we want to work.

ALGERIAN CONFERENCE

Mention has been made of the forthcoming conference at Algiers. It is true that this conference, which is based on geographical rather than ideological considerations is bound to be more complicated than the conference of non-aligned nations, because there was some basic ideology which governed the thinking of the countries that participated in the latter conference. Therefore, this conference is likely to be more difficult and the issues that are likely to arise are also of such a nature that we will have to take very good care to see that our viewpoint is properly brought out and also that the outcome of the deliberations of the conference is in the general interests of Afro-Asian solidarity. Notwithstanding the differences that loom large, there are many things common. All these countries are underdeveloped. There are the vestiges of colonialism racialism and economic matters. And the almost universal desire of all of us, with the unfortunate exception of Indonesia, is to strengthen the

76

United Nations. There are many common matters and it is our earnest hope that the, deliberations of the Afro-Asian nations in Algiers will be successful. The Algerian leaders themselves have led their country to freedom after a very revolutionary struggle. They have got some very dynamic ideas of Afro-Asian solidarity and friendship. Our voice should always be on the side of progressive countries, trying to work out the future of Africa and Asia on the basis of ending colonialism and strengthening the forces of peace rather than of confrontation.

PAKISTAN

I am conscious that within this short-time, I have not been able to cover all the points. But there are one or two points I would like to mention. About our relations with Pakistan, I have said something before and I have mentioned to the House the unfortunate state of our relations as they exist today. Even in this, we should always remember that Pakistan is our neighbour and we have common frontiers several thousand miles long and there are close geographical and historical ties. So, notwithstanding the present difficulties of a diverse nature-some purely irritants and other long range-ultimately this also will have to be tackled by some sort of settlement. I know at the moment, I can be. accused of taking a view which is not realistic. (interruption).

MILITARY AID

We have always said that the steps which India has taken to strengthen our defences or getting military aid from all friendly countries and also strengthening our military and defence potential are to safeguard the integrity and sovereignty of our country against aggression. We cannot neglect this. I do not want to go into details, because this House discussed the Defence Ministry's demands only the other day. It is unfortunate that Pakistan is carrying on an incorrect and false propaganda against us that we are strengthening ourselves and as such we are posing a threat to our neighbours. It is quite interesting that in their anxiety to say anything to harm to India, they raise some imaginary fears in some other neighbours of ours, which is absolutely unfounded. We have got the most friendly relations with our neighbours. There is this unfortunate conflict with China and Pakistan and it is amazing how, when we make our arrangements for strengthening our defences against the Chinese threat, Pakistan should carry on this baseless propaganda against India and should say that by India becoming strong there will be danger to anybody. India's strength means really stability in this part of the world and it is our intention to continue to make India stronger and stronger so that not only can we defend our territories against aggression but also significantly contribute by pursuing these policies both internally and externally towards stability in this region.

USA INDIA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA SWITZERLAND VIETNAM LAOS MALAYSIA INDONESIA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC YUGOSLAVIA CHINA PAKISTAN EGYPT JAPAN CANADA POLAND AFGHANISTAN NEPAL BURMA ALGERIA

Date : Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Joint Communique on Prime Minister's Visit

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri accompanied by Shrimati Lalita Shastri paid a goodwill visit to Nepal from April 23 to April 25, 1965. During his stay in Nepal, the Prime Minister held talks with His Majesty the King and with the Chairman of the Council of Ministers Mr, Surya Bahadur Thapa, on subjects of mutual interests.

At the conclusion of the visit, the following Joint Communique was issued on April 25. 1965 :

At the invitation of Their Majesties the King

and Queen of Nepal, the Prime Minister of India and Shrimati Shastri paid a goodwill visit to Nepal from April 23 to April 25, 1965. The Prime Minister was accorded a warm and affectionate welcome in Nepal. His Majesty's Government and the Government of India regard the Prime Minister's visit as an important step in the further strengthening of the friendly relations existing between the two countries.

The Prime Minister conveyed to His Majesty the cordial greetings and good wishes of the Government and people of India. His Majesty on his part expressed his heartfelt greetings and good wishes to the Government and people of

77

India. The Prime Minister took advantage of his visit to review with His Majesty the King and the Chairman of His Majesty's Council of Ministers the world situation in general and developments in Asia in particular. These discussions were marked by cordiality and understanding and a broad measure of unity and identity of purpose and approach which characterize the relations between Nepal and India. His Majesty and the Prime Minister reaffirmed their faith in the policies and principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, which they have faithfully and vigorously pursued and which-were reiterated by the recent Conference of Non-aligned Countries at Cairo.

His Majesty and the Prime Minister, while recognising and reaffirming their faith in the traditional kinship and bonds of history, geography and culture which bind together the people of the two countries, noted with satisfaction the growing sense of partnership between them indevelopmental activity. They expressed their determination to continue to strengthen this cooperation with a view to providing for their peoples the innumerable benefits of modern science and technology.

The Prime Minister was happy to observe the progress that Nepal is making in the economic, social and other spheres. He expressed the Government of India's readiness to continue to assist and cooperate in Nepal's accelerated development.

Their Majesties and the Chairman of the

Council of Ministers, accompanied by the Prime Minister and Shrimati Shastri, visited the Kosi Barrage, which His Majesty graciously inaugurated on April 24. The Prime Minister laid the foundation of the Western Kosi Canal. These, two projects are symbolic of the joint efforts of the two countries to provide in cooperation with each other a better and fuller life of their peoples.

The Prime Minister, on behalf of the President of India, extended an invitation to Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal to pay a visit to India this year. Their Majesties have graciously accepted the invitation. The Prime Minister also extended his invitation to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers to visit India at his early convenience. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Shri Surya Bahadur Thapa, has accepted the invitation with pleasure. The dates of the visits will be decided after further consultation between the two Governments.

NEPAL USA INDIA EGYPT

Date : Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Indian Ambassador's Presence in Royal Banquet for Chinese Foreign Minister at Kathmandu

The following is the text of a statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the Lok Sabha on April 6, 1965 regarding the reported presence of Indian Ambassador at the banquet given by the King of Nepal to the Chinese Foreign Minister :

Some time before the arrival of the Chinese Foreign Minister, Marshal Chen Yi, in Nepal, the Ambassador of India in Nepal sought our instructions as to whether he should attend banquets etc. to be given by His Majesty's Government in the Chinese Foreign Minister's honour. We instructed the Ambassador to accept the invitations of His Majesty's Government to functions arranged by them, but not other functions including those arranged by the Chinese Embassy in Kathmandu.

This has been our general approach in such matters in the past. When the Prime Minister of China visited several countries in Asia and Africa during the period from December, 1963 to February 1964, our Heads of Missions in those countries had asked for instructions and similar instructions were sent to them at that time.

China has committed aggression on our country and remains in illegal and unjust possession of large portions of our territory. The Government of China spare no pains in maligning our Government, country and people. As a matter of policy, therefore, our representatives abroad do not accept invitations to functions arranged by the Chinese except in Peking, where we maintain a representative accredited to the Government of China.

When, however, the Government of a friendly country invite our representative accredited to them to a function arranged by them in honour of a visiting Chinese dignitary, our instructions to our missions are that the invitation should be accepted, as an act of courtesy to the government of the country to which they are accredited. The refusal of such invitations could be regarded as an act of discourtesy to the host country, which should be avoided.

With our neighbour Nepal, our relations are particularly close. cordial and friendly. Governmerit consider it entirely proper that our Ambassador in Nepal responded to His Majesty's Government's invitation as he did. As I said earlier, he did so under Government's instructions.

78

NEPAL INDIA CHINA USA MALI **Date** : Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

NEPAL

Instruments of Ratification of Postal Agreements Exchanged

Instruments of ratification of the agreements between the Governments of India and Nepal about the exchange of letter mail. inured and parcel post were exchanged in New Delhi on April 9, 1965 between Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, Union Communications Minister, and the Nepalese Ambassador to India, His Excellency Yadu Nath Khanal. The agreements were signed between the two Governments on September 8, 1964. They will come into force from April 13, 1965, when the Indian Embassy Post Office at Kathmandu will cease to function. Till then insured parcel service with India and other foreign countries will continue to be provided to the Nepalese citizens by the Indian Embassy Post Office at Kathmandu.

The new arrangement will enable Nepal to exchange parcels and insured letters with foreign countries with which India has these services. It is recalled that Nepal started its foreign letter mail service from April 14, 1959.

Under the present agreements, the inland

postal rates will apply to insured letters and parcel mail from India to Nepal. The maximum weight of parcels, however, will be restricted to five kilos and the maximum value of insured articles to Rs. 1,560. Air surcharge at the inland rate will be charged on air parcels. Parcels for Nepal will be accompanied by the usual customs declaration form and despatch note as applicable to parcels for other foreign countries.

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date** : Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha on Pakistan's Armed Aggression on Kutch Border

Moving a motion in the Lok Sabha on April 28, 1965 for the consideration of the situation arising from the repeated attacks by Pakistan's armed forces on the Kutch border the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following speech :

Mr. Speaker Sir,

I rise to move that this House may take into consideration the situation which has arisen as a result of repented and continuing attacks by Pakistan's armed forces on the Kutch border. There have been serious and frequent engagements. Our men are defending our frontiers with exemplary valour and I should like to tell them that this House and all the people of this country stand solidly behind them, and will con sider no sacrifice too great to meet this challenge to our territorial integrity.

The situation which we are facing today is undoubtedly grave. I think the House would like to have a connected account of the events leading up to the situation that exists today.

During the last few months, Pakistan has been resorting periodically to firing and clashes at several points in the Indo-Pakistan border, both in the East as well as in the West. Our men have taken defensive action at all these points effectively, but with great restraint. The clashes on the Kutch border are the latest in the series of incidents which Pakistan has chosen to indulge in Sometime ago, Pakistani patrols were noticed moving on a track close to the Kutch-Sind borders. On being challenged by our patrols, the Pakistani patrols claimed that they were moving on a track which was the old customs track and within Pakistan territory. It was also noticed that Pakistan had occupied Kanjarkot and established a standin-Post there. in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Ground Rules, the Deputy Inspector-General of Police,

Rajkot Rangers, took up the matter with the Director-General, West Pakistan Rangers and called for a meeting to discuss the situation and to determine the status quo. The Director-General, West Pakistan Rangers did not attend, but sent his local Commander who had a meeting with the DIG, Rajkot Rangers. This, however. led to no result and encounters between our patrols and those of Pakistan continue.

On April 9, in the earl hours of the morning, our border post at Sardar was attacked with heavy mortar and MMG fire, followed artillery

79

fire from 25 pounder guns under cover of which two battalions of the Pakistan Regular Army belonging to 51 Infantry Brigade advanced towards the post. Details of this encounter have already been given to the House in the statement by the Home Minister on the 12th April. The fact that this attack was pre-meditated and preplanned was quite clear from the documents captured from the Pakistan prisoners and from their interrogation. The plan of assault on our border post by the Pakistan Army was drawn up in the second week of March and movement of troops began thereafter. Orders for the attack were apparently given on April 7 and the attack was launched in the early hours of April 9.

Therefrom, as the House knows, the Chief of the Army Staff was instructed to take over operational control of the border and army units moved into Vigokot the same evening. The Pakistani firings' and shellings, however, continued to which our armed forces have replied.

Since then Pakistani armed attacks of increasing intensity have been continuing at many points into our territory south of the Kutch-Sind border. On April 24 our company post at Point 84 was shelled in the morning and later attacked by Pakistan infantry supported by tanks and other armour. On April 26, Pakistan armed forces, again with tanks and armoured vehicles, attacked our border post at Biarbet. These attacks are still continuing.

Pakistani armed action is a naked act of aggression. They have attacked Indian posts deep into Indian territory, six to eight miles south of the border-a territory which on Pakistan's own admission has never been in its possession. Hon'ble Members have no doubt seen the statement of the Pakistan Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto, on the 15th April in which he said, defending the Pakistan position : "It must he remembered that, the central fact is that this is a dispute over territory which lies roughly north of the 24th Parallel. The dispute has arisen not because the disputed territory is in India's because the disputed territory is in India's adverse possession" This is what he has said. In other words. Pakistan has chosen to mount an armed attack on territory over which Pakistan has never exercised possession and over which Pakistan in fact admits India's possession. Pakistan thus stands self-condemned. She has used force for changing the status quo and for vindicating its territorial claims. This is contrary to the United Nations Charter and to the Ground Rules under the Indo-Pakistan Border Agreement of 1960. Pakistan's behaviour in fact amounts to a clear and open aggression on our territory.

As is usual with Pakistan even while discussions have been in progress through diplomatic channels to settle the matter peacefully, Pakistan has been intensifying its attacks and moving in and heavy artillery to attack our posts.

On April 19, the Foreign Secretary handed over a formulation to the High Commissioner which in substance was the same as the Pakistan Foreign Office had suggested to our High Commissioner in Karachi, a few days earlier, namely, that there should be a ceasefire, to be followed by talks at official level with a view to the determination and restoration of the status quo ante, and later a high-level meeting between the two governments to discuss the boundary question. On the morning of the 24th April, the Pakistan High Cornmissioner handed over an alternative formulation to the Foreign Secretary, according to which ceasefire was to be followed by the withdrawal of the armed forces of both India and Pakistan, whether civil or military, from certain areas which they contended were the disputed territory. But earlier the same morning, even before this new formulation had been presented, Pakistan had launched a heavy attack in brigade strength on our post at Point 84, west of Chadbet with heavy artillery.

Throughout this period, Pakistan has been

making shifting claims and conflicting statements. At the meeting between the DIG, Rajkot Rangers and Lt. Col. Aftab Ali, Commandant of the Indus Rangers, at Kanjarkot on the 15th February, 1965, they said that they had not occupied Kanjarkot but that they were patrolling the area up to the track south of Kanjarkot which according to him was the old customs track adjoining Surai and Ding. In the Government of Pakistan's note dated the 1st March, 1965, which was in answer to our protest note of 18th February, 1965, it was stated by Pakistan Government that Kanjarkot fort had not been occupied by the Indus Rangers. Today, not only Pakistan is in occupation of the Kanjarkot fort but it has gone much beyond its claim to patrolling' up to the customs track. Pakistan today is laying claim to a large area south of the Kutch-Sind boundary and north of the 24th Parallel.

I want to state clearly and emphatically that we reject and repudiate these claims in their entirety. Pakistan claims that the Rann of Kutch is an inland sea and, therefore, Pakistan is entitled to half of this area. This is completely untenable. The Rann of Kutch is not an inland sea and has never been recognised as such. Long before the creation of Pakistan, the then British Government of India decided formally in 1906, that it was more correct to define the Rann of Kutch as a "marsh" rather than as a "take" or "inland sea". That the Rann of Kutch is a "marsh" is indisputable. It has all the flora and fauna of marshland with marsh-grown grass in abundance and other characteristics. What happens is that during the monsoon period because of the strong winds and

80

the high tides in the Arabian Sea, this low-lying area gets flooded by sea water. Furthermore in the monsoon period, it receives fresh water from the swollen rivers. The area, therefore, is flooded from about the middle of May till the end of October. it is mostly dry and partly marshland during the remainder of the year.

Pakistan's claims also ignore the historical fact that even though the Kutch-Sind Border is undemarcated, it is well-defined on maps and wellrecognised in fact. Prior to the partition of India, the Kutch-Sind border separated the then British Indian province of Sind- and the Indian State of Kutch. Not being an international boundary then, it did not need to be demarcated. The boundary itself was, however, well-defined in all official maps dating from 1872 to 1943 and even later, and was well-known and well-established. The boundary has also been described in detail in official documents over the last three quarters of a century prior to the partition of India. The boundary shown in the official maps of undivided India prior to August' 15, 1947, cannot be questioned.

The Official gazetteer of the Province, of Sind published in Karachi in 1907, the Gazetteer of India of the Bombay Presidency published in 1909, and the Imperial Gazetteer of India published by the British Secretary of State for India in 1908 are all categorical about the Rann of Kutch being outside the province of Sind.

In all the documents of the Political Department of the then British Government of India of 1937, 1939 and 1942, defining the political charges of various officers, the Rann of Kutch was invariably shown as falling within the Western India States Agency and Never as falling within the province of Sind. As the House is aware, the entire Western India States Agency became part of India as a result of accession. The totality of evidence leaves no basis whatsoever for any dispute regarding the border between the Sind Province and Kutch.

Ever since these recent intrusions commenced. the Government of India suggested repeatedly to Pakistan that meetings should be held between local officials and also talks be held at a higher level. For instance, we suggested to the Pakistan Government that the Surveyors-General of the two countries should me-et to discuss the problem of demarcation. Pakistan refused. We reminded Pakistan of the Ground Rules and the desirability of a meeting between the local Commanders for the restoration of the status quo. We also suggested in our note of 18th February that there should be a meeting between the representatives of the two Governments at whatever level considered appropriate by Pakistan and repeated this suggestion later more than once. Despite these endeavours, there was no proper response from Pakistan.

On 13th April 1965, the Pakistan Government made a three step proposal suggesting (i) cease-

fire, (ii) an inter-governmental meeting to determine what was the status quo which should be restored; and (iii) a higher level meeting. The Government of India authorised their High Commissioner the very next day, i.e. on 14th April, to convey the acceptance of these proposals. It is to be deeply regretted that the Government of Pakistan later went back on their old proposals.

On 19th April, the Government of India repeated that the proposal for ceasefire should be accepted forthwith, but instead of accepting this proposal, the Government of Pakistan put forward an entirely new formula on the 23rd April which, as I have already mentioned, required the withdrawal of Indian forces from what Pakistan chooses to call unilaterally a disputed territory but which in fact indisputably is entirely our own. Pakistan has since been persisting in this demand. Ibis attitude on their part means a virtual rejection of all our efforts to wean them away from warlike postures.

Sir, I have made this rather long narrative in order to give the House a complete picture of the false nature of Pakistan's claims, its sinister designs and the naked and reckless use of force by Pakistan against us.

It is apparent that one of the prime reasons of Pakistan's irrational behaviour is the obsessive hatred against India which Pakistani leaders, Pakistani press and communal fanatics in Pakistan have worked into their system over the past two decades.

The events which I have just described have caused us all the gravest concern. Ever since the attainment of Independence, India has stood for peace, international amity and goodwill. India has a living and vital stake in peace because we want to concentrate attention on improving the living standards of millions of our people. In the utilisation of our limited resources, we have always given primacy to plans and projects for economic development. It should, therefore, be obvious to any one who is prepared to look at things objectively that India can possibly have no interest in provoking border incident's or in building up an atmosphere of strife.

However, our neighbours, both China and Pakistan, have chosen to adopt an attitude of

aggressive hostility towards India. Lately they seem to have joined hands to act in concert against India.

In these circumstances, the duty of Government is quite clear and this duty will be discharged

81

fully and effectively. The entire resources of the country in men and material will be employed to defend our frontiers and to preserve our territorial integrity. I know that each of one of our 450 million people of India is today prepared to make any sacrifice in defence of the motherland. We will prefer to live in poverty for as long as necessary but we will not allow our allow our freedom to be subverted.

The specific question which we have to consider and, by this, I mean not only the Government but this House and indeed, the whole country is what course we should now pursue. Which path do we take? We are prepared to take the path of peace but we cannot follow it alone. Pakistan must decide to give up its warlike activities. If it does, I see no reason why the simple fact of determining what was the actual boundary between the erstwhile Province of Sind and the State of Kutch and what is the boundary between India and Pakistan, cannot be settled across the table. It need not even be a negotiating table. It is more a question of finding out the facts, rather than of negotiating a settlement. It can be done by experts on both sides. All this is possible provided there is an immediate cessation of hostilities and restoration of the status quo ante.

I should like to tell the House that on the Kutch Border Pakistan has many advantages. What is more, our soldiers are occupying posts in areas which will soon be submerged in water and from where they will, therefore, necessarily have to withdraw. If Pakistan continues to discard reason and persists in its aggressive activities, our Army will defend the country and it will decide its own strategy and the employment of its manpower and equipment in the manner which it deems best. Countries who are friendly to us have urged that a ceasefire should be agreed to as soon as possible. We are ready to respond to these appeals. But, at the same time, I must tell the House that we have also to be ready for the alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I have uttered these words after the most serious thought and with full consciousness of my responsibilities. This is one of the most fateful moments of our times. I realise that both India and Pakistan stand poised at the cross-roads of history. The path of reason and sanity, of peace and harmony, is still upon. Even while our police and later our Army have been defending our soil with commendable courage in the face of heavy odds, the path to peace has not been blocked. But it is a path on which we cannot walk alone. It takes two to make friendship and peace.

It is my earnest hope that the point of no return will not he reached and that Pakistan will still agree to ceasefire in accordance with its own proposals of April 13, which India had accepted.

I know at this hour every Indian is asking himself only one question : What can he do for his country and how can he participate in the nation's endeavour to defend our freedom and territorial integrity. To them and to all our people, I want to address this appeal : wherever you are and whatever your vocation, you should work with true dedication. Bring out the best in you and serve the country selflessly. The supreme need of the hour is national unity-unity not of the word but of the heart. All Indians, of whatever faith or profession, have to stand solidly together and prepare themselves for hardships and scrifices. Let us give no quarter to any ideas that tend to divide us. Let us all work together with a new sense of national discipline and with an inspired feeling of dedication to the cause of country's freedom and integrity. And I would close by asking this august House to give its wholehearted and mighty support to the Government at this momentous hour.

PAKISTAN USA LATVIA INDIA CHAD CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Home Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Kutch-Sind Border Situation

The Union Home Minister, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on April 12, 1965 regarding the situation in the Kutch-Sind border :

I made a statement in the House on the afternoon of April 9, and briefly recounted events on the Kutch-Sind border in the area of Kanjarkot, culminating in the attack on one of our border posts by Pakistan Forces earlier that day.

According to information received subsequent to that statement, an attack on our border post at Sardar commenced at 03.40 A.M. on April 9, with heavy mortar and MMG fire, followed by artillery fire from 25 pounder guns under cover of which two battalions of the Pakistan regular army belonging to 51 Infantry Brigade advanced towards the post. Our CRP unit stationed at Sardar put up a fierce resistance as a result of which the Pakistan battalions had to withdraw leaving 34 dead on the field including two officers and four prisoners in our hands. We lost four policemen dead, 5 were wounded and 19 men including the Deputy Commandant of the CRP are missing at present.

82

Apprehending a further attack later in the evening and as the Sardar post was subjected to intermittent artillery fire which became heavy in the afternoon, the police withdrew to our Vigokot Post, 4 miles south-east of Sardar. The Vigokot post was also shelled by Pakistan artillery in the afternoon.

The Chief of the Army Staff was instructed on April 9, to take over operational control of the border and Army units moved into Vigokot the same evening. This is commendable promptitude considering the distances and the nature of the terrain. Army partrols reoccupied Sardar post on April 10 and some Pakistani documents and equipment were recovered from the neighborhood of the post.

From the interrogation of the prisoners taken in the engagement and the examination of the documents recovered it appears that the plan of the assault on our border post by the Pakistan Army wits drawn up in the second week of March and movement of troops began thereafter. Orders of the attack were apparently given on April 7 and the attack was launched in the early hours of April 9. The second phase of the plan, namely, consolidation of Sardar post was foiled by the brave resistance put up by our border police.

I would like to pay a tribute to the gallantry of the police force at the Sardar post which for over 12 hours heroically defended themselves against such heavy odds and repulsed the attacks by two battalions of Pakistan Army. The House, will, I am sure, wish me to send our condolences to the families of those who were killed in this action. Government would make suitable provision for giving relief and financial assistance to the bereaved and the injured.

Apart from the precautions that have already been taken for the security of the border, we lodged on April 10, a strong protest with the Pakistan Government against the use of regular army units for attacking our border police post and the unprovoked aggression on our territory leading to loss of life and property to our nationals. Adequate compensation for the loss caused, as well as immediate withdrawal of all forces from our territory, have been demanded. Simultaneously, Members of the Security Council and Governments of friendly nations have been addressed with a view to acquainting them with the grave happenings which have dangerous possibilities if Pakistan persists in its present aggressive posture in the Kutch-Sind border.

There was no incident on 10th and 11th April, 1965. This morning, however, there has been an exchange of fire between the Pakistan forces and our men in the neighbourhood of Sardar post and intermittent shelling has taken place. Our forces are alert and the situation is well under control.

The Government's policy in this matter is clear. We are taking every step to protect the in-

tegrity of our frontier. On the 10th April our High Commissioner in Karachi was told by the Pakistan Government that there should be a meeting between the two Governments first at the official and thereafter at the ministers' level. The House will recall that this was the proposal made in our notes of the 18th February and 11th March to the Pakistan Government. We wish that Pakistan had accepted our proposal before mounting an attack by the Pakistan Army on our border force. However, we are prepared for these talks, and we are communicating this to the Pakistan Government.

PAKISTAN USA LATVIA

Date : Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

VIETNAM

Joint Peace Appeal by Non-aligned Countries

The following is the text of a joint appeal on vietnam issued on April 2, 1965 by heads of State of Government of 17 non-aligned countries, including India:

Pursuant to the final declaration of the conference of Heads of States or Governments of non-aligned countries held in Cairo in October 1964.

We, the undersigned Heads of State or Goverment, have noted with great concern the aggravation of existing tensions and conflicts in South-East Asia and in certain areas of Africa,

83

the Middle East and Latin America, arising from oppression and foreign intervention and regret the present deadlock in the United Nations which prevents it from exercising fully its responsibility in maintaining and safeguarding peace. We solemnly reaffirm the right of peoples to self-determination and the principle that all States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force.

We reaffirm our dedication to the principle of the inviolability of, and respect for, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

We express our conviction that recourse to force and pressure in various forms is contrary to the rights of the people of Vietnam to peace, freedom and independence and can only lead to the aggravation of the conflict in that area and to its transformation into a more generalised war with catastrophic consequences.

We are deeply concerned at the aggravation of the situation in Vietnam and are convinced fully it is the consequence of foreign intervention in various forms including military intervention which has impeded the implementation of the Geneva Agreements on Vietnam.

We are firmly convinced that irrespective of possible differences in appraising the various elements in the existing situation in Vietnam, the only way leading to the termination of the conflict consists in seeking a political solution through negotiations. We, therefore, make an urgent appeal to the parties concerned to start such negotiations, as soon as possible, without posing any preconditions, so that a political solution to the' problem of Vietnam may be found in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the Vietnamese people and in the spirit of the Geneva Agreement on Vietnam and of the declaration of the Conference of Non-Aligned countries held in Cairo.

We invite the Governments of ail countries concerned for the maintenance of world peace to associate themselves as soon as possible, with this appeal.

VIETNAM INDIA EGYPT USA SWITZERLAND

Date : Apr 01, 1965

Volume No

ZANZIBAR

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Indian Nationals in Zanzibar

The following is the text of a statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs in the Lek Sabha on April 30, 1965, regarding the plight of Indians and citizens of Indian origin in Zanzibar :

Since the Revolution in Zanzibar in January 1964. the new Government has been taking steps to take over the means of production in the Island. Thus, all land has been nationalised and clove and copra plantations taken over. Recently, 19 factories have also been nationalised. The immigrant communities, which include the people of Indian origin, have felt the impact of these measures because they were also owners of land and other means of production.

The nationalisation measures have been applied uniformally. irrespective of the race or nationality of the owners.

We recognize that it is the sovereign right of an independent State to enact measures concerning ownership of property, within its limits. Moreover. the people affected by these measures are either Zanzibari nationals or holders of UK and Colonies passports. The number of Indian nationals in Zanzibar is about 350, most of whom are in service.

Our Representative in Tanzania has been meeting the leaders in Zanzibar and Dar-es-Salaam and bringing to their notice or, humanitarian grounds the hardship faced by the people of Indian origin with a view to mitigating them. May

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vol. XI MAY No. 5

CONTENTS

PAGE INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Statement in the Disarmament Commission 85

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the Security Council on Pakistani Aggre ssion

in Kutch

90

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the Security Council on Concentration

of

Pakistani Troops on Indian Borders

94

Shri V. C.Trivedi's Statement in the Disarmament Commission on Chinese' Nuclear Explosion 95

NEPAL

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on his Visit to Nepal 96

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Pakistan's Armed Aggression i

n

Kutch 97 Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on Kutch-Sind Border Situation 99

Statement by Government of India on Chinese Support of Pakistan's Aggressi

on

in Kutch 99

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on withdrawal of Indian Diploma tic

Mission from Southern Rhodesia 100

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's State Visit to Soviet Union 101 Prime Minister's Speech at Indian Embassy Luncheon in honour of Soviet Leaders 103 Prime Minister's Speech at Moscow State University 104 Prime Minister's Speech at People's Friendship University 104 Prime Minister's Speech on Moscow Television 105 Prime Minister's Speech at Indo-Soviet Friendship Meeting 106 Joint Communique 108

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA PAKISTAN NEPAL RUSSIA

Date : May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Statement in the Disarmament Commission

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, made the following statement in the U.N. Disarmament Commission on May 4, 1965 :

Mr. Chairman,

Since this is my first statement in the Disarmament Commission, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your unanimous election to that post in this most important body. The Commission is fortunate in being able to secure as its Chairman a person of your eminence. We are happy that we shall be working under your able and wise guidance, and we assure you of our wholehearted co-operation with you in the discharge of your onerous duties.

My delegation is gratified at the convening of the Disarmament Commission, signifying as it does the vital interest that the entire membership of the United Nations has been taking in this most important and urgent issue facing humanity. India has special reasons to feel happy, because it took a lead in the matter of the composition of the Disarmament Commission and, along with Yugoslavia, sponsored a draft resolution at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. That draft resolution, which became General Assembly resolution 1252 (D) (XIII), was adopted without any opposition. That was a very happy augury indeed and lei ultimately to the United Nations as a whole taking a direct responsibility on issues of disarmament.

Another reason why the Indian delegation welcomes the convening of the Disarmament Commission is that the Commission will be able to consider the problems of disarmament-problems which, owing to some unfortunate developments, could not be considered at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly.

In introducing the draft resolution during the thirteenth session, proposing the setting up of the Disarmament Commission, the Indian representative had pointed out that the solution of disarmament problems did not brook any delay and that the world could not continue to wait, amid growing tension, while the major Powers became deadlocked time and again. Once again the international community is facing violence and bloodshed, uncompromising positions taken up by the parties and the heightening of tension in different parts of the world. Men of goodwill everywhere are making efforts to arrange cessation of hostilities, through processes of mediation and conciliation, but as yet there are no signs of the reversal of the current trends of attempting to settle disputes by bombs and violence, and continuing tension through sabotage and subversion.

We must not, however, give up hope. In fact, a worsening of the situation in any part of the globe makes it all the more essential, nay vital, for all of us to proceed with greater determination on the constructive road of detailed, technical and complicated negotiations on problems of disarmament. It should give an added incentive to all of us to strive for the cherished goal of a disarmed world, a world where arms will play no part in international affairs, a world of peace. justice and progress.

Disarmament is indeed the most urgent and the most vital issue facing humanity today, and the Indian delegation is happy that the Disarmament Commission is presently in session to give the needed stimulus to responsible and constructive negotiations on disarmament. This is a world forum where all States Members of the United Nations are represented. We are sure that many new ideas would emerge from our deliberations here, and some new guidelines would he indicated for detailed study and consideration by the Disarmament Committee in Geneva.

The present difficulties need not unduly dishearten us. The international community bas to its credit many achievements in the field of disarmament and reduction of tension. The year 1963 was in particular a notable year in our quest for international peace and security. It witnessed the establishment of a direct communication link between the two super Powers. It witnessed one of the most heartening agreements. which bag been subscribed to by over 100 nations, the treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under

85

water. This was a momentous landmark and a significant first step towards, sanity. Most nations have observed the prohibition, whether they signed the Treaty or not. There has been only one solitary defiance of international will as reflected in the Moscow Treaty. Barring this cynical disregard for human welfare by one nation, all other nations have refrained from polluting the earth's atmosphere, from subjecting the present and the future generations of mankind to the health hazards of radioactive fallout. With this one and only exception, the international community has decided not to wage war on the defenceless men, women and children, both of our age as well as those yet unborn. Of course, the defiance hurled by the People's Republic of China needs to be countered, and we trust the international community will take note of the affront given to it and the darnage--one hopes the damage is not irreparabledone to it by the explosion at Lop Nor.

The year 1963 also witnessed yet another hopeful development in the agreement not to station or orbit nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in outer space.

There are significant steps in the right direction but there were no comparable developments last year, except for the cut-back in fissile material production, nor has there been any progress during the current year so far. The Indian delegation would, however, like to express the hope that the convening of the Disarmament Commission would mark the beginning of another fruitful series of endeavours toward disarmament and reduction of tension, notwithstanding the unfortunate happenings in Viet-Nam and elsewhere.

As I said earlier, the difficulties which we encounter today need not dishearten us unduly. Disarmament is not a matter which could be worked out over-night by a miracle as it were. There is no short-cut to disarmament. We have adopted for ourselves the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. This is an unprecedented objective. There has not been a single period in history when we have seen a completely disarmed human society. There have been instances of statesmen and saints preaching non-violence and abjuration of arms. There had always been visionaries who dreamt of a civilization where war would be banned and the energy of mankind would be devoted only to the arts of peace. The world community has, however. yet to witness a disarmed society. If we have failed to make

greater advance toward disarmament, the reasons are not far to seek. From the dawn of history man has fought against man and has always turned his inventive genius, towards discovering weapons of destruction. Every country has its own heroes, and our children grow up learning to glorify heroic deeds in wars. A real and earnest desire to put an end to wars has been of comparatively recent origin. The masses have realized that they are no longer immune from experiencing the horrors of war; civilians nowadays are as much victims of war as combatants. For the first time, therefore, there is now a general demand for genuine disarmament.

Despite this general demand, it is not easy to achieve the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. A lot of patient negotiation is necessary to iron out the differences that still persist and to find solutions to the problems that may arise in course of such negotiations. Even leaving out of consideration the views of those few countries who still believe in the inevitability of war and the glory of war. it would be unrealistic on our part to think that nations can agree to negotiate a comprehensive treaty on disarmament without adequate assurances of their own security. The cold war is still with us and countries continue to confront each other. Disarmament has, therefore, to be achieved in well-calculated and acceptable stages with the assurance that no country is put at a relative disadvantage during the actual process of disarmament. This requires patient and detailed negotiations, generally of a technical nature, and naturally these negotiations need to be spread out over a period of time.

Disarmament has been engaging the attention of the United Nations since its very inception and, as some representatives have already emphasized, the first resolution adopted by the United Nations, resolution 1(I), dealt with an aspect of disarmament. Since the eleventh session in particular, we have been attempting to establish a forum for purposeful negotiations on disarmament and, fortunately, the United Nations has, after a period of trial and error. agreed upon suitable bodies for the purpose. We have in the first place set up the Disarmament Commission consisting of the entire membership of the United Nations, and through this Commission the United Nations discharges its responsible functions in the field of disarmament. For the actual negotiations on the detailed issues of disarmament and related matters, the General Assembly has entrusted the task to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva. This Committee has been doing useful work. We would, of course, all like to have speedier progress and achieve more substantial results. But bearing in mind how difficult it is to achieve the objective of general and complete disarmament-an objective which mankind had never attempted to tackle seriously in the past-and remembering that detailed and technical negotiations have to be conducted in the context of safeguarding national and international security, my delegation has no hesitation in saying that the work done

86

so far has been, on the whole, useful and rewarding. The Disarmament Committee can, for example, claim some credit for the conclusion of the Partial Test-Ban Treaty, as also for the decision of the major nuclear Powers to reduce their production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. The Committee recessed last year with hopes for some progress in several promising fields in the near future.

The presence of eight non-aligned delegations in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament 'Committee has proved to be most useful. This was the first time that nations not aligned with any of the Power blocs were included in a body negotiating disarmament, and there has been a general recognition of the effective role played by these delegations. The memorandum submitted by them on a nuclear test ban has been of particular significance.

The document which forms our agenda concerns the entire gamut of the problems concerning disarmament and the memoranda submitted, by the delegations of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and the United Arab Republic deal with these problems in some detail. We hope that some tangible progress will be made on at least some of these issues when the Disarmament Committee reconvenes in the near future.

One of the most important tasks facing the Disarmament Commission, therefore, is to give

the necessary impetus and directives to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee to proceed with its work with determination and urgency. The work done so far has been useful. but that is only the beginning. The Disarmament Committee first met in the midst of a crisis and a confrontation; we are facing another crisis and a confrontation today. We expect, however, that the Eighteen-Nation Committee will continue its work in the true spirit of co-operation undaunted by passing storms, for what is at stake is the future of entire mankind. If we fail to achieve our objective, the survival of humanity will be in jeopardy.

The Memorandum of the Indian delegation (ENDC/144, p.8), appended to the report of the Disarmament Committee, sets forth our views both on the broad issue of general and complete disarmament as well as on the specific issues of various collateral measures. It is not, therefore, necessary for me to go into detail at the present stage. We have, however, now reached a stage when isolated collateral measures are no longer easy to undertake or implement. In the early period of consideration of measures of arms control, it was possible, for example, to select an isolated first step like the nuclear test ban and implement it. This first step has not only not been adequately followed up by other steps, but it has in fact been defied with impunity. In the circumstances, it has now become necessary to take some integrated steps. Also, as we make further advances and come nearer to the problem of disarmament, it becomes necessary to take coordinated steps covering two or three or more measures of arms control and limitation, in order that the security considerations of individual nations are not affected in any way. The United States and the Soviet Union have both put forward various constructive suggestions in regard to collateral measures of arms control and limitation, and reduction of tension. In considering these measures in detail, we feel that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament will need to adopt an integrated approach-an approach which tackles two or more measures simultaneously. The Indian delegation notes with appreciation that, despite differences in detail, this is the approach which the major Powers have also adopted in this respect.

India has always taken a prominent part in

all discussions relating to disarmament. Apart from our historical and cultural traditions, this is because we believe that we have now reached a stage when the stockpile of nuclear weapons is enough to destroy the whole world several times over. There is an increasing danger of war by accident or miscalculation, if not by design. If war was always bad, it is now unthinkable, as it would engulf all humanity, combatants as well as non-combatants, and destroy all that civilization has built up over the centuries. Our instinct of self-preservation dictates that we destroy these weapons before they destroy us. India and the other developing countries, constituting the bulk of the human race, have another war to wage-a war against poverty, ignorance and disease. They have embarked on the task of building a world of peace, justice, progress and prosperity. The results of all these endeavours would be buried under the radio-active debris, once a conflict escalates into a thermonuclear war. We have, therefore, to make substantial progress, and that most urgently, towards a disarmed world.

It is because of this urgency that collateral measures have assumed such special importance. Apart from leading the international community by stages to the goal for general and complete disarmament, these measures are also expected to lead to a reduction of tension and to the building up of mutual confidence. These objectives are desirable in themselves and we should all bend our energies to achieve them.

The first measure that strikes us to be of overwhelming importance is that of a comprehensive test ban treaty. India was the first country to urge a cessation of nuclear weapons tests and it was as early as 1954 that our late Prime Minister had urged the United Nations to take up that

87

issue urgently. Thereafter, we moved resolutions in the United Nations and, although at first we were not successful, we now rejoice that we have a partial test ban treaty. We have now to make some further progress by converting this partial prohibition into a comprehensive prohibition. The nuclear Powers have given a solemn undertaking that they would continue negotiations towards this end, and we urge that these should be continued with a view to reaching a comprehensive treaty as soon as possible. We realize that there are differences on this issue between the major nuclear Powers. While negotiations, are conducted for reconciling these differences, particularly in the light of the developing technofogy of identification, it is imperative that all underground tests be discontinued immediately, either by agreement or through a policy of mutual example. It is equally vital that those countries which have not yet subscribed to the present treaty should do so immediately, for the international community cannot for long tolerate a situation and idly stand by when one or more countries embark on a programme of nuclear weapons. In its resolution 1762 (XVII), the United Nations condemned all nuclear weapon tests and we trust that this condemnation will be proclaimed again and again and, what is more, the international community will have to consider what positive steps can be taken to discipline those who ignore this condemnation.

The second issue on which my delegation places particular emphasis is that of non-proliteration of nuclear weapons. India had inscribed an item on this subject on the agenda of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly. Unfortunately, the Assembly was unable to consider that item along with many other items. We are glad that the Disarmament Commission has now been convened and we hope that it will direct its attention to this important question and ask the Disarmament Committee in Geneva to proceed with purposeful negotiations on that ailimportant issue, in the light of the broad principles that may emerge from this Commission.

The unfortunate development that took place soon after the inscription of the item on nonproliferation was the nuclear weapons explosion conducted by the People's Republic of China in defiance of the international will as expressed in the Moscow Treaty and in utter disregard for the Bandung Declaration of 1955, to which at least, it was a party. We are, therefore, now in a situation when proliferation has already started. It is that situation which we have to face, We want not only the prevention of further Proliferation but also the reversal of present proliferation. Statements were made by many delegates in the General Assembly pointing out that it is unrealistic to ask countries to forswear for ever a programme of nuclear weapons production, when the existing nuclear Powers continue to hold on to their awesome arsenals and when, we may add, new countries embark on nuclear pro grammes. My delegation is in entire agreement with this view. It has warned the international community time and again of the dangers of proliferation. Its constructive suggestions have not yet borne fruit, and today we are witnessing further proliferation. The Government of India has reaffirmed its determination to use nuclear energy only for peaceful purposes, but at the same time it fears that unless the world community does something to reverse the existing situation of proliferation, there is hardly any likelihood of preventing further proliferation. The expansion of nuclear weapons capacity from two to three Powers and then to four Powers has not been a healthy development. And now yet another country is embarking on a nuclear weapons programme. That is not a situation which we or the international community can view with equanimity.

This is, of course, not a cry of despair, although it may be a cry of anguish. It is not yet too late to fake to the path of sanity. An integrated programme of purposeful measures can still bring us back on the road leading to a disarmed world.

I have no doubt that the Disarmament Committee in Geneva will discuss this matter in detail, but I would like at this stage to outline for the consideration of the Commission, what, in the view of my delegation, could form the basis of an integrated solution of the problems of proliferation. The elements which should enter into an arrangement on non-proliferation could be the following :

(1) An undertaking by the nuclear Powers not to transfer nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons technology to others;

(2) An undertaking not to use nuclear weapons against countries which do not possess them;

(3) An undertaking through the United Nations to safeguard the security of countries which may be threatened by Powers having a nuclear weapons capability or embarking on a nuclear weapons capability; (4) Tangible progress towards disarmament, including a comprehensive test ban treaty, a complete freeze on production of nuclear weapons and means of delivery as well as a substantial reduction in the existing stocks; and,

(5) An undertaking by non-nuclear Powers not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons.

It is an integrated proposal of this nature which alone could solve the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons. One or two isolated measures within this integrated programme will

88

not be adequate. For example, it is no use telling countries. sonic of which may be even more advanced in nuclear technology than China, that they should enter into a treaty which would only stipulate that they must not acquire or produce these weapons. Again, it is no use telling them that their security will be safeguarded by one or other of the existing nuclear Powers. Such an assurance has to be really dependable. Moreover, nations are not interested in having another Hiroshima on their soil before an assurance of this nature could come into effect. Unless the nuclear Powers and would-be nuclear Powers undertake from now on not to produce any nuclear weapons or weapons delivery vehicles and, in addition, agree to reduce their existing stockpile of nuclear weapons, there is no way of doing away with the proliferation that has already taken place or of preventing further proliferation.

I hasten to add that this does not mean that countries with knowledge of nuclear technology would otherwise straightaway go ahead with a nuclear weapons programme. As far as India, is concerned, we have emphasized our present determination to use nuclear energy only for peaceful purposes. I am, however, speaking now of the international community as a whole and I must point out the dancer that some countries may find it necessary, in the interest of their own security, to acquire nuclear weapons. if proliferation is allowed to go on. We must, therefore, stop proliferation urgently. The only way of doing so lies in some integrated arrangement of the type outlined by me. The Indian delegation fully realizes that this is a matter which requires detailed and technical discussions but as our Foreign Minister said in the General Debate in the last session of the Assembly :

"The importance of non-proliferation cannot be overemphasized. This question is as important as that of banning nuclear tests. We feel that the Assembly should direct the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to discuss the question of nonproliferation as a matter of highest priority." (A/PV. 1301, pp. 48-50).

We suggest that the Disarmament Commission should now do what the Assembly could not do.

India like most other countries believes that nuclear arms pose the most serious dancer to international peace and security and that it is essential that we deal with that problem with the utmost urgency. At the same time, we must not lose sight of the awesome panoply of conventional arms in the armories of the world. We must remember that the conflicts which plague us today are being waged entirely with conventional arms. In any case, disarmament is an objective to be subscribed to by all nations. We, in India, are particularly conscious of the danger posed by large conventional armies. One of our neighbouring countries, for example, boasts of an army of 3 million men with the support of 200 million militia men. It is all very well to talk of a world conference to destroy nuclear weapons of other countries, but the international community must also demand that pari passu with nuclear disarmament there should be a full-scale reduction of such menacingly large armies and armaments. Along with the conversion of atomic weapons to peaceful uses, there should also be the classical conversion of the sword into the ploughshare. Here again, the Indian delegation is lad to note that despite differences-and some of these differences are vital-the draft treaties submitted by the two sides adopt the correct integrated approach towards comprehensive disarmament, both nuclear and conventional. Large military Powers, both nuclear and conventional, have, therefore, to adopt bold and far-reaching measures of substantial reductions in their arsenals.

My delegation is encouraged to note that the delegates who have already spoken before us have put forward several constructive suggestions and we have no doubt that many more ideas will be put forward by other speakers. An idea that we particularly welcome is the one advanced by the delegate of Italy. He referred to the noble appeal made by His Holiness the Pope at the end of his memorable visit to my country in December 1964. The Indian delegation would like to commend the suggestion made by the representative of Italy, namely, the acceptance of the principle that savings made in the military expenditure by the affluent members of the international community should be earmarked for aid to developing countries in some form of fraternal collaboration.

The distinguished representatives of the Soviet Union, the United State, the United Kingdom and Hungary also made some valuable suggestions in regard to the ban on nuclear weapons, the consequences of improved scientific verification capabilities and the reduction of nuclear weapons to lower, safer and less costly levels. All these suggestions will, of course, need to be examined in detail by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to the distinguished Minister of State of the United Kingdom for the handsome tribute paid by him to my country for refusing to be hustled into a nuclear arms race despite its technological capacity to do so.

References have been made to the idea of a world conference on disarmament. My Government is a signatory to the Cairo declaration of Non-aligned States and agrees that a conference

89

of this nature will be useful at an appropriate stage. At the same time, we believe that the present is not an appropriate time for such a conference. Unlike the questions of trade and development, where we. needed enunciation of certain broad principles, what we need today on disarmament is detailed discussions on the terms of a treaty based on broad principles which have already been laid down. The international cornmunity is agreed upon the broad objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The international community has already accepted the broad features of the Zorin-Stevenson. set of principles. Draft treaties on fairly similar lines have already been put forward by the two sides. What we need at present, therefore, is the finalization of the details of a treaty, or at least some tangible progress in that direction. The Government of India still adheres to the views that were expressed by our Prime Minister in his letter to the Prime Minister of China on 27 November last year. He said:

"In the reply we had sent to your last' communication, we had pointed out that the problems of general and complete disarmament, including nuclear and conventional arms, were highly complicated matters requiring a lot of detailed work and were not matters which could be debated and settled at a large conference of the kind proposed by Your Excellency. By their very nature. these intricate issues need to be negotiated in smaller committees and often at the level of experts, as was being done by the United Nations. We agreed that it was essential that all the countries subscribe to a treaty on general and complete disarmament, but we felt that a conference of plenipotentiaries of the countries of the world could be useful only when substantial progress had been made in working out a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.

"The Government of India continues to adhere to these views, which are also the views of the majority of the nations of the world. What is needed is not declarations or exhortations, but concrete and specific steps, like the cessation of tests, the prohibition of the use of fissile material for purposes of weapons, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the reduction of large and intimidating arms, etc. In this context, I trust Your Excellency's Government will take early steps to subscribe to the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty and stop the production of these weapons of mass destruction."

What we are all striving for is a world without arms, a world in which justice, prosperity and peace shall prevail. What we wish to bequeath to our succeeding generations is not a polluted world of radiation fall out but a purer world where our children and our grandchildren can breathe the air of freedom and progress, of justice and economic progress.

We in the Disarmament Commission have a great responsibility to fulfil. Representing the entire membership of the United Nations, as we do, it is imperative that we give a clear indication of the direction in which the world should move and a clear mandate to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to proceed with determination and urgency in their efforts to negotiate general and complete disarmament. We need the co-operation of the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

I should like to conclude with an appeal addressed by our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, to the great leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union. He said :

"Our earth has become too small for the new weapons of the atomic age. While man, in the pride of his intellect and knowledge, forces his way into space and pierces the heavens, the very existence of the human race is threatened..... No country. no people, however powerful they might be, is safe from destruction if this competition in weapons of mass destruction and cold war continues. Apart from these dangers ahead, the civilization which thousands of years of human efforts have built up is being corroded and undermined by fear and hatred and will progressively wither away if these trends continue. All the peoples of the world have a right to life and progress and the fulfilment of their destiny. They have the right to peace and security."

INDIA USA YUGOSLAVIA SWITZERLAND RUSSIA CHINA BRAZIL BURMA ETHIOPIA MEXICO NIGER NIGERIA SWEDEN INDONESIA JAPAN ITALY HUNGARY EGYPT

Date : May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, Permanent Representative of India at the U.N., delivered a letter to the President of the Security Council, on May 3. 1965. on Pakistan's armed aggression in Kutch. Gujarat.

The following is the text of the letter:

On 11 April 1965. I had under instructions of my Government addressed to you a letter, bringing to your notice the serious situation created by

90

the flagrant aggression committed by Pakistan against India in the State of Gujarat. In my letter of 28 April 1965, I informed you of further acts of aggression committed by Pakistan in the same area. I have now been instructed by my Government to state the following facts:

In his letter of 19 April 1965 the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has made fantastic allegations and has put forward false and untenable claims. The contention of the Government of Pakistan that the northern half of the Rana of Kutch has always been under the control and administration of Sind (now part of Pakistan) until the time of the partition of the Indian subcontinent is totally untrue. The fact is that prior to the partition of India, the northern half of the Rann of Kutch was not under the control and administration of Sind. but under the control and administration of the princely State of Kutch. The Kutch-Sind border then separated the British Indian province of Sind and the princely State of Kutch. Sind was under direct British administration while Kutch was under the suzerainty of the British as a paramount power. Not being an international boundary, it was not demarcated as international boundaries are demarcated. The boundary between Sind and Kutch was, however, well-established, well-known and well-defined in all official maps dating from 1872 to 1943 and even later. The boundary is described in detail in official documents over the last three quarters of a century prior to the partition of India. The boundary shown in official maps prior to 15

August 1947 cannot be questioned. The official documents of the British period, the official Gazetteer of Sind published in Karachi in 1907, the Gazetteer of India of the Bombay Presidency published in 1909 and the Imperial Gazetteer of India published by the British Secretary of State for India in 1908 are categorical about the Rann of Kutch being outside Sind, as will be seen from the following :

1. The official Gazetteer of Sind published in Karachi in 1907 defines the boundaries as under :-

Bounded on the cast by the native states of Marwar, Jaisalmer and Bahawalpur, on the north by a small corner of the Punjab and by the level and sandy portion of the territories of the Khan of Kalat known as Kacchi, on the west by the mountainous part of the same territories, the boundary line running along the ridge of the Khirthari range and the Habb river and on the south by the Arabian Sea and the Rann of Kutch.

2. The Imperial Gazetteer of India of the Bombay presidency (1909) says as follows :

Sind is bounded on the south by the Rann of Kutch and the Arabian Sea.

3. The imperial Gazetteer of India published by the British Secretary of State for India in 1908 says as follows :

The extreme south eastern border of Sind is formed by the Rann of Kutch.

4. The British Commissioner of Sind stated in 1910 as follows :

There is a mass of evidence that since 1837, the boundary between Sind and Kutch had been recognised and shown on all maps which have been prepared from that date to the present day to be a straight line due south from the Trijunction of the Badin Taluka of the Hyderabad district, the Jati Taluka of the Karachi district and the Rana of Kutch.

5. In all the documents of the political department of the then British Government of India of 1937, 1939 and 1942 when the political charges of various officers were defined, the Rann of Kutch was invariably shown as falling within the Western India States Agency and not as falling within Sind. The entire Western India States Agency became part of India as a result of accession.

Further, the demarcation between Sind and the Indian state of Kutch is definitively established by the following official maps published by the Survey of India during the British administration.

1. Map attached to Bombay Government resolution No. 1192 of 24 February 1914.

2. Sind Revenue Survey sheet Nos. 93, 94 and 95, district Oomerkot (Thurparkur). (1"=1 Mile). Surveyed in 1868-69 and published in 1871 under the direction of Col. H. L. Thuillierra, R.A.F.R.R., Surveyor-General of India.

3. Sheet No. 40H/SE and parts of sheet Nos. 40L/SW and 40H/SW (1"=2 Miles). 1886 edition, published under the direction of Col. G. C. Depree, S.C., Surveyor-General of India.

4. Sheet No. 40H (1"=4 Miles). Issued in 1921, 1925, 1936 edition March 1943, published under the direction of Col. C. H. D. Ryder, C.I.E., D.S.O., R.E., Surveyor-General of India.

5. Original of Sheet No. 40 H (1"=4 Miles), March 1946.

It is pertinent to observe in this context that in 1908 there were claims and counter claims between Sind and the ruler of Kutch (known as the Marao of Kutch) regarding the boundary in a small western portion of the Rann of Kutch. Even then, it was not a claim concerning the

91

entire northern half of the Rann of Kutch, but only concerning a small sector in the western portion of the Rann. The issue was settled and formalised in 1914 by a resolution of the Government of Bombay, which at that time administered Sind. This resolution was approved by the then British Government of India. Extracts from a letter of 20 September 1913 from the Government of Bombay to the Government of India, a copy of a letter of 11 November 1913 from the Government of India to the Government of Bombay and a copy of the resolution No. 1192 of 24 February 1914 of the Government of Bombay and the relevant map are attached as appendices to this. letter. The importance of this resolution lies in the fact that it not only defined the boundary in the western area which had been the subject of claims and counter claims but also clearly indicated the rest of the boundary of Sind. The boundary of Sind was thus clearly delineated on a map, and no attempt was made then or afterwards to challenge it. The wording of the Government of Bombay resolution of 1914 is unambiguous and deserves to be quoted; the relevant words are as follows :

"On a full review of the evidence, therefore, Government arrived at the conclusion that the boundary between Kutch and Sind should be the green line in the accompanying map from the mouth of the Sir Creek to the top of the Sir Creek at the point where it joins the blue dotted line. From there it should follow the blue dotted line due cast until it joins the Sind boundary as marked in purple on the map."

This boundary clearly delineated on the map and restated in 1914 was the boundary between Sind and Kutch at the time of the withdrawal of the British Power and remains so up to this day. This is the boundary which Pakistan arbitrarily seeks to violate.

The totality of evidence leaves no basis whatsoever for any tenable claim for change in the border between Sind and Kutch. Under the British Act of Parliament, known as the Indian independence Act 1947, certain specified territories constituted Pakistan and certain territories constituted India. Sind became part of Pakistan and the Indian State of Kutch became part of India as a result of accession as provided for in the British Act of parliament. During the long years of British rule over India as the administering power (in respect of Sind) and as the paramount power (in regard to Kutch), the boundary between Sind and Kutch was clearly and repeatedly defined by the British Government admitting of no controversy. Neither the spurious claim raised by Pakistan after the withdrawal of the British power, nor its present attempt to enforce that claim by Military aggression can be said to constitute a valid dispute. It is only indicative of Pakistan's territorial ambition and has no legal basis.

In consonance with its basic policy of seeking peaceful solution of problems with Pakistan, through mutual discussions, and in order to remove all possibilities of friction, India agreed to study jointly and discuss the border with Pakistan as early as 1956. The Prime Minister of India and Pakistan agreed in an exchange of letters to entrust the demarcation of the entire western boundary to the Central Surveys of India and Pakistan as a matter of the highest priority. The Survey Department of India has been repeatedly urging the Survey Department of Pakistan to attend a meeting to arrange the early demarcation of the Gujarat-West Pakistan boundary. It is significant that up to this day Pakistan has not agreed to this meeting of survey experts. The letters from the Director of Surveys of India to his counterpart in Pakistan, followed by telegraphic reminders, have remained unanswered. I attach herewith as Appendix I a copy of the latest of such communications, dated October 17, 1964, from the Director of Indian Surveys to the Director of Survey of Pakistan.

The Permanent Representative of Pakistan has chosen to describe the Rann of Kutch as a land-locked sea or inland lake. This is entirely incorrect. Long before the creation of Pakistan, the then British Government of India decided formally in 1906 that it was more correct to define the Rann of Kutch as a marsh rather than as a lake. What happens is that during the monsoon period this low lying area gets flooded by sea water because of the strong wind and the high tides in the Arabian Sea. Further, during the monsoon it also receives fresh water from the swollen rivers. The area, therefore, is flooded from about the middle of May till the end of October. It is mostly dry and partly marshland during the remainder of the year. It has all the flora of marshland with abundant grass and similar characteristics.

The Government of Pakistan has tried to falsify the international border in this area. In order to keep the record straight, it is necessary to describe the correct international border. The northern border of Gujarat with West Pakistan starts from the western tri-junction pillar position between Jati Taluka, Badin Taluka and Kutch located at the point whose approximate coordinates are latitude 24(dg) 17' 42" north and longitude 68(dg) 45' 53" east and runs generally along the northern limits of the Rann of Kutch in an easterly direction to the eastern Tri-junction located at the Point whose approximate coordinates are latitude 24(dg) 41' 25" north and

92

longitude 71(dg) 05' 43" East. That the 24th parallel was never the boundary is incontestably proved by the fact that the line of stone pillars erected in implementation of the decision taken by the Government of Bombay and the Government of India in 1913-14 runs up to about 23 miles north of the 24th parallel.

In my letter of 11th April, 1965, I have already conveyed to you the sequence of events culminating in the Pakistani armed aggression on Kanjarkot, Sardar and Vigokot in Indian territory on 9th April, 1965. Subsequent to that, Pakistani armed attacks with increasing intensity have been continuing at many points deep in Indian territory, South of the international border. Full details of Pakistani attacks have been given in the letter which I have addressed to you on 28th April, 1965.

Pakistan has attacked Indian posts deep in Indian territory 6 to 8 miles south of the frontier. These attacks have been launched on a territory which, on Pakistan's own admission, has never been in its possession. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan on 15th April declared as follows :

"It must be remembered that the central fact is that this is a dispute over territory which lies roughly north of the 24th parallel. A dispute has arisen not because the boundary is undemarcated but because the disputed territory is in India's adverse possession." In other words, Pakistan has chosen to mount an armed attack on a territory over which it has admittedly never exercised possession and over which Pakistan in fact acknowledges India's possession. Pakistan thus stands self-condemned as having used force for changing the status quo in order to push its spurious territorial claims. This is contrary to the United Nations Charter and is in violation of the ground rules under the Indo-Pakistan Western Border Agreement of 1960. Pakistan's behaviour, in fact amounts to unabashed and open aggression on Indian territory.

It is my duty to bring to your notice how even while negotiations were proceeding through diplomatic channels for the restoration of peace, Pakistan chose to launch these unprovoked military attacks and widen the conflict. On 13 April 1965, after a series of approaches by the Government of India, the Government of Pakistan made a proposal consisting of a 3-point formula namely :

(1) Cease-fire;

(2) An inter-Governmental meeting to determine what was the status quo ante which should be restored; and

(3) A higher level meeting.

The Government of India accepted this formula on 14 April 1964 and proposed a cease-fire to be effective at 8.00 A. M. on 15 April, 1965. Contrary to expectations and in repudiation of its own formula earlier presented, Pakistan then refused to agree to the cease-fire and instead raised numerous objections, and sought clarifications. All these clarifications were furnished and Pakistan was assured that no pre-conditions were being attached by India to the holding of the high level meeting. On 19 April, 1965 the Government of India renewed the same proposal which had originally been made by Pakistan. To India's surprise, however, Pakistan completely resiled from its proposals of 13 April and refused to implement it. Instead, Pakistan put forward on 23 April 1965, a totally new demand for the vacation of all territory north of the 24th perallel by Indian military and civilian forces.

It is thus patent that Pakistan is not sincere in its desire to negotiate and all this exchange of proposals is merely a pretence. Had this not been so, Pakistan would not have resiled from its own proposal of 13 April, 1965 which India had so promptly accepted.

The Government of Pakistan seems to imagine that as soon as it puts forward a bogus territorial demand on a neighbouring country, the entire area coveted by it becomes ipso facto disputed territory which must be vacated by the lawful authorities. While maintaining a mere fecade of negotiations, Pakistan has redoubled its military attacks on Indian territory and has brought attacks on, Indian territory as has already been brought to your attention in my letter of 28 April, 1965.

The Pakistani Permanent Representative alleges that the Indian Home Minister made a bellicose statement in the Parliament on 7 April 1965. What the Home Minister of India actually said on 7 April, is as follows :

"My Colleague, the Minister of External Affairs, has already made a statement in the House on 3 March 1965, giving an account of the intrusions by Pakistani personnel into Indian territory south of the Kutch-Sind border in the Kanjarkot-Kutch area and expressed the seriousness with which the Government viewed these intrusions. Considering the importance of the problem and in order to acquaint myself personally with the measures taken and any further measures that may become necessary for maintaining the integrity and security of our borders, I visited the areas near our frontier at Kanjarkot on 31 March 1965, accompanied by the Chief Minister, Gujarat, and on I April 1965 held consultations with the Chief Minister and the Home Minister of Gujarat and others who were dealing with the situation.

93

"The Pakistani authorities have disturbed the status quo. They have illegally set up two standing posts about 1,300 and 2,000 yards within our territory. In spite of out reminders, they have not shown any disposition to have meetings of the D.I.G., Rajkot Range and D.G., West Pakistan Rangers. We are continuing our diplomatic efforts. Meanwhile, I want to assure the house that the Government are taking and will continue to take effective measures to remove intrusions and ensure the integrity of our border."

This cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be considered a "bellicose statement" as alleged by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan.

From what has been stated above, it is clear that Pakistan's claims do not have a shred of legitimacy or any basis in historical evidence. They only reflect Pakistan's greed for territorial expansion which it seeks to satisfy by military force. I am directed to state clearly and emphatically that India rejects and repudiates Pakistan's claim in its entirety. India continues to hope that Pakistan will return to the path of reason and sanity and will agree to a cease-fire and come to the negotiating table in accordance with Pakistan's own proposals of 13 April 1965.

I shall be grateful if this communication is circulated to the members of the Security Council, as an official document.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA UNITED KINGDOM MALI **Date :** May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Letter to the Security Council on Concentration of Pakistani Troops on Indian Borders

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, handed over on May 28, 1965, the following letter to the President of the Security Council regarding the concentration of Pakistani forces all along the Indian borders :

Excellency,

I have been instructed by my Government to refer to the letter dated 7th May from the permanent Representative of Pakistan, circulated as document No. S/6340. This letter contains baseless accusations against my Government.

It is not India which has threatened Pakistan as alleged by the Representative of Pakistan but Pakistan which, in pursuance of the public statement made by its President. Field Marshal Ayub Khan, on 1st May, 1965, threatening "general and total war", has massed its troops in heavy concentration and in an aggressive posture all along the Indian borders. A brief account of these threatening Pakistani troop deployments aimed against the peace and security of India had already been conveyed by me in my letter dated 28 April 1965. Since then Pakistan has not only maintained its aggressive posture, but further strengthened its forces all along the border both in the west and the east. There has been movement of troops from West Pakistan to East Pakistan. Construction of bunkers, digging of trenches and other war-like preparations continue all along the border. The units of the Frontier Corps viz., Khyber Rifles, Kurram Militia, Tochi Seouts, South Wazirasthan Scouts, Zhob Militia, and Bajaur Scouts, have been concentrated at particular places for deployment against India. The so-called Mujahids. which is an irregular armed force have been embodied for service with regular troops and are being put through an extensive weapon training course.

The sector-wise position is as follows :

Jammu and Kashmir

There has been a steep rise in the number of incidents of firing, intrusions and raids deep into our territory and of other provocative activities by Pakistan armed forces all along the cease-fire line and the international border in Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan troops have moved closer to the cease-fire line during the recent weeks. There has been a build-up in the Sialkot area which is close to the international border in Jammu and Kashmir. The 7th Infantry Division and the 6th Armoured Division have been moved into this area from Peshawar and Naushera respectively. Besides regular troops, a part of Khyber Rifles Force has moved from Jamrud and Shagai forts towards the Pakistan occupied Kashmir.

Western sector

Heavy movement of troops from the interior of West Pakistan particularly from Kharian Peshawar, Landikotal, Kohat, Naushera and Risalpur towards the Indo-Pakistan border has taken place. (The letter then gave details of the units of Pakistani troops which had been moved close to the Indian border.)

A large build-up of the army covering an area approximately 2 sq. miles has been organised in the thick jungle on Sialkot-Pasrur road.

Long convoys of vehicles loaded with arms and ammunition, bridging material and barbed wire

94

are being brought from the interior of West Pakistan towards the border.

Eastern sector

In addition to 14 Division located in East Pakistan, 17 Baluch Regiment from Quetta and 18 Field Regiment from Sialkot in West Pakistan have been moved to East Pakistan. One infantry battalion (21 Baluch Regiment) is deployed in Mymensing District opposite our Garo Hills. One infantry battalion (II Punjab Regiment) is deployed in Sylhet opposite Cachar district. Four companies of the II Punjab Regiment have now been deployed opposite the Lathitilla-Dumabari area in Assam. Besides, Pakistan has concentrated sizeable forces opposite our Cooch-Behar, Rangpur and Lalmonirhat and Dahagram areas. The forces mentioned above are in addition to the East Pakistan Rifles, a heavily armed para military force. This force itself had originally a strength of 10,000.

The whole of the Pakistan army is now deployed in battle position on our borders both with east and west Pakistan.

Added to these, there have been aggressive and continuing violations of Indian air-space by Pakistan Air Force. From the 1st of April 1965 till this date there have been as many as 43 violations of Indian air space by Pakistan Air Force. In one instance on 8th May, 1965, a Pakistan Air Force plane. intruded as much as 43 nautical miles into Indian air space at Utarlai in Rajasthan. The Government of India has protested to the Government of Pakistan against The all such violations but the Government of Pakistan ignoring these protests has, not only maintained but intensified the violations of Indian air space by aircraft of Pakistan Air Force.

The aggressive intentions of Pakistan have manifested themselves in a continuous series of violent incidents and shooting in various parts of the Indian border, on the borders between the Assam State of India and East Pakistan, between the Tripura State of India and East Pakistan, between West Bengal State of India and East Pakistan, between Rajasthan State of India and West Pakistan and on the cease-fire line in Kashmir. These provocative incidents are daily on the increase.

As has been clearly stated in my letter dated 27th April 1965 while negotiations were in progress and various proposals and counter-proposals were being exchanged and studied, Pakistan chose to launch a massive attack into Indian territory on 24th April with tanks and heavy artillery and overran several posts 6 to 8 miles deep into Indian territory, south of the Kutch-Sind sector of the Indo-West Pakistan border. This has become the pattern of Pakistan's behaviour, namely, to maintain a camouflage of negotiations while systematically organising ruthless military adventures. This behaviour has posed a persistent and serious threat to peace and hence my Government has instructed me to bring this situation to the notice of the Members of the Security Council.

I shall be grateful if the communication is circulated to the Members of the Security Council.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date :** May 01, 1965

Volume No

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in the Disarmament Commission on Chinese Nuclear Explosion

Shri V. C. Trivedi, Member of the Indian Delegation, made a statement in the Disarmament Commission on May 14, 1965 on China's second nuclear explosion.

The following is the text of the statement :

I am sure all of us must have been deeply shocked at the great and serious damage done to international peace and security and to our quest for disarmament and reduction of tension by the second nuclear explosion conducted by the People's Republic of China, with impunity and in total disregard of all that we stood for and all that we are doing today in this hall. The explosion conducted by the People's Republic of China is an attack not only on all that we stand for and all the efforts that we are making, but it is also an attack on the whole of humanity. atmospheric explosion carried out by the People's Republic of China with its attendant radioactive fall-out constitutes a genetic and health danger, not only to the present generation, but to future generations as well.

The United Nations had in its resolution 1762 (XVII) passed without a single vote of opposition-I repeat without a single vote of opposition-a resolution that condemned all tests. The Chinese tests, therefore, ipso facto stand condemned. And it is not only that a nonmember can defy with impunity the resolutions of the United Nations, for the. People's Republic of China was a signatory to the Bandung declaration and that declaration specifically stated:

"Pending the total prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear and thermo-nuclear 95

weapons, this conference appeals to all the powers concerned to reach an agreement to suspend experiments with such weapons." This was a declaration of the Afro-Asian powers which was signed by the Pople's Republic of China.

In fact, it has become a habit for the People's Republic of China to defy, with impunity, all that the international community does. There is the UN Resolution 1762 (XVII): There is the Bandung Declaration: There is the Moscow Test Ban Treaty. And what is more, the, Cairo Declaration in which all of the non-aligned powers took part, specifically asked that nuclear weapons tests should not be undertaken. This is what the Cairo Declaration says :

"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 welfare of humanity."

Thus, once again, the Peoples Republic of China has shown that it has no regard for, and pays no respect whatsoever to any international gathering. And for that country to indulge in an attack of this nature on humanity, particularly when the Disarmament Commission is in session. is a very grave affront of which all of us, I am sure, will take very serious note of.

INDIA CHINA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDONESIA RUSSIA EGYPT **Date :** May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on his Visit to Nepal

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made, the following statement in Parliament on May 11, 1965 on his visit to Nepal:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, several months ago, His

Majesty the King of Nepal kindly invited me to pay a visit to Kathmandu. I went there on April 23 for a short visit of about two days. As I said in Nepal, there are no problems of any importance or consequence between our two countries; and our relations with Nepal are in a very good and healthy state. My visit to Nepal was, therefore, a goodwill visit in every sense of the phrase.

His Majesty's Government and the people of Nepal accorded us a warm and affectionate reception. This is symbolic of the friendship of the Government and people of Nepal for our Government and people. I should like to take this opportunity of thanking His Majesty's Government for the hospitality they extended to us.

I had the opportunity of cordial and friendly exchange of views with His Majesty and with the Chairman of His Majesty's Council of Ministers, Shri Surya Bahadur Thapa. We exchanged views on the world situation and the recent developments in Asia, and I am glad to inform the House that, as stated in the joint communique issued on the conclusion of my visit to Nepal, these talks were characterised by a "broad measure of unity and identity of purpose and approach" on all these matters. His Majesty's-Government agree with us that so far as the developing countries of the world, including Nepal and India, are concerned, there is no acceptable alternative to the policies and principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, which we have pursued hitherto.

I was glad to see that Nepal is making progress in the economic, social and other spheres of her national life. I am glad to inform the House that His Majesty's Government are appreciative of the assistance which we have been able to extend. The numerous projects being constructed in collaboration with ourselves are making rapid progress and the Government of Nepal conveyed to me their satisfaction at the speed of progress on these projects.

His Majesty the King inaugurated the Kosi Barrage on April 24 at a moving ceremony at the Barrage site which was attended by a vast number of people of India as well as Nepal. This project is an impressive symbol of Indo-Nepal co-operation in removing hunger and poverty and in bringing a better and a fuller life within the grasp of our two peoples. I laid the foundation of the Kosi Canal during the same ceremony.

In conclusion, I am glad to say that I have returned from Nepal reinforced in my belief that the friendship between our two countries is lasting. Trust and sympathy are the hall-mark of our relations with Nepal. Goodwill between the two countries and their peoples is plentiful, and

96

the desire for co-operation for mutual benefit is all too evident. Because of the geographic juxtaposition of the two countries and the numerous other bonds that tie them together, the dealings between our two Governments are extensive. In the course of the conduct of these relations at all levels, some minor difficulties are bound to be experienced by one side or the other, but there is no reason to think that these difficulties cannot be resolved in mutual consultation to the satisfaction and advantage of both countries. In fact, that is happening every day. Apart from high level visit and consultations, the officials of the two countries filet practically every other month to resolve these minor difficulties as they arise and to promote and carry forward the co-operation which is vital to both countries.

I have extended an invitation to His Majesty the King to visit India and he has graciously accepted our invitation. I have also invited Shri Thapa, Chairman of the Council of Ministers. to visit our country and he has very kindly agreed. We shall look forward to their visits.

NEPAL USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Pakistan's Armed Aggression in Kutch

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on May 3, 1965, while moving a motion for consideration of the situation arising from the repeated attacks by Pakistan's armed forces on the Kutch border :

Mr. Chairman, Sir,

I beg to move that the situation arising out of the repeated and continuing attacks by the armed forces of Pakistan on the Kutch border be taken into consideration.

I know how anxious the, Hon'ble Members must be to know the facts of the situation and the policy of Government in regard to the grave developments which have taken place. First of all, I would like to report to the House that during the last two or three days, there-has been no major engagement on the Kutch border and that the aggressive armed forces of Pakistan have not been able to make any further inroads on our territory. Secondly, during the clashes which took place, heavy losses were inflicted on the intruders. The morale of our armed forces is very high. I know that this House and the people of India stand behind them, united in the determination that the territorial integrity of India must be preserved fully and completely.

With your permission, Sir, I would like to state briefly the facts of the situation.

The Kutch-Sind border is a well-defined, wellknown and well-established border which is clearly marked in the various editions of the Survey of India maps ever since 1871. A large part of the boundary is not demarcated on the ground. This is so. however, because there was no disputed boundary between the province of Sind and the Kutch Darbar; and it was not customary to demarcate with pillars boundaries between provinces and States of British India as they were not international boundaries.

On the 15th August, 1947, Pakistan was carved out of India as an independent State. Under the Independence Act, the territories of Pakistan were enumerated and these included the province of Sind. The boundary between Sind and Kutch, thus, became. an international boundary. Pakistan is precluded from claiming any more territory than was included in the province of Sind on the 15th August, 1947. No part of the territory south of the Kutch-Sind border which is shown in the map as situated north of Kanjarkot which is thus clearly Indian territory, could, conceivably, be a part of Pakistan. In fact, this area was under the jurisdiction and authority of the Ruler of Kutch which had extended at all times both in law and in fact right upto the border between Sind and Kutch as shown in the Survey of India maps of 1871, 1886, 1898, 1943 and 1946 which was the last map before the date of independence.

The boundary between Kutch and Sind has also been described in detail in other official documents over the last three quarters of a century prior to the partition of India. The Official Gazetteer of Sind published in Karachi in 1907, the Gazetteer of India of the Bombay Presidency published in 1909 and the Imperial Gazetteer of India published by the British Secretary of State for India in 1908, are all categorical about the

97

Rann of Kutch being outside the Province of Sind. In all the documents of the Political Department of the then British Government of India in 1937, 1939 and 1942, defining the political charges of the various officials, the Rann of Kutch was invariably shown as falling within the western India States Agency and never as falling within the province of Sind. As the House is aware, the entire Western India States Agency became part of India as a result of accession. The position is so clear that in the light of this, the, attack on the Kutch border is a clear case of aggression by Pakistan. This aggression also fits into the pattern of Pakistan's aggressive behaviour during the last few months. Pakistan has been resorting frequently to firing and clashes at several points on the Indo-Pakistan border, both in the East and in the West. She has shown an utter lack of responsibility and displayed amazing recklessness.

A few days ago, Prime Minister Wilson sent a message to me and I presume a similar message to President Ayub Khan, making certain proposals in the framework of which a cease-fire could be brought about. The Prime Minister of U.K. is still pursuing his efforts and, therefore, for obvious reasons, I am unable to say much more about this matter at this stage. I can, however, assure the House that in the exchanges I have had with Mr. Wilson and in any further exchanges, we shall not depart from the position that along with cease-fire there must be a restoration of the status quo ante.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian' Government and the Indian people have no ill-will against the people of Pakistan. We wish them well and we would be happy to see them progress on the road to prosperity. We are aware that their prosperity as well as the prosperity of the people of India, of the 600 million people who inhabit this sub-continent, depends upon the preservation of peace. It is for this reason that we have adhered fervently to the path of peace all these years. A war in the Indian sub-continent may well undo the massive efforts which have been made in both countries to secure an improvement in the living standards of our people. The march in this direction has only just begun and there is a long way yet to go. But President Ayub has talked of a total war between India and Pakistan. We on our part have been greatly restrained not because we are unprepared to meet President Ayub's challenge but because we feel that reason and sanity, should prevail over aggression and bellicosity. President Ayub seems to suggest that whereas his country has the right to commit aggression on Indian territories at will and at a point of its own choice. India must not take effective counter-measures. This thesis is totally unacceptable to us. The pattern of Pakistani activity is this: First raise a claim to neighbour's territory; suddenly mount an attack taking the neighbour by surprise; launch an ingenious propaganda campaign to suggest that the action is only of a defensive character. I do want to urge President Ayub to think a little more carefully of the consequences of the line of action that he has chosen to pursue. So far the Pakistani aggression on the Kutch border has been met only by local defensive action to protect our territories. From the Indian side there have been no counter-measures and the aggression has, therefore, been a totally one-sided affair. We have restrained ourselves, but if the Government of Pakistan persists in its present aggressive posture, the Government of India will be left with no alternative except to think how best to defend

the territorial integrity of the motherland.

Mr. Chairman, let me once again make the position of the. Government of India perfectly clear. We will have no objection to ordering a cease-fire on the basis of a simultaneous agreement for the restoration of status quo ante. After the status quo ante has been restored, we will be willing to sit together with the representatives of Pakistan to demarcate the boundary in accordance with the well-settled and well-established dividing line between the erstwhile Province of Sind and the State of Kutch. At the same time, I must reiterate clearly and emphatically that the Government of India do not recognise that there is any territorial dispute about the Rann of Kutch. Let me also make it clear that the threat of total war held out by President Ayub will not deter us from performing our rightful duties. No Government in the world would be worth its name if it allows its own territories to be annexed by force by an aggressive neighbour. The Government of India know their responsibilities in the present situation and they are determined to discharge them most effectively.

The threat to our freedom is real, continuing and immediate. We have to meet this threat with all our resources and with all our might. We can afford to give up a few projects for economic development but we cannot allow our defence mechanism to be in any manner inadequate for safeguarding our frontiers.

Among the people there must be a real sense of unity. We must give no quarter to the rumours that are sought to be circulated by antisocial elements. I am greatly strengthened by the knowledge that the morale of our people is high and that every Indian today is prepared to make any sacrifice for defending the territorial integrity of India.

The Rann of Kutch has been and continues to be India's territory. It has been in our possession according to Pakistan itself though Mr. Bhutto characteristically chooses to call it adverse possession. Pakistan now seeks to annex this territory by force. This we shall not allow. No Government in the world would allow that. We have acted with the greatest restraint so far but the sands of time are running out.

I shall say no more on this difficult situation. This is a testing time for our country and our people. I would say to our people: be united, feel the pride of belonging to a great nation, carry out your tasks with true dedication. Take no notice, of the false Pakistani propaganda. Let us have faith in ourselves and in the great destiny of our country. I would now close by asking the House to declare that we all stand together united in defending our motherland.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM

Date : May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on Kutch-Sind Border Situation

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following statement in Parliament on May 11, 1965 about the situation on the Kutch-Sind border:

After making my statement on the 28th April, 1965, I have been informing the House about the developments which have been taking place in regard to the situation on the Kutch-Sind border.

The initiative which Prime Minister Wilson took some days ago has been followed up and gradually concrete proposals have been evolved with a view to bringing about a satisfactory settlement of the problem. We have made it clear on every occasion that a case-fire would be possible only on the basis of a simultaneous agreement for the restoration of status quo ante as on 1st January, 1965. We have also indicated clearly that only when such a restoration has been effected that we would be ready to have recourse to the procedures which had already been agreed between the two Governments for demarcating the border where this had not already been done.

In the communications from the British Government, various points of detail have been put forward for consideration by both the Govern: merits. So far, no final draft has been prepared or presented. All I would say is that consistenly with the stand which I have taken on the floor of this House, we attach the greatest importance to the restoration of status quo ante and we have indicated our willingness to proceed thereafter to negotiations at Ministers' level followed, if necessary, by a reference to an impartial tribunal as contemplated-in the earlier agreements on the subject.

Our policy and our intentions are quite clear and unequivocal. We do not believe in talking with one voice here and with another voice there. We do not believe in talking of peace at one place and committing aggression at another. Our position has been made known to the whole world in the clearest possible terms.

I want the Hon'ble Members to have the assurance that our armed forces are ready and determined to defend the territorial integrity of the country. They have been greatly strengthened in their determination by the united and powerful support which this House and the people of India all over have extended ever since the crisis, began.

I am leaving for Moscow tomorrow morning and I know I would be carrying with me your good wishes and fraternal greetings to the friendly people of USSR, people who have stood: by us in hours of trial and anxiety.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Statement by Government of India on Chinese Support of Pakistan's Aggression in Kutch

The following is the text of a statement issued by the Spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, on May 7, 1965, commenting on the New China News Agency's statement regarding Chinese support of Pakistani aggression in the Rann of Kutch:

The Government of India have seen the statement of 4th May issued by the New China News Agency on behalf of the Chinese Government in support of Pakistan's aggression against India in the Rann of Kutch.

It is significant that this statement is more prompt and vehement than even the innumerable utterances of the Chinese Government on the grave situation in Vietnam. This is a demonstration of the aggressive partnership between the Chinese and Pakistan Governments against India. The Chinese statement contains a threat against India when it says that if the armed conflict is widened "the Indian Government will definitely come to no good end." This is nothing but open incitement to Pakistan to persist in its aggressive occupation of Indian territory in the Rann of Kutch under the umbrella of a Chinese military threat against India, and is further evidence of China's collusion with Pakistan against India.

99

The Chinese and Pakistan Governments entertain a common hatred and a common hostility against India. Both have committed aggression against India in Kashmir; both have laid claims against Indian territory and grabbed a portion of it illegally; and both have constantly applied military, political and propaganda pressure against India in order to make India submit to their aggressive demands. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Chinese Government has come out with this statement supporting Pakistan in its aggression in the Rann of Kutch just as the Pakistan Government has come out in support of Chinese aggression against India. The boundary between India and Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch is a well-established and delimited boundary. What Pakistan has tried, is to assert its fantastic claim by use of force. The whole world knows that it is Pakistan who launched an attack in the Rann using considerable military force with tanks and heavy artillery, and that India had to send its troops there purely in self-defence.

The world also knows that it is Pakistan who has used American tanks to fight Indian troops in this area-tanks which it has got under the military agreement with the United States and under the SEATO and CENTO Pacts of which Pakistan is a founder member, and evidently China approves of this. To ignore these facts and to accuse India of fighting its neighbours with `U.S. imperialist arms' proves nothing but the utter opportunism, and cynicism of the Chinese Government in the field of international relations.

The Chinese Government has alleged that India is carrying out the U.S. scheme of "making Asians fight Asians and disrupting Afro-Asian solidarity". This is a mantle which falls fittingly on China and Pakistan who are fellow-aggressors against India. In committing aggression against India and in encouraging Pakistan to commit aggression against India, it is the Chinese Government that is disrupting Afro-Asian solidarity and making Asians fight Asians. While paying lip-service to Asian-African unity and the Bandung Principles, the rulers of China are doing everything possible to subvert these principles.

In the statement issued by the New China News Agency the Chinese Government had the presumption "to advise the Indian Government" to give consideration to the interests of the Indian people and "settle its disputes with the neighbouring countries through peaceful negotiations". The only two neighbouring countries who have resorted to military action against India in defiance of international law and good neighbourly relations, and refused to settle problems through peaceful negotiations, are China and Pakistan. The Chinese Government's "advice" should, therefore, have been addressed to itself and to the Government of Pakistan. The world has not forgotten that the Chinese Government has suppressed by massive, force the autonomy of Tibet and the elementary human rights of the Tibetan people, has invaded India and is occupying large areas of its territory, and is interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign States and indulging in subversive activities aimed at overthrowing the lawful Governments of such States in Asia as well as in Africa.

The Chinese Government's stand on Pakistani aggression in the Rann of Kutch is a reflection of its familiar technique of trying to change the established frontiers of States through the use of military force. This is contrary to the principles of peaceful co-existence, the Ten Principles of Bandung and the Declaration of the Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned Nations. The people of Asia and Africa can see that China is unashamedly fomenting trouble and conflict in Asia and Africa. China has emerged as the greatest disruptive force in Asia, a chauvinistic and imperialist power which has made a mockery of the principles of peaceful co-existence, and is trying to bully and intimidate its neighbours and other Asian and African countries.

PAKISTAN INDIA CHINA VIETNAM USA TUNISIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT INDONESIA

Date : May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on withdrawal of Indian Diplomatic Mission from Southern Rhodesia

Shri Dinesh Singh, Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on May 7, 1965, regarding the withdrawal of the Indian diplomatic Mission from Southern Rhodesia :

The Government of India have been greatly

concerned at the political developments taking place in Southern Rhodesia. The series of measures taken by the minority settlers' Government in Salisbury, especially the elections ordered for

100

7th May, indicate its determination to take positive steps towards the declaration of independence unilaterally on the basis of the existing constitution and without the consent of the people of the country through recognised democratic processes. Any semblance of constitutionality' sought to be given by the process of conducting a spurious election would be completely unacceptable.

Government of India have repeatedly made it known that Southern Rhodesia should gain independence without delay on the basis of the establishment of a duly constituted democratic government, elected on the principle of 'one man one vote. We consider that the status of Southern Rhodesia as a non-self-governing territory, which has been affirmed in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1747 of 28th June, 1962, remains unchanged.

It is a matter of great concern that despite opposition from the majority population of Southern Rhodesia and expressions of disapproval by the international community in the United Nations, in the Organisation of African Unity, in the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Nations and other forums, the minority Government in Salisbury persists in the achievement of its illegal objectives.

To demonstrate our Strong disapproval and as a mark of solidarity with the people of Southern Rhodesia struggling for the vindication of their rights and in conformity with enlightened world opinion, Government of India have decided to withdraw their Mission in Salisbury as from to-day. The British Government have been informed of our decision and our Representative is leaving Salisbury to-day.

INDIA USA **Date :** May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's State Visit to Soviet Union

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri accompanied by Shrimati Lalita Shastri, paid an official visit to the Soviet Union from May 12 to 19, 1965. On May 12, the Soviet Government gave a banquet in honour of the Prime Minister in the Kremlin Palace, Moscow.

Replying to the toast by the Soviet Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said :

Your Excellency Mr. Prime Minister,

Your Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

My colleagues and I have been in your country for just a few hours. We are greatly impressed by the warmth and cordiality with which we have been received. My predecessor, Jawaharlal Nehru, always had the most vivid impressions of the deep feelings of friendship for India which are entertained by the people of the Soviet Union.

I would like to express my deep appreciation of the kind references you have made to my country and people. I would like to assure you that we in India have the highest regard and affection for the Soviet Union and the people of your great country.

FRIENDLY RELATIONS

The Soviet Union was one of the first countries with which we established diplomatic relations after the dawn of freedom in our country. We did so in the conviction that the development of friendly relations between our two countries was necessary not only in the interests of our two peoples but also in the larger interests of peace throughout the world.

Over the years there has been a most remarkable development in our relations in the political, economic and cultural fields. The close understanding and cooperation between our two countries in many vital international questions which has grown between ourselves is a lasting tribute to the success of the policy of peaceful co-existence between States with different political, social and economic systems to which both our Governments steadfastly subscribe.

NON-ALIGNMENT

We are particularly gratified by the constant understanding and respect your Government has shown for our policy of non-alignment. This policy is not based on considerations of expedi-

101

ency but finds its roots in the history and tradition of our country from ancient times. In the context of today We are firmly convinced that the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence is the best means to preserve our independence and sovereignty. We have adhered to this policy in spite of the serious pressures and threats to our independence and territorial integrity to which we have been subjected. It is no exaggeration for me to say that our ability to pursue this policy has to a large measure been due to the understanding and support with which your Government has regarded this policy.

COMMON QUEST FOR PEACE

It has been a source of great satisfication to us to see the development of close understanding and cooperation between our two countries in many vital international questions. At the United Nations and other international forums our delegations have cooperated fruitfully, in the pursuit of common objectives. Your support to us on some vital issues concerning India has been deeply appreciated by our government and people and has forged unbreakable bonds of friendship between us.

The close cooperation and understanding

which so happily exists in the approach of our two countries to various international problems flows from our common quest for peace and our common desire to eliminate war. It is for this reason that both our countries are totally opposed to the use of force for the settlement of international disputes. Similarly, we share the view that general and complete disarmament must be achieved as early as possible if mankind is to be saved from the threat of complete annihilation. The Test Ban Treaty which was signed in this historic city two years ago was a significant first step on the way to disarmament. India was one of the first countries to sign this treaty. Unfortunately, not all countries have found it possible to subscribe to this treaty and the world now faces the dangerous consequences of an unrestricted proliferation of nuclear weapons. The international community has to address itself with the utmost seriousness to this problem if there is to be any guarantee that weapons of mass destruction do not pass into the hands of larger number of countries resulting in a serious threat to the security of the world. It is a matter of great satisfaction that our Governments have always worked in close coordination in all matters relating to disarmament. It is our hope that the current session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission will lead to some positive progress in this field and that its deliberations might lead to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee resuming its work with a greater sense of direction and purpose as soon as possible.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

I would like to express our gratitude for the substantial economic assistance we have received from the Soviet Union during our Second and Third Five-Year Plan periods. The various schemes and projects which have been implemented with Soviet aid have gone a long way to create a base for the economic structure we are planning to build in our country. The Bhilai Steel Project is but one of many lasting monuments to the close and friendly cooperation between our two countries in the economic field. We are now engaged in working out the framework for our Fourth Five-Year Plan and I am glad to hear that my colleague Mr. Asoka Mehta has had fruitful discussions with representatives of your Government on the basis of which our

long-term economic cooperation can be coordinated for the mutual benefit of both our countries and peoples.

VOYAGE OF DISCOVERY

Mr. Chairman, for me personally this is truly a voyage of discovery. I have had previously the privilege of meeting several distinguished leaders of your great country during their visit to India. I was anxious also to meet the friendly and warm-hearted people of the Soviet Union and their leaders and to feet the glow of that close friendship which illumines our mutual relationship. We in India are now going through the first stages of industrial revolution., We are making strenuous efforts to improve the living standards of the millions of my countrymen. Your country, Mr. Chairman, has already advanced far towards the completion of this process. You have achieved marvels in the field of science and technology and have enabled man to conquer space. We admire you and we congratulate you on your achievements. We are also happy in the thought that in so many spheres of economic activity in our country, we are successfully collaborating with the Soviet Union and 'ire steadily but surely progressing towards the establishment in our country of a socialist society in which there will be no serious inequalities between the rich and the poor and in which everyone of our people will be assured of a reasonable standard of living.

I fully share your view, Mr. Prime Minister, that the close and friendly ties which have developed between our two countries are in the interests of our peoples and of world peace itself. May I request you, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to join me in drinking a toast to the health of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, His Excellency Mr. Mikoyan, to the health of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of the Soviet

102

Socialist Republics, His Excellency Mr. Kosygin, to the welfare and prosperity of the Soviet people and to the further consolidation and strengthening of Indo-Soviet friendship.

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Speech at Indian Embassy Luncheon in honour of Soviet Leaders

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and Shrimati Shastri were hosts at a luncheon held at the Indian Embassy in honour of the Soviet leaders on May 13, 1965.

Welcoming the distinguished guests, the Prime Minister said :

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

It gives me a very great pleasure to welcome all of you on what is in fact a bit of India in the Soviet Union. We have had the privilege of acquainting ourselves with your great capital city and your people. The combined will for peace of our nations, comprising as many as 700 million people, constitutes a powerful influence for the establishment of peace and amity among peoples throughout the world. The world is going through a serious crisis at the present moment and the situation in Asia is particularly tense. Both our governments are deeply concerned at the developments in this area and it is our earnest hope that the serious threat to peace which hangs over Asia might be warded off by patient and painstaking efforts to resolve existing differences by negotiations rather than by the use of force. The Soviet Union has played a very important role in supporting the liberation struggle in Asia and in assisting the newly independent countries of Asia to develop their backward economies. It is for this reason that the future independence and prosperity of Asia can to a large extent be assisted and strengthened by closer cooperation between the Soviet

Union and the countries of Asia. Our own record of cooperation with the Soviet Union both in the political and economic fields is significant and impressive.

In the political field we have worked closely together in the struggle against colonialism and the quest for the early agreement on disarmament. In the postwar years the efforts of the international community have been to bring about a peaceful settlement of all international disputes. In this task the United Nations Organisation has played and should continue to play a vital role. Today the world body is facing a serious crisis. The determination of both our governments to preserve the integrity of the world organisation has prompted closer cooperation between us on the measures to be adopted to resolve the difficulties with which it is faced. it is our earnest hope that an equitable solution will be found to the problems which today threaten the very existence of the United Nations.

Indo-Soviet economic cooperation has grown in leaps and bounds in recent years. There are any number of monuments to our economic friendship and cooperation in such places as Bhilai, Neyveli and Ankleshwar. I would like to express the hope that our future relations may be as strong and lasting as the steel produced at Bhilai. It was only very recently that we celebrated the tenth anniversary of our collaboration in the economic field and we had the privilege of having an old friend of India, your distinguished Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Dymshits, in India. We are happy that our efforts to coordinate our respective economic plans have reached a fairly advanced stage. In all these ways we hope to benefit from your experience and assistance in order to strengthen the economic base of our country and to bring about a greater degree of prosperity for our people.

Even in the cultural field we have come much closer to one another in recent years. Our programme for cultural exchange is now quite extensive. The opening of an Institute of Russian Studies in India is but a symbol of the growing desire of our peoples to get to know one another better.

My visit to the Soviet Union has convinced

me that the foundation for the further development of friendly relations between our two countries has been firmly laid. It is a matter of great satisfaction that we share the view that this free and voluntary association has been of benefit to both our countries and people and I am confident that Indo-Soviet friendship is both now and in the future a factor in modern international relations conducive to peace and international harmony.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to request you to join me in a toast to the health of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, His Excellency Mr. Mikoyan. to the health of the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministries, His Excellency Mr. Kosygin and to the constant growth and strengthening of Indo-Soviet Friendship.

103

INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Speech at Moscow State University

The following is the text of the speech of the Prime Minister, Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri at the Moscow State University on May 14, 1965:

Mr. Rector,

Distinguished guests,

Friends and Students,

I am very happy to have this opportunity of visiting your great Institution. You enjoy a very high reputation indeed. The standards you have set are second to none. You have produced eminent people in various walks of life. You have every reason to be proud of this great Institution for the service it renders to your own country and to culture and science throughout the world. May I congratulate you on the great progress you have made in recent years and wish you even greater success in the future.

I am particularly happy to learn that a number of students and scholars from India are studying in this great university. It is necessary that teachers and students from the universities of our two countries should pay visits to and study at each other's Institutions. It is necessary to do so in order to understand each other's problems, to appreciate each other's difficulties, to share each other's hopes and aspirations, joys and sorrows.

Humanity is one and human beings are held together by a common bond, a common purpose, a common aim and a common ideal of brotherhood and fraternity. It is my fervent hope that the great ideals, which your university stands for, will serve the interests not only of your country and your people, but of all countries and peoples throughout the world.

RUSSIA USA INDIA **Date :** May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's speech at Peoples Friendship University

The following is the text of the speech made by the Prime Minister at the People's Friendship University in Moscow on May 14, 1965:

Mr. Rector,

Dear Friends,

I am very happy to have this opportunity of seeing with my own eyes how the world of friendship is being built in the minds and hearts of the youth of various countries. This is a laudable experiment. The only way to build peace and friendship among the peoples of the world is by bringing them together in institutions like this where they can open their hearts and minds to the fresh wind of thought that blows from all parts of the world. I believe that the seeds of friendship sown in institutions like this are bound to take up deep root and grow in times to come. If the leaders of the world could join and discuss things in a friendly and peaceful atmosphere, as you have here, most of the international problems could be solved in a friendly and peaceful manner. You are the future leaders of countries and of the world, and I wish you every success in carrying out the message of friendship, of world peace, of human understanding, from the portals of this university to your countries. You have to bring about by your sincere and earnest efforts a world where man will respect his fellow man, where the colour of one's skin, political or religious creeds of people will not be the forces that divide mankind.

I am also happy that over 150 students from India are studying in this institution. We are grateful to the Soviet Union for having given this opportunity to our students to study in various fields of science and technology at this university. I hope that our students will bring credit to themselves, to their country and to this institution.

Mr. Rector, at a time when tensions and strifes are once again tending to divert the attention of the world from the path of peace and progress it seems necessary to make special efforts to stress those higher values of amity and goodwill to which both our countries are irrevocably devoted. Mahatma Gandhi who generated, shaped and guided India's struggle for independence proclaimed and carried into effect a policy that even a colonial Power could be fought by peaceful methods and without feelings of bitterness or animosity. The world's conscience today is to be roused against the forces of strife and destruction. People's minds have to be chanelled towards the pursuit of peaceful methods and noble objectives. The leaders and peoples of India and Soviet Union are working together in this direction. In this great task your university and other similar institutions can play a truly effective role.

Mr. Rector, I wish you every success in the unique experiment that you have launched here, and through you I wish to convey to all the students of the 83 countries who study here success in their work.

104

RUSSIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA **Date :** May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's speech on Moscow Television

The following is the text of Prime Minister Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri's speech on Television in Moscow on May 15, 1965 :

Dear friends and citizens of the great Soviet Union,

I bring you the warm and friendly greetings of the Government and the 470 million people of India. I wish you every success in your noble effort in building up your country and in building friendship, understanding and peace throughout the world. We, in India, are also engaged in the great adventure of building up our country in various fields-political, social, economic, cultural scientific and others. As you know, we suffered from 200 years of colonial rule and we have to make up for lost time and telescope centuries into decades and decades into years. In this great task of building up of our country and helping the maintenance of peace, we feel' greatly encouraged by the sympathy, understanding and active support of the Government and the people of this great country.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

We have always admired your Government's policy of peace and peaceful co-existence which, as your leaders told me, is a fundamental principle of your foreign policy from the days of the Great Lenin. We have also from the beginning of our struggle for independence, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, dedicated ourselves to this cause of peace. Our late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru also initiated the five principles of peaceful co-existence between different social, political and economic systems and enunciated the principle of non-alignment as the two main pillars of our foreign policy. We respect your policy of peaceful co-existence just as you respect our policy of non-alignment. These two policies go hand in hand and help in the maintenance of peace in the relaxation of tensions and in helping newly independent and developing countries to maintain their political and economic independence.

The international situation is taking a dangerous turn in various parts of the world in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America. In this--our thermonuclear age-it is all the more necessary to follow the path of peace and peaceful coexistence so that the world may be saved from the scourge of war. The only alternative to peaceful co-existence is a violent upheaval which will destroy the whole humanity. Peaceful coexistence is not a policy of weakness but of strength; it is not a policy that can compromise with imperialism or colonialism. It is a positive policy that helps the liberation of colonial territories and peoples under foreign domination to liberate themselves. We hope that the remaining pockets of colonialism and imperialism in various parts of the world, such as Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia etc., will be removed in the very near future through the force, of strong and powerful world opinion.

I have been in your hero city only for four days today. I have been deeply impressed by the warmth of your reception and the sincerity of your feelings of friendship for my country and people. We know how bravely you fought against fascism and nazism and I congratulate you on the recognition you recently received from your Government on the 20th anniversary celebrations of the victory over fascism. The people of the Soviet Union played a decisive role in this great victory over fascism, and was an inspiring example of all countries to fight against aggression.

We are determined to maintain the territorial integrity and sovereignty of our country. While we have no designs on the territory of any other country, we shall not tolerate any encroachment on our own territory. Like you, however, we believe in the settlement of all international disputes through peaceful negotiations. We hope that all other countries will likewise follow this path of peace and settle all questions through peaceful means.

ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL RELATIONS

I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the Government and the people of the, Soviet Union for the generous and disinterested help they have given to us in various fields of our economy. We, in our turn, are also trying to help some of our neighbouring countries and other countries to the best of our ability, to strengthen their economies. No country in the world can develop with foreign assistance alone. It is, therefore, our aim to reach a self-sustaining stage, mainly with the efforts of our own people.

Our trade and economic relations have developed very rapidly during the last years. The tenth anniversary of our economic cooperation was recently celebrated with great enthusiasm by our people in India. Bhilai and Ranchi, Ankleshwar and Barauni, Neyvelli and Ranipur, are shining examples of our co-operation in the future of India.

Our trade has increased more than eight timesin the last eight years. Both our Governments have agreed to double it in the next five years.

105

We hope that our economic and trade relations will be as beneficial to you as they are to us.

Our cultural relations are also increasing rapidly. It is necessary that more and more people from our two countries should visit each other so that there is greater fellow feeling and understanding amongst us. It is my earnest hope that our growing friendly relations will help in promoting a feeling of amity and goodwill all round. Let the friendship between the Indian and Soviet people serve as a solid foundation for, understanding and co-operation amongst all the people of the world.

I am leaving for Leningrad tonight and I would, therefore, like to take leave of you. Allow me, my friends, to say how deeply touched I am by the warm affection which has been showered upon my wife and myself. We are carrying with us happy memories which we will always cherish. Once again I would ask you to accept the greetings and good wishes of the people of India for the happiness and well-being of all the men, women and children of this great country.

RUSSIA INDIA USA ANGOLA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Speech at Indo-Soviet Friendship Meeting

The following is the text of the Prime Minister's speech at an Indo-Soviet Friendship meeting held in the Kremlin Palace on May 15, 1965.

Chairman, Your Excellencies and Friends,

I feel greatly honoured to participate in this function and heartily reciprocate the warm feelings which you have expressed. From my point of view this is an extremely important occasion when I am meeting the leaders of a country which has strong ties of friendship with India. I want to tell Your Excellencies that the people of India have the highest regard for the people of USSR and they cherish this deep and growing friendship between ourselves.

While Governments can give the lead in cementing friendly relations between countries, the consolidation of such friendship depends in the ultimate analysis on the efforts of the people themselves. The people of India and the people of the Soviet Union have already demonstrated that they are united together by genuine, strong and abiding bonds of friendship. Our mutual relations are based not upon any temporary expedients but upon the sincere realization that the larger interest of humanity can be served best by promoting and enlarging the area of peace. Our close relationship is not directed against the interests of any other country or any other people. On the contrary, how earnestly do we both wish that all the countries of the world were to stand united together by similar feelings of mutual regard and close understanding. Our mission would stand completed only when that day dawns.

COLONIALISM

The father of the Indian Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, and our great national leader, the builder of modern India-Jawaharlal Nehru, always conceived of the freedom of, India only as a part of the freedom of the oppressed nations all over the world. They were men of great vision and unbounded idealism. They taught us to believe that the freedom and independence of India would be incomplete so long as any country in the world anywhere continued under foreign domination. When, therefore, we attained our independence, we did not think that the Journey's end had come. We knew that the process of liberation has just commenced and that we had to traverse a long road ahead of us. It is for this reason that throughput these years we have given strong support to all the peoples who have fought for independence from colonial domination. The people of India are clear in their belief: that peace can be established throughout the world only when the last vestiges of colonialism have been eliminated. I want, therefore, to reiterate today how strongly we support the aspirations of the people of countries such as Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa for independence and for freedom from foreign rule. I am happy that in this noble task, the Soviet Union and India have always stood shoulder to shoulder in the United Nations in fighting colonialism and imperialism.

Often I wonder why even today certain colonial countries should still wish to cling to their colonies. These Powers should not in my opinion ignore the realities of the situation. In fact they should heed the world opinion which supports solidly the liberation movement of all countries which are still ruled by colonial powers. It is absolutely essential that the colonies must gel their freedom at the earliest time. Although a number of countries have already attained their independence, colonialism still persists and this must be eliminated from the face of the earth so that men everywhere may live in freedom and with a sense of national dignity.

106

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

India and the Soviet Union both firmly believe in the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence. Peace is essential for the preservation of humanity in this thermonuclear age. The only alternative to peaceful co-existence is complete destruction and even total annihilation. We must therefore, co-operate amongst ourselves in this task of strengthening peace and promoting international amity and goodwill. We must also not lose sight of the fact that peace is indivisible and that a threat of war anywhere is a threat to peace everywhere. It is my sincere hope and earnest expectation that India and the Soviet Union will together provide mighty support to the forces of peace in this strife-torn world.

VIETNAM

We are most unhappy at the Vietnam situation which is a great danger to peace. We want that peace is restored through Vietnam. AR outside interference should cease and the people of Vietnam should be able to live their lives, in dignity and freedom. Every endeavour should be made to bring about stoppage of armed conflict and wean away the parties from the battle field to the conference table. There can be no military solution to the Vietnam problem. I have already said publicly that bombings of North Vietnam should stop and the right atmosphere should be created for a peaceful solution.

We strongly believe that the primary responsibility of countries which have secured independence from colonial domination is to provide relief to their people who have suffered so long under foreign rule. All attention has to be concentrated on economic development with a view to providing adequate food, clothing, shelter, education, medical facilities etc., to the people by the establishment of a just economic and social order. Peace is thus of vital importance to the developing countries. Those who seek to create an atmosphere of strife and to build up tensions are no friends of the developing countries. In fact, they compel the developing countries to divert their limited resources from projects for economic development to armament for national defence.

PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The most serious threat to peace in the-world as I see today, is from the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has taken initiative in, promoting measures for arresting the further spread of nuclear weapons. The Moscow Test Ban Treaty was clearly designed for this purpose. Whereas your country is trying to promote measures for nuclear disarmament. China has detonated another nuclear device. This further underlines the importance and the urgency of the problem of control and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. We in India firmly believe that unless effective measures are taken to control the nuclear menace within a short time, the world may well reach the point of no return. I ask you my friends to bestow the most serious consideration you can on this danger to mankind and to evolve appropriate measures to fight this menace.

NON-ALIGNMENT

While India pursues steadfastly the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, certain countries are casting covetous eyes on our territories and are attempting to violate our frontiers. In this manner our territorial integrity and national sovereignty is threatened. We as a people believe in peace and in the pursuit of peaceful methods even for the settlement of international disputes. We are prepared always to sit together and discuss such disputes as may arise. But if the path of peace and negotiation is discarded and aggression' is committed, we are duty bound to safeguard our freedom and to defend our frontiers. In such a situation we would consider no sacrifice too great. Our responsibility for the preservation of our freedom is higher than any other responsibility. I want to make it clear that we have no desire whatsoever to take even an inch of any other country's territory. In fact such an idea never occurs to our mind. At the same time we are determined that no part of our own territory shall be allowed to be annexed by force by any other country no matter what its alignment and what its power.

DISARMAMENT

We still believe sincerely that if the world is to live in peace at all, there must be total disarmament both nuclear and conventional. We congratulate the Soviet Government on taking the initiative in regard to nuclear weapons by pressing the Moscow Test Ban Treaty. It was an important step towards the achievement of nuclear disarmament, but only the first step. We hope that this will lead to the banning of all nuclear tests, including underground tests, and to the banning of the-use of nuclear weapons throughout the world. We also hope that total and general disarmament by stage's and with adequate means of international control and inspection will be achieved in' our lifetime and in the not too distant future. I can assure you that my Government and my people will work wholeheartedly in co-operation with you and with other peace-loving countries for this cause.

Your Excellencies, although my country is facing a difficult situation on its border. we are still determined to go ahead with the Plans to improve the economic condition's of our people and to give social and economic content of our political freedom. Yet we, are striving hard, with

107

the voluntary co-operation of all our people, to

meet these problems, to raise the standard of living of our people, to industrialise our country and to achieve the aims enshrined in our Constitution. We believe in the equality of all races and religions; we believe in the equality of man; we believe. in socialism, and we hope we can achieve these objectives in our own way according to our own genius mainly through the efforts of our own people.

INDO-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

The Government and people of India are happy that friendly relations have always existed between our two countries. They are confident these relations will ever grow stronger. Our trade with the Soviet Union has been doubled in the last 3 years and I hope will re-double in the next two years. We believe that our friendship is to the mutual benefit of both our countries and peoples.

My visit to the Soviet Union has convinced me that the Soviet and Indian people can together be the most potent factor for world peace. Your Excellencies, let us make no mistake. The world has once again begun to drift away from the path of peace towards the path of strife. The highest degree of statesmanship is needed to prevent the coming conflict. Let us resolve that together we may contribute towards the emergence of that statesmanlike leadership so that the atmosphere of peace may yet be recaptured. It is in this wider context that we should view the importance of the friendly ties that bind us together.

My visit to this great capital city of Moscow will come to a close tonight when I leave for Leningrad. During the days I have been here, I have been overwhelmed by the warmth of affection which the leaders and the people of your great country have showered upon my wife and myself. The Soviet people are warmly human and so straightforward and genuine. I want to assure Your Excellencies that the 470 million people of India respond heartily to these feelings and I would ask, the Soviet people to accept the greetings and good wishes of all my countrymen for your well-being and prosperity.

INDIA USA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE VIETNAM RUSSIA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** May 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Joint Communique

At the conclusion of Prime Minister LAl Bahadur Shastri's 8-day State visit to the USSR a joint communique was issued in Moscow on May 19, 1965.

The following is the text of the joint communique :

At the invitation of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. and Shrimati Shastri paid an official visit to the Soviet Union from May 12 to 19, 1965. The Prime Minister of India was accompanied by Sardar Swaran Singh. Minister of External. Affairs, and other high officials.

During their stay in the Soviet Union the Prime Minister of India and his party in addition to Moscow. visited Leningrad, Kiev and Tashkent. The distinguished guests visited the Mausoleum of V. I. Lenin and laid a wreath. They noted with interest the various aspects of the life of the great Soviet people, their work and achievements in the fields of economy. science, culture, health and the arts. They visited a number of industrial and agricultural establishments as well as scientific and cultural institutions of the U.S.S.R.

In Moscow and in other cities of the Soviet Union the Prime Minister of India and his party received a cordial welcome and warm hospitality. They met and talked with representatives of various sections of the population of the Soviet land-workers, scientists, collective farmers; everywhere the guests from India saw the expression of sincere friendship and regard of Soviet people towards the great Indian people.

The Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri participated in a mass rally of Soviet-Indian friendship in the Kremlin. The Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. A. N. Kosygin, and the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, spoke at the rally.

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri had meetings and talks with L. I. Brezhnev, A. N. Kosygin, A. I. Mikoyan and other leading statesmen of the Soviet Union.

Participating in the talks on the Soviet side were : A. N. Shelepin, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; N. S. Patolichev, Minister of Foreign Trade of the USSR; S. A. Skachkov. Chairman, State Committee of the USSR Council of Ministers for External Economic Relations; V. V. Kuznetsov and N. P. Firyubin, Deputy Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the USSR: V. A. Sergeyev, Deputy Chairman of the State Committee for External Economic Relations: and V. I. Likhachev, Chief of the South Asia Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

108

Taking part in the talks on the Indian side were: Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs; Shri Asoka Mehta, Deputy Chairman of the National Planning Commission; Shri Triloki Nath Kaul, Ambassador of India to the USSR; Shri Lakshmi Kant Jha, Secretary to the Prime Minister; and Shri Chandra Shekhar Jha, Foreign Secretary.

During these talks held in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, the two sides exchanged views on major international problems and discussed questions pertaining to the further development of Soviet-Indian relations and mutually profitable co-operation.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

The Soviet Government and the Government of India noted that the many-sided co-operation of the Soviet Union and India based upon the principles of peaceful co-existence of States with different social systems was progressing successfully.

Both sides reiterated their continued adherence to the principles of peaceful co-existence which call for respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, non-aggression equality and mutual benefit. Peaceful co-existence of States with different social systems provides an opportunity for nations to direct their efforts at the consolidation of their political and economic independence and the improvement of their living standards. It is a positive factor in the development of national liberation movements.

The two sides affirmed that no State or group of States has the right to interfere, directly or indirectly, under any pretext in the internal affairs of any other State and its external policy or to come in the way of any people in their exercise of the right to choose and develop the political, economic and social system which they consider best suited to their aspirations. Both sides agree that international disputes, including border and territorial disputes, should be settled by peaceful negotiations, and the use of force for the settlement of such disputes is not permissible.

Recognising the vital necessity of an active struggle for a radical improvement of the international situation and the strengthening of peace, both sides stress their firm determination not to spare any efforts in the search for the means for a prompt Solution of international issues, for the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war, for achieving general and complete disarmament, and for securing a stable peace between nations.

NON-ALIGNMENT

Both sides noted that the policy of non-alignment has become in our time the firm course in the foreign policy of the majority of countries newly liberated from the colonial yoke, and that it meets growing international recognition. This policy serves the noble goals of preventing war and consolidating peace, easing world tensions and developing international co-operation. The two sides noted with satisfaction the results of the Second Non-aligned Nations Conference held in Cairo in October 1964 which contributed to the consolidation of peace-loving forces in their struggle for the establishment and maintenance of an enduring peace.

The Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of India declare their firm determination to uphold the cause of peace and to carry on an active. struggle against attempts to aggravate international tensions.

The two sides noted that in various parts of the world the international situation has been recently aggravated, notably in the region of South and South East Asia.

VIETNAM

The two sides expressed great concern at the situation in Vietnam. The two Governments state once again that the bombings of DRVN should be stopped immediately. The solution of the problem of Vietnam can be found only within the framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 on Indo-China.

Both sides expressed their concern that no solution has yet been found for such vital problems of our time as general and complete disarmament, the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons, the problem of a German peace settlement, and the final elimination of colonialism, the solution of which calls for the unflagging efforts of all peace-loving States and peoples.

DISARMAMENT

In the course of the discussions an identity of views was confirmed as regards the need for general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

The two sides consider it necessary to emphasize the great importance of partial measures aimed at limiting the armaments race and easing international tension, the implementation of which might contribute to general and complete disarmament. In their opinion, it would be desirable inter alia to achieve prompt agreement on such measures as the elimination of foreign military bases in alien territories, the banning of the use of nuclear weapons, the establishment of denuclearized zones in various areas of the globe. Both sides attach great significance to effective, measures being taken against any proliferation of nuclear weapons through their direct transfer by nuclear States to non-nuclear ones, or through military alliances, groupings and association of countries, or by any other means.

The decision of the Government of India not to use atomic energy for the production of nuclear weapons but to channel it for peaceful purposes exclusively is welcomed by the Soviet Government.

UNITED NATIONS

Both sides expressed their agreement as regards the need to strengthen the United Nations as an instrument for maintaining world peace and security on the basis of the strict observance of the UN Charter. The two sides believe that with the admission to the UN Organization of newly independent States of Asia and Africa, there is an urgent need to provide for a broader representation of these countries in major UN bodies.

The two sides agreed that they will co-operate in overcoming the difficulties existing at present in the United Nations. They believe that such settlement should be carried out in the near future with strict observance of the legitimate rights and interests of the member-States under the Charter.

GERMAN PEACE SETTLEMENT

The two Governments consider that the abnormal situation prevailing 20 years after the end of World War II is fraught with danger to peace in Europe and the whole world. With a view to maintaining and consolidating universal peace the two Governments believe that there exists particular need to exert efforts in order to obtain a German peace settlement.

The Soviet side is of the opinion that the conclusion of a peace treaty with both German States and the normalization on this basis of the situation in West Berlin, as an independent political entity, would be the best solution to the German problem.

The Indian side reaffirms the statement of the

late Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, in the joint Soviet-Indian communique issued in Moscow on September 11, 1961, and the provision of the joint communique of September 19, 1964, issued at the conclusion of President Radhakrishnan's visit to the USSR where it is said that at present the fact of the existence of the two German States cannot be ignored, that any attempt to change the existing frontiers will have dangerous consequences, and that there is an imperative need for finding a peaceful solution of the German problem through negotiations with the participation of all parties concerned.

COLONIALISM & NEO-COLONIALISM

The Soviet Union and India favour the complete elimination of the colonial regimes which still remain. They are against all forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism, and express their sincere support for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are struggling for the achievement and consolidation of freedom and independence. The two sides declare their resolute support for the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1960. They are unanimous in their belief that such peoples waging a struggle for their national liberation and independence must have the right to decide their fate in accordance with their own will.

The two sides support the struggle of the people of the Congo (Leopoldville) in defence of their freedom and independence, against foreign interference in the Congo's internal affairs.

The Soviet Union and India condemn the continuation of colonialism in Angola, Mozambique, "Portuguese" Guinea, Southern Rhodesia and Southern Arabia, and express their resolute support for the courageous struggle of the peoples of these countries for freedom and independence. They expressed their determination to work in close, co-operation with one another at the United Nations and elsewhere to ensure the liquidation of colonialism without further delay, and to oppose manifestations of imperialist domination in any part of the world.

POLICY OF APARTHEID

The two sides severely condemn the racialist policy of apartheid pursued by the Government of the South African Republic which constitutes a crime against humanity. As this policy contradicts the UN Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights, the two Governments call upon States, which have not yet implemented the decisions of the UN regarding the South African Republic, to do so and to end all cooperation and all relations with the Government of that country so as to compel it to grant legitimate rights to the population of the Republic of South Africa.

Both sides support the forthcoming Second Conference of Asian and African countries, and express the hope that if will make its contribution to the consolidation and invigoration of all forces fighting against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, and promote the establishment and development of relations between States with different social systems on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence, and will voice its support for peace and against aggression.

110

INDO-SOVIET RELATIONS

Both Governments were happy to note that the relations between the Soviet Union and India are friendly and constitute an important factor in strengthening world peace. The two sides express their satisfaction at the development of diversified ties between the two countries.

The development of Soviet-Indian relations on the basis of equality, mutual benefit and respect for sovereignty furnishes an example of the successful implementation of the principles of peaceful co-existence of States with different social systems.

These principles provide great opportunities for broad co-operation between the Soviet Union and India in the struggle for the maintenance and consolidation of peace on earth, for the easing of tensions in relations between States, the elimination of all forms of colonial domination, and for the peaceful solution of international problems. This co-operation in foreign policies is in keeping with the fundamental interests of the peoples of India and the Soviet Union, and the interests of all mankind.

The two sides note with satisfaction that the co-operation between the two countries in the economic and technical fields is of diversified character and is being successfully carried out. The Soviet Union has been rendering economic and technical assistance to India in the construction of a number of industrial and other projects in India's public sector, which are of primary importance for the development of the independent economy of that country.

The Prime Minister of India conveyed the warm thanks of the Government and people of India for the economic and technical assistance received from the Soviet Union during India's Second and Third Five-Year Plans. He reaffirmed his Government's determination to strengthen India's economy and substantially increase. the rate of development in the Fourth Five-Year Plan.

As a result of the exchange of views which took place, the Soviet Union expressed its willingness to continue economic and technical cooperation during the period of the Fourth Five-Year Plan of India, in particular, for the construetion of specific enterprises relating to iron and steel, non-ferrous metals, mining and oil industries, power supply, and for training Indian personnel in higher technology, as well as for developing sea fishery. In this connection the Soviet Union will send to India in 1965 Soviet experts who, together with Indian experts, will consider on the spot specific matters related to possible further co-operation in projects included in the Fourth Five-Year Plan. They will prepare appropriate recommendations for the consideration of the two Governments.

Both sides expressed their gratification at the successful development of Soviet-Indian trade which in recent years has considerably increased both in volume and variety of goods.

Both sides are desirous of further developing mutually beneficial trade and agreed on the desirability of roughly doubling by 1970 the turnover of goods between the Soviet Union and India as compared with the 1964 level. To this end they agreed on the, advisability of concluding an agreement on the exchange of goods for five years which will provide an opportunity to develop, together with the expansion of trade relations, certain industries in the Soviet Union and India to the interests of both countries. Both Governments will instruct their Ministers for Foreign Trade to undertake appropriate preparatory work for the conclusion of the said agreement with a view to signing it in August-September 1965.

Both sides expressed their satisfaction at the strengthening of cultural and scientific ties between the Soviet Union and India and recognized the need for their further development.

The visit by the Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, to the Soviet Union constitutes an important milestone in the further development of friendly relations and mutual understanding between the USSR and India.

The Prime Minister of India expressed his high appreciation of the warm and friendly reception accorded to him and his party in the Soviet Union.

The Prime Minister of India extended an invitation to L. I. Brezhnev, Firs Secretary of the Central committee of the CPSU, and A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and renewed the invitation to A. I. Mikoyan, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, extended by the President of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, during the latter's visit to the Soviet Union in September 1964, to visit India at a convenient date. These invitations were accepted with gratitude.

L6Mof EA/65--2,600-14-8-65--GIPF.

USA RUSSIA INDIA UKRAINE UZBEKISTAN EGYPT CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC VIETNAM SWITZERLAND CHINA MALI GERMANY CONGO ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA SOUTH AFRICA

Date : May 01, 1965

June

¹¹¹

Volume No

	~	~	-
Т	g	y	5
	_	1	~

Content

Foreign Affairs Record Vol. XI 6	1965 JUNE	No.		
C	ONTENTS			
	PAGE			
S CANADA Prime Minister's State V	visit to Canada	113		
Prime Minister's Speech	n at McGill University	114		
Joint Communique		116		
COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE Final Communique 118				
Commonwealth Mission	n on Vietnam : Statement of	f Guidance	124	
Agreed Memorandum o	on Commonwealth Foundati	ion	124	
INDIA AND `THE UNITED NATIONS President's Broadcast on the Twentieth Anniversary Celebrations of U.N. 125				
Sardar Swaran Singh's H	Broadcast on the Internation	nal Cooperation Year	127	
Shri Natwar Singh's Statement on the granting of Independence to Colonial Territories. 128				
PAKISTAN Indo-Pakistan Agreemen	nt for Cease-fire in the Ran	n of Kutch	130	
TUNISIA Indo-Tunisian Friendshi	ip Agreement Signed	131		

UNITED KINGDOM Prime Minister's Speech at the University of Sussex	132	
Prime Minister's Speech at Royal India, Pakistan and Ceylon	Society	133
Prime Minister's Speech at a Press Luncheon	134	
Prime Minister's Address to Indian Students in London	136	
Indo-British Loan Agreement Signed	139	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Indo-U.S. Loan Agreements Signed	139	

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CANADA VIETNAM INDIA PAKISTAN TUNISIA USA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CANADA

Prime Minister's State Visit to Canada

The Prime Minister. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, paid an official visit to Canada from June 10 to 14, 1965. On June 11, the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Lester Pearson, gave a dinner in honour of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri at a Country Club, across the Ottawa river, in Quebec Province.

Replying to the toast by Prime Minister Pearson, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Members of the Cabinet,

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : I am extremely happy to be in Canada. When we in India think of Canada we think not of the long physical distance that separates the two countries, but of the strong ties of friendship and mutual regard which have brought us so close and which bind us together. From the earliest days of our freedom struggle we noted with admiration the rapid evolution of your country into a sovereign state and your steadfast devotion to the ideals of parliamentary democracy. There is a great deal about your country, your people and your policies which. are admired by the people of India. Our association has been marked by cooperation, not only in the councils of the Commonwealth, but in the United Nations and in other international bodies and organizations. Canada and India have shared with other peace-loving nations the responsibility in many an area to safeguard peace. We have done so in the Congo and in the Middle East. We have been associated together in trying to implement the Geneva agreements on Indo-China and to help in the preservation of peace in a sensitive area of the world. We have thus functioned closely together with each other in the international field. We are deeply appreciative of the generous assistance which you have given to us, with sympathy and understanding. Between our two countries has developed over the years great understanding and goodwill. We greatly value our relations with Canada and I hope that in the coming years these will be further consolidated and strengthened to our mutual advantage.

HEAVY RESPONSIBILITY

Just a year ago there fell on me the heavy responsibility of carrying on the great task and the unfinished work of our beloved leader and noble son of India, the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Twice during his tenure of office he visited Canada at your invitation and I recollect the great affection that he had for Canada and her people.

Canada is a highly developed country and we as friends are happy that the people of Canada have attained such a high standard of living. Our Journey in India in that direction has just commenced. Our problems are of stupendous magnitude. Not only do we face the problem of eradicating poverty, ignorance and disease, but we have to build up a modern nation following the methods of science and technology. We have a great deal of leeway to make up. Neglect of centuries has got to be repaired within a few decades. Our people, like people of developing countries everywhere are, today, legitimately anxious to secure improvement in their living standards. They might even get impatient tomorrow. We, have, therefore, to progress and develop in a hurry. Our economic development is and ought to be very largely a product of our own endeavours. Our third Five Year Plan for economic development will soon be completed and during the period of this Plan, and the preceding two, we have succeeded in laying the first foundation of a modem industrial economy. We are determined to go ahead at an accelerated pace and the people of India are cooperating with the Government in this massive endeavour.

SYMPATHY AND COOPERATION

The Government of Canada have taken a keen interest in the success of the tremendous task which we have undertaken, of building up a new India in which social and economic justice will prevail and higher standards of living will be attained by India's millions. I should like to express here the thanks of our Government and our nation for the splendid way in which Canada has extended its sympathy and assistance to us. Over the last fifteen years. Canadian grants and loans have totalled some 400 million dollars. We wish to thank you and your country, Mr. Prime Minister, for this assistance. We seem to be living. Mr. Prime Minister in a period of world history

113

when great changes are taking place. There is much in the world today which is encouraging and which gives promise of peace and plenty. On the other hand, there is much that gives rise to fear of extreme violence and disruption. While the last decade has seen remarkable developments in the sphere of international cooperation, it is also true that the world today lives under a shadow of fear of a terrible nuclear holocaust. There is the serious danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons. More powers want to acquire nuclear weapons. We on our part have taken a decision not to be diverted from our peaceful objectives and to use our considerable nuclear technical know-how and skill for peaceful purpose only.

PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

In this great new world of science and technology that has developed, a world in which destructive power of nations surpasses anything that existed ever before, the prime needs of the hour are peace and disarmament. We wholeheartedly subscribe to the ideal of general and complete disarmament and, within the limitations and difficulties inherent in the problem of disarmament, we are making our contribution at the disarmament Committee in Geneva. I am confident that our two countries will work together closely in the field of disarmament.

Your Excellencies, I want you to know how anxious India is that world peace must be preserved and safeguarded. We cannot afford to have our attention distracted from the task of national reconstruction and we want very earnestly to avoid strife and tension. But in the world that we live in, it will be a mistake to take peace for granted. Forces keep emerging, at one place now and at another later, which tend to disrupt stability and orderliness. These forces do not seem to recognise that the only alternative to peaceful co-existence is war and destruction. Each nation must be free to develop its economy and polity, according to its own genius without any interference from outside and without any attempts at subversion. Indeed, all those who stand for peace and who respect sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations must meet the challenges that are thrown up from time to time. We are fully aware that Canada is foremost amongst the countries that are passionately devoted to peace. You are willing to look at events and developments with great objectivity. I have no doubt that both India and Canada can cooperate even more fully in the years to come in the positive task of preservation of world peace. I know, Mr. Prime Minister, how ardently devoted you are to the cause of peace and how fervently you believe in the ideals of the United Nations. Towards the attainment of these noble objectives, I extend to you and to your countrymen the wholehearted support of India and the Indian people. Let us pledge our friendship and our unity to the forces of international harmony and goodwill.

I now want to thank you, Mr. Prime Minister, for the very kind words you have said about India and for your warm hospitability. The memories of this visit are those we shall cherish for a long time to come.

May I now request Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen to drink with me a toast to the health and happiness of Her Majesty the Queen and to the progress, prosperity and welfare of the people of Canada.

CANADA INDIA USA CONGO SWITZERLAND CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CANADA

Prime Minister's Speech St McGill University

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following speech at a special convocation held by the McGil University, Montreal, on June 14, 1965 where the Prime Minister was conferred an honorary Degree of Doctorate :

Mr. Rector and friends,

When I was invited by you to receive an Honorary Degree from the University of McGill I was somewhat sceptical about my eligibility for this great honour. However, I have accepted it in all humility and indeed I feel so grateful for your very generous gesture. I realise McGill is one of Canada's oldest and most distinguished universities and one which has developed close ties with India. Our esteemed President Dr. Radhakrishnan had delivered the Convocation Address at this university some years ago and in 1955 he had delivered the renowned Beauty Memorial Lectures. McGill university has in recent years devoted considerable scholarship to the study of India. I have learnt with pleasure that a centre for developing am studies has been set up which engaged in teaching and research on India's, economy, political system and society. It is interesting to know also of the Institute for Islamic Studies in the McGill University. As you know India has the third largest Muslim population in the world numbering some 50 millions. The interest of the Canadian scholars in

114

India is gratifying and I am very pleased to learn that it is proposed to set up the Institute of Indian Studies at the McGill University which will enable the Canadian scholars and students to carry out research in India.

Canada has provided training for over 700 students and technicians from India under the Colombo Plan as well as about 150 students under the Commonwealth Scholarship Plan. With the projected Institute of Indian Studies at McGill, India will be in a position to welcome the Canadian scholars and students and make available to the Canadian centres of learning research material from India.

Because of its association with India I had heard about the McGill University long time ago. I come not as visitor but as a pilgrim to this seat of learning and I see in McGill a flourishing institution of academic study and a university whose maturity reflects the maturity of your country.

WAR AND PEACE

The biggest problem facing humanity today is haw to avert violent conflicts and conflagarations. Even after the conclusion of the last devastating war, world has never been completely at peace. There has ben turmoil and violence continuously in one part of the world or the other during the last twenty years. There are warlike words and pronouncements heard so often in many parts of the world. And so nations and peoples live in uneasy twilight between war and peace. Great many conflicts in the world have amen because of attempts by some powers to alter historical boundaries by force. It seems important that the existing borders and frontiers of different countries should be accepted and they should not be disturbed through violence. If there is a dispute or a difference, the matter should be settled peacefully even if it means waiting and delays for some time. To commit aggression for the rectification of border disputes is dangerous and will inevitably lead to bigger conflicts. It would be advisable therefore for international bodies to give serious thought to this matter and to resolve on the abjuring of violence for the solution of frontier or border disputes.

There is so much suspicion and distrust between countries and countries. Distrust begets distrust and the result is doubts and misgivings. Ibis is the main reason for differences which exist between great power blocs. If for a moment, bigger countries could get over their complexes and try to understand each other better, things could definitely improve. Conflicts might arise in case of smaller countries also. But if cold war atmosphere has to be averted it is essential that bigger countries should start thinking and acting in a somewhat different way. Why should it be taken for granted that they will always live at loggerheads with each other? The general fear amongst the bigger countries is because none is sure of its position on account of the threat of attack from one against the other. The fact of the matter is that none of the bigger countries really want to attack each other. But fear is there and it persist. The United Nations might as well consider if there could be any truce between the big powers which are in conflict with each other. There should be a period of calculated and deliberate truce entered into between big powers. This period should be fully utilised in searching for avenues to further strengthen peace through disarmament. Efforts should also be made for greater cultural and economic contacts between countries during this period.

VIETNAM

It is a matter of great regret that the situation in Vietnam has deteriorated of late and the end of hostilities is not yet in sight. We would like to see the people of Vietnam enjoy their freedom and independence without any interference from outside from any quarter whatsoever. They must be left free to work out solutions to their own problems. It is a matter of satisfaction that both our countries, Canada and India, are agreed that all hostilities in Vietnam should cease so that negotiations may take place. It is ray firm belief that Canada, India and other like-minded countries who are wedded to peace must persist in their efforts to prevent the situation from deteriorating further.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

We seem to have entered a new phase in which there is a great danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons. A new element of anxiety has thus appeared on the international horizon. Despite the overwhelming world public opinion against nuclear weapons and nuclear weapon testing, new nations are acquiring or aspiring to acquire nuclear weapons. Today at least halt a dozen nations, in addition to those who are already nuclear powers or have exploded nuclear weapons, have the capacity to produce nuclear weapons within a short time. With each new nation becoming a nuclear power, the sense of fear among others increases and alongside it comes the desire to produce nuclear weapons for ensuring their own security. It is becoming fashionable in some quarters to possess nuclear weapons both as the symbol of power and as a assurance of security, although both these aspects are highly exaggerated, and with every new nation that acquires nuclear weapons, the danger of world war increases.

We are among the countries which have a capacity to produce nuclear weapons. We have enough know-how and scientific skill to do so. We have, however, decided despite the dangers to which we are elposed, as a matter of deliberate policy, not to produce nuclear weapons and to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only.

115

DISARMAMENT

In this context disarmament has acquired even greater urgency than before. Disarmament is a problem of problems and on the solution of it depends the future of humanity. Although all members of the United Nations have pledged themselves to achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament, progress in this direction so far has been on the whole disappointing. It is true that nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, on the ground and under water have stopped-except by one nation, the People's Republic of China.

It is necessary that the question of disarmament should be taken up in the United Nations, in the

Disarmament Committee and in all international forums which are concerned with this matter with utmost possible speed. No time should be lost. We have to move towards a world without war for which humanity yearns. There is fortunately much in the world today which gives cause for hope and encouragement. The last few decade, have seen great achievements in the field of human rights and the emergence into freedom of peoples and nations from colonial rule. A major part of Asia and Africa was at one time under the rule of the foreign powers. Today the people of Asia and Africa are free, independent and sovereign and masters of their own destiny. Emergency of these new nations has given a new dimension to international relations. The United Nations is richer for their present. New forces have been generated working towards the realization of ideal of social and economic progress not for privileged few but for all humanity.

We in India are engaged in the tremendous task of building a better world for our 470 million people. We know by experience that the task is not an easy one; and the same difficulties that we are experiencing are felt by most developing nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which today form a large majority of the world's population. The two-thirds of the world's population belong to the category of developing or underdeveloped nations. There is a ferment among them. They want to catch up with the more advanced nations. They are in a hurry and they are impatient. International cooperation in the economic field needs to be reinforced and strengthened so that the aspirations of the people in these countries are fulfilled.

Mr. Rector, Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you again for inviting me today and for the great honour you have conferred on me. I have enjoyed being in this beautiful and historic city of Montreal, a city which in many ways represents the blend of two great cultures. Your city already famed throughout the world which I am sure will gather even greater renown because of the International Exhibition which will be held in 1967 to celebrate the centenary of the Canadian Federation. I am glad that Indian will be participating in that exhibition.

I conclude, Mr. Rector, by conveying to you and to all those associated with this university my

very best wishes for your continued success and achievement. My visit to McGill has given me an opportunity to see one of Canada's foremost seats of learning and to share with the distinguished gathering assembled in this hall, my thoughts about problems in India and problems of world peace. There is no ready solution to the question of world peace. And yet though paths may differ, the goal is one. Each of us in his own way has to take up the quest and face the challenge which this age poses-the challenge of peace and peaceful coexistence on which depends the future progress and indeed the very existence of mankind.

CANADA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SRI LANKA VIETNAM CHINA

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CANADA

Joint Communique

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued on June 14, 1965 at the end of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's visit to Canada:

The Prime Minister of India, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri paid an official visit to Canada, June 10-14, at the invitation of the Candian Government. During his stay in Canada the Prime Minister visited Ottawa and Niagara Falls and spent June 14 in Montreal. While in Ottawa, the Prime Minister of India visited the House of Commons and officially opened the Commonwealth Room in Parliament building. He laid a wreath at the War Memorial.

In Montreal, the Prime Minister of India addressed a special convocation at the McGill University at which an honorary degree was conferred upon him. He also called on the Mayor of Montreal at the City Hall. The Prime Minister of India had discussions with Prime Minister Pearson and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Hon'ble Paul Martin, with the Minister of Finance, Hon'ble Walter Gordon, with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Hon'ble Mitchell Sharpe, and with the Minister of Industry and Defence Production, the Hon'ble Charles M. Drury. The High Commissioner for Canada to India, Hon'ble Roland Michener, and Canadian officials attended the discussions. The Prime Minister of India was assisted by the Indian High Commissioner of Canada, Mr. B. K. Acharya, Mr. L. K. Jha, Secretary to the Prime Minister, and Mr. R. Prasad, Joint Secretary to the Prime Minister.

116

FRIENDLY TIES

In the course of their talks, the two Prime Ministers dealt with the wide range of relationships between India and Canada, with the questions expected to arise at the forthcoming meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government, and with, the main international problems of the day. The talks disclosed understanding and respect for each other's point of view and a wide area of agreement on many world issues.

The two Prime Ministers expressed satisfaction with the friendship and cooperation which have at all times marked the relations between India and Canada. They looked forward with confidence to the continuation of this warm relationship in future.

Cooperation between the two countries extends to many fields, particularly the economic field. The Prime Minister of India expressed appreciation for the assistance extended by Canada to India under the Colombo Plan and for the cooperation between the two countries in promoting the economic development in India. The Prime Minister of Canada reiterated Canada's deep and continuing interest in the economic development of India and in the success of India's Five Year Plans.

Both Prime Ministers agreed on the urgent need to raise the standard of living of the peoples of developing countries. They recognised the responsibility of both the developed and developing countries to cooperate in this task and welcomed the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development as an organisation which could make a vital contribution towards the elimination of disparities in economic conditions through more rapid economic growth.

SUPPORT FOR U.N.

The two Prime Ministers re-affirmed their support for the United Nations and their desire to see the world organisation develop into an effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security and for promotion of understanding and cooperation among nations. The Prime Ministers noted that the present year marked the Twentieth Anniversary of the United Nations and was being celebrated as the International Cooperation Year. They hoped that it would usher in an era of increased United Nations activity and better international cooperation in the cause of world peace and prosperity.

They noted with concern and regret the difficulties that stood in the way of the functioning of the Nineteenth Session of the General Assembly. They expressed their sincere hope that these difficulties would be overcome as a result of the discussions now going on in the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and that the world body would emerge stronger after the crisis.

It was also noted that both Government shared the desire to strengthen practical arrangements for United Nations peace-keeping. Both have been major participants in the United Nations peace-keeping operations and continue to provide contingents or their armed forces for service in the United Nations Emergency Force in Gaza, as they had done throughout we united Nations peace-keeping operations in the Congo. An Indian Delegation participated in the discussions between military experts on the technical military aspects of the United Nations peace-keeping which took place in Ottawa, last November, The Prime Ministers agreed that, whatever the constitutional and other difficulties which stood in the way of collective responsibility for United Nations peace-keeping, it was imperative that a solution be found which would enable the United Nations to continue to fulfil this essential role in future.

DISARMAMENT

The two Prime Ministers re-affirmed their support for the attainment of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They discussed the great danger of prohileration of nuclear weapons and agreed that the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee should devote itself, as a matter of priority, to finding a solution to this problem. They called upon all States to abide by the spirit and provisions of Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. They emphasized the importance of taking early steps for the conclusions of a comprehensive test ban treaty so as to cover underground tests as well.

The Prime Ministers expressed their deep regret and concern over the series of nuclear tests to which the People's Republic of China has devoted itself in defiance of a world opinion which strongly opposes continuance of tests in any environment. These tests represent a setback to current efforts to achieve non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Prime Minister of Canada expressed particular satisfaction at India's decision not to use nuclear energy for other than peaceful purposes, despite India's technical capability to produce nuclear weapons.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSIONS

They further expressed their satisfaction at their mutual association in the International Control Commissions in Indo-China during the last 11 years. They recogaised the difficulties in the functioning of the Commissions in the present circumstances.

While recognising that it had not always been possible for Canadian and Indian views to coincide on every aspect of consideration of the difficult problems arising before the Commissions, both Prime Ministers agreed that their mutual association in the Commissions had been useful and

117

reaffirmed their desire that their representatives in the Commissions should make every effort with a view to encouraging implementation of the Agreements, which it is the task of the Commissions to supervise.

SITUATION IN VIETNAM

The Prime Ministers examined the situation in Vietnam and considered the measures open to them to try to bring to that country. They reviewed their efforts to try to interest the powers directly involved in a cease-fire; in unconditional negotiations and in greater international participation in and responsibility for bringing about and guaranteeing a cease-fire and any agreement which might accompany or succeed it. They expressed their regret that lack of respect for the cease-fire agreement, as reported by the Commission in 1962, had led to the present higher level of hostilities. They were convinced that a purely military solution was neither practicable, nor desirable.

They hoped that it might still be possible for the combatants to curtail hostilities or to initiate periods of cease-fire which might become permanent; they also expressed the hope that earlier proposals for negotiations without preconditions would still yield results. They agreed to work for a solution to the Vietnam problems which will enable the people of Vietnam to enjoy freedom and independence. Any settlement should be suitably guaranteed by the international community.

SYMPATHY AND SUPPORT FOR INDIA

Both Prime Ministers expressed concern at the increasing tendency to use force for settlement of disputes and the Prime Minister of Canada reiterated Canada's sympathy and support for India in her border conflict with China. He expressed the hope that the problem will be resolved peacefully and that China would agree to talks with India on the basis of the proposals of the six non-aligned countries formulate in Colombo in December 1962 which India had accepted.

The Prime Minister of India expressed his pleasure at visiting Canada and establishing contacts with Canadian leaders and people. He expressed deep appreciation of the warm hospitality extended to him and the members of his party. He extended an invitation to the Prime Minister of Canada to visit India. The invitation was accepted with pleasure.

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Final Communique

The following is the text of the communique issued in London on June 25, 1965 at the end of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting :

At the meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, which ended today (June 25), Pakistan, Ghana, Tanzania and Zambia were represented by their Presidents. Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, Malaysia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Malawi, Malta and the Gambia were represented by their Prime Ministers. Jamaica was represented by the acting Prime Minister, Ceylon by the Minister of Justice, Cyprus and Kenya by the Ministers of External Affairs.

This was the first meeting at which Malta, Zambia and the Gambia were represented as members of the Commonwealth: and the other Commonwealth Heads of Government were pleased to welcome them. The Prime Minister of the Gambia informed the meeting that it was his country's desire to continue her membership of the Commonwealth after introducing a republican form of constitution and to accept the Queen as the symbol of the free association of the independent member nations and as such, the Head of the Commonwealth. The Heads of delegations of the other member countries of the Commonwealth assured the Prime Minister of the Gambia that they would be happy to recognise the Gambia's continued membership of the Commonwealth.

The Prime Ministers took note that their meeting was being held during the International Cooperation Year, which itself stemmed from a proposal by the former Prime Minister of India, the late Mr. Nehru. They recorded their sympathy with its objectives and their desire to assist in its success.

The 20th anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations fell on the last day of the meeting.

118

The prime Ministers sent a message of greetings and of good wishes to the organisation to mark this occasion.

COMMONWEALTH A MULTIRACIAL ASSOCIATION

The Prime Ministers recognised that the Commonwealth, as a multiracial association, is opposed to discrimination on grounds of race or colour; and they took the opportunity of their meeting to re-affirm the declaration in their communique of 1964 that, "for all Commonwealth Governments, it should be an 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."

U.N. AND WORLD PEACE

In the course of a comprehensive review of the major current international issues, the prime Ministers noted with concern that, despite the efforts of many countries to promote peace and stability throughout the world, dangerous conflict, or the threat of conflict, persists in several areas They expressed their conviction that in these circumstances all possible steps should be taken to reinforce the authority of the United Nations Organisation; and they discussed in this context the question of China's representation in the Organisation. They also re-affirmed their belief in the importance of the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations; and they renewed their support for the efforts now being made by a committee of the United Nations to establish just and equitable principles for authorising, organising and financing peace-keeping operations. They

considered it essential that the General Assembly, when it reconvened, should be able to function normally. They welcomed the voluntary and unconditional contributions which had been made to the United Nations in order to help towards relieving it of its financial difficulties; and they expressed the hope that, as a result of these and other actions, the United Nation,; would be able to discharge its functions. The Prima Ministers pledged their loyalty to the United Nations, the success of which they considered to be essential to the maintenance of world peace.

The Prime Ministers expressed serious concern over the grave situation in Viet-Nam and the danger of its developing into a major international conflict. They reviewed the various efforts which had been made to achieve a peaceful solution to the problem: and, bearing in mind that the Commonwealth, by virtue of its wide membership, represented a very broad spectrum of opinion in the world and that their meeting was taking place at a time when the peril to world peace was rapidly increasing, they considered, on the first day of the meeting, a proposal for a new attempt to move forward to a peaceful solution. To this end a Mission was established to make contact with the Parties Principally concerned with the problem of Vietnam.

The Mission is composed of the Prime Minister of Britain, the President of Ghana and the Prime Ministers of Nigeria and of Trinidad and Tobago. The Prime Minister of Britain, as chairman of the meeting was appointed chairman of the Mission. Its object is to explore with the parties principally concerned how far there may be common ground about the circumstances in which a conference might be held leading to just and lasting peace in Vietnam and, having ascertained such common ground, to seek an agreement on a time, place and composition of a conference The Mission will report progress from time to time to the Prime Ministers by whom they were appointed. The meeting approved a statement of guidance to the Mission, a copy of which is attached to this communique, together with copies of two statements issued by the mission.

MALAYSIA

The Prime Ministers reveiwed other developments in South-East Asia. They noted, with concern, that tension still persisted between Malaysia and Indonesia, thus disturbing the peace and security of the area, despite the interval since they had last collectively considered the matter and had stated in the communique issued at the end of their meeting in 1964 that "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 recognised and supported the right of the Government and people of Malaysia to defend their sovereign independence and territorial integrity, and expressed their sympathy to the Prime Minister of Malaysia in his country's efforts to this end. They looked forward to the establishment of peaceful, friendly and mutually advantageous relations between Malaysia and Indonesia on a just and honourable basis.

CYPRUS

The Prime Ministers expressed concern about the situation regarding Cyprus. They reaffirmed their full support for the U.N. Security Council resolutions on the subject. The Prime Ministers asserted that the Cyprus problem should be solved within the framework of the UN and its

119

Charter and in accordance with the principles of democracy and justice and in conformity with the wishes of the people of Cyprus.

They appealed to all countries concerned to act in accordance with the Security Council resolution of March 4, 1964, and 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. They also expressed their appreciation of the work and presistent efforts of the United Nations mediator.

AFRICA

The meeting took note of the widely expressed regret at the failure of the Portuguese Government to give due recognition to the legitimate political aspirations of the peoples of the Portuguese territories in Africa. The meeting expressed support for the application of the principle of self-determination to the inhabitants of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea. The Prime Ministers reaffirmed their condemnation of the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of the Republic of South Africa and unanimously called upon South Africa to bring the practice to an end.

CARIBBEAN

In discussion of Caribbean problems the Prime Ministers took note of the situation in the Dominican Republic. They expressed the hope that peace would be restored there and a final settlement reached within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations on the basis of selfdetermination and in accordance with the wishes of the people of the Republic.

DISARMAMENT

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed the aim which they had expressed in their statement on disarmament on March 17, 1961, namely, to achieve total and worldwide disarmament, subject to effective inspection and control. They commended the thorough and useful work which had been done in furtherance of that aim by the 18nation disarmament conference since it first met in March 1962, both on general and complete disarmament and on preliminary measures to build international confidence. They recognised that the non-aligned members of the conference by playing a constructive and intermediary role. had contributed to the progress already achieved and had increased world understanding of the importance of disarmament.

The Prime Ministers believed that there was an urgent need for further progress in the disarmament field, both in the interests of world peace and in order to enable the nations of the world to devote their resources to more fruitful purposes. They considered that the problems involved in the elaboration of an agreement for general and complete disarmament should be reexamined, in the light of their statement on disarmament of March 1961, by the 18-nation disarmament committee at Geneva. They considered that, in order to create the optimum conditions for the success of their efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament, the 18-nation disarmament committee should resume its detailed negotiations at Geneva with a view to reaching agreement on the next steps to disarmament which could be submitted to an eventual world disarmament conference which should be open to participation by all States.

They welcomed the various proposals which had been put forward for measures to reduce tension and build up international confidence. They hoped that early progress would be made towards an acceptable agreement on some of these measures, including the limitation and reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles and a phased reduction in conventional armaments, as steps towards a world agreement for general and complete disarmament. They emphasised the urgency of arms control, and recognised that in appropriate areas agreement on nuclear-free zones could assist such control. In this connection, the hope was expressed that, in the preparation of the appropriate treaties. the declarations by the Organisation of African Unity and certain Latin American States regarding the establishment of nuclear-free zones in their own geographical areas would be respected.

The Prime Ministers emphasised that ways and means should be found for associating the People's Republic of China with future discussions on disarmament. Indeed, they felt that the importance of a solution of the disarmament problem had been underlined by the fact that, since their last meeting, the Government of the People's Republic of China had exploded two nuclear devices and had clearly demonstrated their intention to develop nuclear weapons.

The Prime Ministers wished to record their firm conviction that the continuing spread of nuclear weapons had created a serious danger to mankind. They believed that the development of new national nuclear weapon capabilities might jeopardise further efforts to bring about general and complete disarmament. Moreover, the prospects for achieving a fair settlement of disputes, would suffer as international tension increased and there would be a growing risk that nuclear proliferation might cause a local conflict to escalate to a nuclear exchange into which the major nuclear Powers might be drawn. Accordingly, the Prime Ministers, fully aware of the gravity of the situation and of their responsibility to each other and to other members of the international community, expressed their determination to give urgent and whole-hearted support to measures to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. To this end, they reaffirmed their willingness to join with other countries in signing as soon as possible any appropriate international agreement which would halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

They expressed the hope that efforts to extend the treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water should be extended to cover underground tests as well. They called on all nations to abstain from actions which might make agreement on general and complete disarmament or preliminary measures more difficult.

DEPENDENT TERRITORIES

Britain made the following statement to the meeting about the progress of British colonial dependencies towards independence. The independent members of the Commonwealth now amounted to no less than 21, including a population of more than 750,000,000; Britain had 31 remaining dependencies with only 10,000,000 inhabitants, of whom over half were in Hong Kong and the South Arabian Federation. Nineteen of these dependencies contained less than 100,000 people and six less than 10,000. It was hoped that many of these remaining dependencies, would reach independence in the next three years, including Basutoland, Bechuanaland, British Guiana, Swaziland and the South Arabian Federation; and also some or all of the territories in the East Caribbean, either in a federation or separately.

The Prime Ministers of the other Commonwealth countries noted with approval the further progress of British territories to independent membership of the Commonwealth since their last meeting. They welcomed the assurance of the Prime Minister of Britain that it remained the objective of his Government to lead to independence, on the basis of democratic government and the principle of universal adult suffrage, such of the remaining territories as desired it and could sustain it, and that the British Government would continue to seek to devise the most appropriate alternative arrangements for such smaller territories as were unable, or unwilling, to proceed to full independence.

In relation to Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. the view was expressed that such economic assistance and guarantees of territorial integrity as were necessary to maintain the territories as independent States should be given.

As regards British Guiana, while differing views are held on the constitutional best suited for the country, the Prime Ministers welcomed the British Government's 'intention to hold a conference later this year, one of the tasks of which would be to devise a constitution and to fix a date for independence. The Prime Ministers noted the British Government's recognition of the need for adequate machinery to ensure human rights and due judicial processes.

As regards the countries of the Eastern Caribbean, the meeting expressed the hope that the assistance urgently required to strengthen their economies and ensure their viability so as to enable them to sustain the obligations of independence would not be delayed by the discussions on political arrangements.

RHODESIA

The Commonwealth Secretary informed the meeting of the attempts which the British Government had made in recent months to resolve the problem of the further constitutional developwent of Rhodesia. He explained the consideration by which they were and would continue to be guided in their approach to the question of Rhodesia's independence and emphasized that central to these was the necessity to provide guarantees that future constitutional development should conform to the principle of unimpeded progress to majority rule, together with an immediate improvement in the political status of the African population and the progressive elimination of racial discrimination. As they had repeatedly made clear, the British Government would only recommend to Parliament the grant of independence to Rhodesia if they were satisfied that this was on a basis acceptable to

the people of the country taken as a whole. He emphasised the dangers of the use of force or unconstitutional methods by any party; and he reaffirmed in this connection the policies of the British Government as indicated in their statement of October 27, 1964, and April 29, 1965.

The Heads of Government of the Commonwealth took note of the Commonwealth Secretary's statement. They reaffirmed their previous statement that they were irrevocably opposed to. any unilaterly declaration of independence by the Government of Rhodesia, and further reaffirmed their insistence on the principle of majority rule.

While the Prime Ministers reaffirmed that the authority and responsibility for leading her remaining colonies, including Rhodesia, to independence must continue to rest with Britain, they also reaffirmed that the question of membership of the Commonwealth by an independent Rhodesia or by any other newly independent territory would be a matter for collective Commonwealth decision.

121

The British Prime Minister was urged by other Prime Ministers to convene a constitutional conference at an early date, say within three months, which all the political leaders in Rhodesia should be free to attend. They reaffirmed that the object of such a conference should be to seek agreement on the steps by which Rhodesia might proceed to independence within the Commonwealth at the earliest practicable date on a basis of majority rule. In this connection they welcomed the statement of the British Government that the principle of "one man one vote" was regarded as the very basis of democracy and this should be applied to Rhodesia.

An appeal was made for the immediate release of all the detained or restricted African leaders as a first step to diminishing tensions and preparing the way for a constitutional conference. A further appeal was made that the death sentences passed on persons now awaiting execution for offences under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act should be respited.

It was further urged that, should the Rhodesian Government refuse to attend such a conference and to release the detainees, the British Government should introduce legislation to suspend the 1961 constitution and appoint an interim Government, which should repeal oppressive and discriminatory laws and prepare the way for free elections.

The British Government said that they were actively engaged in discussions with the Government of Rhodesia, and they undertook to take full account, in relation to these discussions, of all the views which had been expressed during the meeting. In this process of seeking to reach agreement on Rhodesia's advance to independence, a constitutional conference would, at the appropriate time, be a natural step. If the discussions did not develop satisfactorily in this direction in a reasonably speedy time, the British Government, having regard to the principle enunciated by the Commonwealth Secretary of unimpeded progress towards majority rule, would be ready to consider promoting such a conference in order to ensure Rhodesia's progress to independence on a basis acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole.

The Prime Ministers renewed their call to all leaders and their supporters in Rhodesia to abstain from violence and to co-operate in the work fostering tolerance and justice, as the basis of a society in which all the inhabitants would be assured that their interests would be protected.

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

The Prime Ministers then turned to consider problems of aid and development, They recognised that economic and social development constitute a long-term co-operative enterprise in which all countries can work together. The importance of economic planning in relation to development would call for an increased supply of experts; and concerted measures would therefore be required in order to enlarge and mobiliseresources of this kind by means of adequate facilities for education and training.

The Prime Ministers appreciated the importance of programmes of economic aid to the developing Commonwealth countries. They took note of the contributions made to such programmes by Commonwealth countries both collectively and individually: and they agreed that these programmes should be maintained and expanded as far as possible. They endorsed the concept of co-operative forward planning of development aid which would apply not only to matching the assistance provided by the developed countries with the needs of the developing countries but also to the supply of personnel for schemes of technical assistance, to which they agreed that high priority should be given. They welcomed the establishment of the British Ministry of Overseas Development together with the decision of the British Government to provide loans free of interest in appropriate cases; they also expressed their appreciation of the similar loans already provided by the Government of Canada and of the fact that the Government of Australia makes its aid available wholly on the basis of grants. It was suggested that in the cases where financial assistance would remain unused, or give rise to serious internal problems, because of the inability of some recipient countries to finance local costs, donor countries should consider making financial contributions to cover a proportion of such costs. The Prime Ministers recognised the importance of the flow of direct investment to developing countries and expressed the hope that, insofar as economic circumstances permit, the minimum restriction would be placed in its way.

The Prime Ministers recorded their satisfaction at the constructive outcome of the third Commonwealth Education Conference in Ottawa last August; they looked forward to an equally successful result for the Commonwealth Medical Conference which is to be held in Edinburgh in October 1965.

The Prime Ministers agreed that effective development is promoted not only by aid but even more by trade. Moreover, they were convinced that an expanding exchange of goods and services, by emphasing the inter-dependence of the countries of the world, was one of the most effective ways of promoting the growth of international understanding and the elimination of the causes of friction.

122

In further discussion of economic development in the Commonwealth, emphasis was laid on the importance to the economies both of Britian and of certain other Commonwealth countries of emigration to Britain from those countries. The Prime Ministers recognised that the extent of immigration into Britain was entirely a matter for the British Government to determine. The hope was expressed that in operating such immigration controls as they might think necessary the British Government would continue to give preferential treatment to Commonwealth citizens; and they welcomed the assurance of the British Prime Minister that there would be no differentiation in any restriction on amount of colour or creed.

The Prime Ministers welcomed the work which had been done since their last meeting in carrying forward the initial impetus on the expansion of trade which was provided by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; and they Pledged themselves afresh to press for more outlets for the trade of developing countries.

They stressed the importance to the development of the economics of member countries of the Commonwealth of the prices obtained for their primary commodities. particularly where the prices of primary produce fell in relation to prices of manufactured goods. The low levels to which the prices of cocoa and some other commodities have fallen are a matter of serious concern to producers. The problem of commodity prices extended beyond the Commonwealth and the Prime Ministers endorsed the need for consideration of the strengthening of the existing international commodity agreements, where appropriate, and stressed the urgent need of negotiating further agreements of this kind.

The Prime Ministers agreed on the desirability of exploring means by which Commonwealth trade might be encouraged and expanded. One possibility would be to enable Commonwealth Governments, in planning their economic development, to take into account each other's, plans. An exchange of information of this kind might enable production to be More effectively matched to requirements in the Commonwealth and thus increase trade between Commonwealth countries.

The Prime Ministers accordingly agreed on the following measures designed to further these objectives, while at the same time reaffirming their support for the negotiations now proceeding at Geneva, which these measures will not affect. They agreed to arrange discussions between officials of Commonwealth Governments in the first instance, with the help of the Commonwealth Secretariat, in order to examine these issues further and to prepare for an early meeting of Commonwealth Trade Ministers, These official discussions could also pay special attention to problems of individual commodities of particular interest to Commonwealth countries, in order to see how far policies could be coordinated within the Commonwealth with a view to appropriate further action, whether on a Commonwealth or international scale.

They also agreed that subsequently the appropriate. Ministers or officials in Commonwealth countries should meet to consider the extent to which each country's production and plan, as foreseen, could meet requirements in other member countries.

The Prime Ministers decided to consider through the medium of the Commonwealth Air Transport Council means of promoting a closer understanding of the basic civil air transport requirements of member countries.

In addition, the Commonwealth Secretariat will examine the possibility of arranging for the results of research to be shared more widely among the Commonwealth countries.

COMMONWEALTH FOUNDATION

At their previous meeting in 1964 the Prime Ministers considered that it might be desirable to establish a Commonwealth Foundation to administer a fund for increasing interchanges between Commonwealth organisations. in professional fields. Officials were instructed to consider this proposal in greater detail. At their present meeting the Prime Ministers approved a report by officials and an agreed memorandum on the establishment and functions of the Foundation which is attached to this communique.

COMMONWEALTH SECRETARIAT

At their 1964 meeting the Prime Ministers saw a Commonwealth Secretariat as being a visible symbol of the spirit of co-operation which animates the Commonwealth and instructed officials to consider the best basis for establishing a Commonwealth Secretariat. At their present meeting the Prime Ministers had before them a report by officials which they approved and an agreed memorandum on the establishment and functions of the Secretariat is attached. As already announced, they have unanimously approved the appointment of Mr. Arnold Smith as the first Secretary-General.

123

UNITED KINGDOM GHANA TANZANIA ZAMBIA CANADA USA INDIA MALAYSIA NEW ZEALAND NIGER NIGERIA SIERRA LEONE TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO UGANDA THE GAMBIA MALAWI MALTA JAMAICA CYPRUS KENYA CHINA VIETNAM INDONESIA ANGOLA GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND SWAZILAND AUSTRALIA RUSSIA

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Commonwealth Mission on Vietnam: Statement of Guidance

1. To enable the Mission to approach its assignment meaningfully, there should be certain broad areas of agreement regarding the requirements for ending the conflict in Viet-Nam peacefully.

2. There is already general agreement on certain basic considerations :

(A) There is an inherent risk of the conflict in Viet-Nam escalating into a wider war.

(B) For this reason there are grave doubts as to an early or final solution by military means.

(C) A comprehensive cease-fire and a conference of all the parties directly involved in the situation seem to provide the essential precondition to the solution of the problem.

(D) Bearing in: mind these considerations and also the purpose of the mission, it should be

guided by the following ultimate objectives during consultations with the parties principally concerned :

(a) A suspension of all United States air attacks on North Viet-Nam.

(b) A North Viet-Namese undertaking to prevent the movement of any military forces or assistance or material to South Viet-Nam.

(c) A total cease-fire on all sides to enable a conference to be convened to seek a peaceful solution.

(d) The objectives of such a conference might be to : (i) End the war in Viet-Nam (ii)
Secure the withdrawal of all foreign military presence from Viet-Nam and the neutralisation of the area; (iii) Establish, for a period, an international peace force, under the auspices of the Geneva agreement, to safeguard peace in Viet-Nam; (iv) Establish principles for the eventual unification of the country through free and internationally supervised elections.

The following statement was issued by the Mission on June 19, 1965 :

"The mission appointed by the Commonwealth prime Ministers' meeting is to explore the circumstances in which a conference might be held to end the fighting in Viet-Nam.

"Meanwhile, in order to create the conditions in which the Mission can carry through its work, the Mission is appealing to all parties concerned to show the utmost restraint in military operations as a step towards the total cease-fire which the Mission hopes will be established at the earliest possible opportunity. The Mission would wish to meet all the parties concerned."

The following statement was issued by the mission on June 24, 1965 :

"Because of certain misunderstandings which have gained currency during the last few days, the Heads of Government of Britain, of Ghana, of Nigeria and of Trinidad and Tobago wish to clarify the basis on which they agreed to form a Mission in connection with the problem of Viet-Nam.

"The Mission was appointed by the London meeting of the Heads of Government of the Commonwealth and on behalf of the Commonwealth as a whole. The Commonwealth as such is in no way committed to either side of the conflict in Viet-Nam and had formed no collective view except on the urgency of re-establishing conditions in which the people of Viet-Nam may be able to live in peace.

"Although within the Commonwealth there is diversity of opinion on the Viet-Nam problem, there is complete unanimity as to the need to find a peaceful solution. In the discharge of the task entrusted to it the Mission will be guided by the views of the Commonwealth as a whole and not by the views of any individual member of the Commonwealth.

"It is in this context that the Commonwealth is satisfied that its Mission must make direct contact with all the Viet-Namese parties. It is reiterated that positive steps should be taken by all outside parties to exercise restraint in military operations while the Mission is carrying out its task."

VIETNAM USA SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GHANA NIGER NIGERIA TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Agreed Memorandum on Commonwealth Foundation

1. A Commonwealth Foundation will be established to administer a fund for increasing interchanges between Commonwealth organisations in professional fields throughout the Commonwealth.

124

It will be the purpose of the Foundation to provide assistance where it is needed in order to foster such interchanges.

2. The Foundation will be an autonomous body, although it will develop and maintain a close liaison with the Commonwealth Secretariat. Like the Secretariat, the Foundation will be accommodated at Marlborough House.

3. Within the broad purpose indicated above, the Foundation will include among its aims the following objects :

(A) To encourage and support fuller representation at conferences of professional bodies-within the Commonwealth.

(B) To assist professional bodies within the Commonwealth to hold more conferences between themselves.

(C) To facilitate the exchange visits among professional people, especially the younger element.

(D) To stimulate and increase the flow of professional information exchanged between the organisations concerned.

(E) On request to assist with the setting up of national institutions or associations in countries where these do not at present exist.

(F) to promote the growth of Commonwealthwide associations or regional Commonwealth associations in order to reduce the present centralisation in Britain.

(G) To consider exceptional requests for help from associations and individuals whose activities lie outside the strictly professional field but fall within the general ambit of the Foundation's operations as outlined above.

4. The Foundation could usefully develop informal contacts with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. To avoid the risk of duplication with the activities of existing organisations concerned with cultural activities and the press, the Foundation should not initially seek to assume any functions in these fields.

5. The policy of the Foundation will be directed by a chairman, who will be a distinguished private citizen of a Commonwealth country, appointed with the approval of all member Governments. and a board of trustees who should be expected to meet at least once a year. The board of trustees will consist of independent persons, each subscribing Government having the right to nominate one member of the board. These nominees, even if officials, will be appointed in a personal capacity. The Commonwealth Secretariat will be represented on the board of trustees by the Secretary-General or an officer appointed by him.

6. There will be a full-time, salaried director who will be appointed, initially for a period of not more than two years, by Commonwealth Heads of Government collectively acting through their representatives in London. He will be responsible to the board of trustees.

7. The director will require a small personal staff. General office services will be provided by the Commonwealth Secretariat.

8. It is hoped that Commonwealth Governments will subscribe to the cost of the Foundation on an agreed scale. Payment of the first annual subscriptions will be made as soon as the director has indicated that a bank account for the Foundation has been opened. It is hoped that, in addition, private sources may be willing to contribute to the funds of the Foundation.

9. The account of the Foundation will be audited annually by the British Comptroller and Auditor-General, whose report will be submitted to the board of trustees., The financial year of the Foundation will be from July I to June 30.

10. The budget of the Foundation will be subject to the approval of the board of trustees.

11. The British Government will draw up the necessary documents to set up the trust and take any further steps needed to constitute the Foundation as a legal charity.

USA UNITED KINGDOM

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's Broadcast on the Twentieth Anniversary Celebrations of U.N.

The following is the text of the President's broadcast on June 26, 1965 on the twentieth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations:

125

Twenty years ago, on June 26, 1945, at San Francisco, the representatives of the nations assembled signed the Charter which affirmed their profound conviction that the anarchy of uncontrolled nationalism which led to two world wars in one generation could be replaced by effective instruments of international control. The Charter, with its provisions for the effective maintenance of international peace and security is a declaration of faith by the nations of the world that war is not inevitable and peace can be maintained.

The fact that the membership of the United Nations Organisation has grown from the original 51 in 1946 to the present 114 is a clear testimony of the faith that the peoples of the world have in the United Nations and its peace-keeping machinery.

The United Nations has done commendable work in promoting better standards of living and narrowing the economic disparities between the advanced and the newly independent developing countries.

It is of no small significance that the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the present decade as the United Nations Development Decade-a period of concentrated effort to raise the economic and social level of two-thirds of humanity still living in poverty and want. The United Nations has played a vital role in resolving conflicts in various parts of the world.

FAILURE OF U.N.

Though the achievements of the United Nations in these twenty years have been impressive, its failures have been considerable. The most notable of them all has been in regard to disarmament. The first atom bomb was detonated by the United States of America on July 16, 1945, near Alamagardo, New Mexico. On August 6, 1945, an atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. The Soviet Union announced its first atomic blast on September 23, 1949. The United States exploded the first hydrogen bomb on November 1; 1952. On August 12, 1953, the Soviet Union touched off its first hydrogen bomb explosion. On May 15, 1957, Britain conducted its first hydrogen bomb test in the Pacific region. On February 13, 1960, France exploded an atomic device in the Sahara desert. On October 16, 1964, the People's Republic of China exploded its first atomic device. They have now had the second explosion also.

We all know that if the nuclear arms race is not arrested and reversed, the prospects of mankind are very grim. Some nuclear power in anger or excitement, by some miscalculation or misunderstanding, may set the world ablaze and the resulting ruin will find no distinction between the victor and the vanquished, between the Capitalist and the Communist, the Arab and the Jew.

DISARMAMENT OF MIND

We have. to protect humanity against war. Peace is not the absence of war. It is the presence of fellow feeling and of respect for man as man regardless of his race or nation, class or creed. It is the disarmament of minds that is called for. The future is not all bleak. An old Arab proverb says, "Do not grieve that row trees have thorns, rather rejoice that thorny bushes bear roses".

The present climate of fear, suspicion, intolerance and misunderstanding has to be changed. On October 10, 1963, a treaty banning nuclear tests, except beneath earth's surface, came into effect: it was signed by the United States of America, by the Soviet Union, by Britain and more than 100 other countries. France and China are not parties to this treaty, though they may be expected to change their minds. Scientific collaboration and co-operation in space research are increasing. We have to strengthen the, United Nations, so that it can insulate dangerous situations of conflict or potential war and bring them within the sphere of peaceful settlement. We can do so only by adhering to the principles and purposes of the Charter.

A few years ago, Jawaharlal Nehru asked us to emphasise the opportunities for understanding and cooperation and not merely those of misunderstanding and conflict. So this year is designated the Year of International Cooperation.

The path of peace is, however, thorny and difficult and the world body has passed through many crises. Even today it is faced with disagreements among member States in regard to the authorisation and financing of peace-keeping operations which are intended to maintain and restore international peace and security.

SUPPORT TO U.N. OBJECTIVES

India has consistently supported the noble aims and objectives of the United Nations and has subscribed to the view that it is the only body which can bring about a world without war, a world based on the cooperation of nations and peoples. As a member of the United Nations, India has assumed its full measure of responsibility in all the activity of the World Organisation. Our Government is more convinced. today, than ever before, that this organisation is the only means for the achievement of a stable and peaceful world and on this day, which marks the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, let us dedicate ourselves to the continuing and unflinching support of the United Nations.

126

INDIA USA MEXICO JAPAN FRANCE CHINA PERU **Date :** Jun 01, 1965

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swarn Singh's Broadcast on the International Cooperation Year

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following broadcast in New Delhi on June 24, 1965 on the significance of the International Cooperation Year :

One of the main purposes of the United Nations, as enshrined in its Charter, is the achievement of "international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian charter, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race. sex, language, or religion".

While the existence of disagreements and differences among nations must be recognised it must also be recognised that there is a great deal of Cooperation between nations and the area of cooperation is continually expanding. This process is assisted by the U.N. and its specialised agencies, and other organisations working for peace and international cooperation and understanding. Obsessive preoccupation with conflicts and divisions in the world, to the neglect of the very real and widespread cooperation that already exists, creates a stiffing atmosphere of fear and tension in which, where fear rules reason, the problems of the world are magnified and become more difficult of solution.

THE NEHRU IDEAL

Our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, had, in a memorable address to the 16th Session of the UN General Assembly in 1961, appealed for emphasizing the aspects of cooperation rather than of the conflict between nations and peoples, on which rested the peace and progress of the world. He 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. 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. Perhaps it would be a truer picture if the cooperating elements in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on cooperation and not on conflict."

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's suggestion that the Assembly might consider devoting a year to international cooperation aroused enthusiastic response anti culminated in a resolution, cosponsored by India and unanimously adopted by the General Assembly, designating 1965, the 20th year of the United Nations, as the International Cooperation Year. A U.N. Committee for the ICY was constituted, including India, to draw up and coordinate worldwide plans for the observance of the International Cooperation Year.

An Indian National Committee for the ICY was formed some time ago to formulate and implement projects for suitable observance in India of the International Cooperation Year.

INTERDEPENDENCE

The concept of international co-operation which, in essence, means the realization of the universal brotherhood of man, of a sense of common purpose and destiny, irrespective of differences of race, creed and status is no longer the dream of the prophet or the visionary, but a matter of practical necessity. The peoples of the world are interdependent. What happens in one part of the world affects, people everywhere else. A little war in a remote corner of the world may escalate into a wider war, engulfing the whole world. A strike in one port may tic up shipping in many more. Improved seed may be a hybrid from different varieties from different countries. The fertilizer for enriching the soil may have been made from Jordanian rock phosphate in a German plant. Irrigation water may

have come from a dam erected by utilising skill and material from many countries and so on. Interdependence is now so much a part of our life that we cease to be conscious of it as though it belonged to the natural order of things.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

At the same time, the world, despite the experience of two great wars, hovers on the brink of another, more deadly than all the previous wars in history. The awesome development of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons of mass destruction poses a new kind of threat-a threat to the very survival of mankind.

The discords that exist cannot be washed out of existence by pious declarations or brave words. The path of peace is long, difficult and tortuous and can be covered only by sure and steady steps. Peace is the imperative need of our time and can ultimately be secured only by general and complete disarmament. The funds released thereby can be used for productive purposes.

The Practice of racial intolerance and colonial exploitation must be given up and poverty, disease and ignorance eradicated from large parts of the world. Political freedom is meaningless without economic independence.

127

CHALLANGE TO MANKIND

The problems before us are of a colossal and unprecedented magnitude, but so are the means created by achievements of scientific research to solve it. It is a challenge that has to be met by the combined efforts of all nations and peoples.

Peace, like prosperity, is indivisible. To the degree that life is made tolerable for the mass of humanity, the peace and security of the world will be assured. All this can only be achieved by co-operation on the widest scale, regardless of differences of race, creed or ideology.

Thus, the purposes of the International Cooperation Year will have been achieved if the idea of cooperation, so essential for peace and the orderly progress of mankind, lakes firm root in the minds of people and they begin to think of helping their neighbours, while they help themselves.

INDIA USA JORDAN LATVIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Natwar Singh's Statement on the granting of Independence to Colonial Territories

Shri K. Natwar Singh, Representative of India on the U.N. Committee of Twenty-four, made the following statement on June 14, 1965 at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on the granting of independence to the colonial territories :

Mr. Chairman,

It is my privilege and particular pleasure to convey through the distinguished representative of Ethiopia the respectful thanks of my delegation to His Imperial Majesty, Emperor Haile Selassie and to the Government and people of Ethiopia for inviting use here to this ancient capital and thus making it possible for the Committee of 24 to meet on African soil. I have no doubt that our presence here in this inspiring capital will, we trust, give hope and encouragement to the freedom fighters in Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and all other territories which are still under colonial rule.

Three years ago I first came to this city. These three years have been full and significant years for Africa and the world and the principal city of this great country has been at the centre of African and Afro-Asian activity especially after the establishment of the present headquarters of the Organization of African Unity. The changes that have taken place in this city are truly remarkable. Ethiopia's past and future problem are not dissimilar to our own. Both our nations are presently engaged in nation building programmes and have declared a war on poverty, ignorance and disease. In the international affairs, both our countries have identical approaches to world problems and we share the same ideals of peaceful co-existence, nonalignment, Afro-Asian solidarity and faith in the United Nations. The great friendship that exists so happily between our two ancient lands has its springs in the great and determined stand we have throughout taken for human dignity and freedom. The people of India cherish the memory of the visit of His Imperial Majesty to our country some years ago. As one of the great and historic figures of this century, His Imperial Majesty is held in high esteem everywhere and we in India have profound respect and deep affection for him and the great Ethiopian people. The generous, moral and material support that His Imperial Majesty, the Imperial Ethiopian Government and the friendly people of this country extended to us at a critical moment in our history touched the many millions of my countrymen. Our bonds, strong as they are, are constantly being strengthened and the latest evidence of it was when my' Foreign Minister had the privilege of being received by His Imperial Majesty in Addis Ababa a few days ago. In October, the President of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, will be visiting Ethiopia as guest of His Imperial Majesty, thus further cementing our ties.

We are now in the last week of our deliberations. At Lusaka and Dar-es-Salaam, we have deliberated upon the problems facing the people of Southern Rhodesia and the territories under Portuguese rule. The Committee has adopted two resolutions, one on Southern Rhodesia and the other on territories under Portuguese rule. Critics of the Committee may perhaps say that yet two more resolutions have been added to a long list of existing resolutions on these matters, but my delegation does not share these views. These resolutions have been adopted in the hope that even at this late hour the administering authorities concerned will take urgent steps to ensure a peaceful transfer of power to the indigenous people of Southern Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique and other territories that have not vet attained independence. On several occasions the views of the delegation of India with regard

to Southern Rhodesia have been stated, most recently by the Foreign Minister of India, Sardar Swaran Singh, when he was in Addis Ababa a few days ago. The people of Southern Rhodesia must not be denied their fundamental and inalienable rights. The granting of independence to Southern Rhodesia by the United Kingdom

128

government must follow, not preceed, the granting on full and equal rights to all the inhabitants of the territory irrespective of their colour and creed. Elections should be conducted on the principle of one man one vote so that Southern Rhodesia has a representative and freely elected government, representative of its people. A Constitutional Conference of all concerned should be called by the United Kingdom and all repressive legislation withdrawn. With regard to the Portuguese territories there is no possibility of having a constructive or meaningful discussion with the Salazar government. Portugal has not shown any signs of shifting from its mental and psychological stand in which she has persisted for over 450 years in its total disregard of world public opinion and of the dynamic changes that are taking place in Africa.- The liberation of people from domination and alien subjugation is an irresistible and irrevocable process of history. It is the opinion of my delegation that it would be unwise to resist these processes and place obstacles to arrest this process by giving assistance either moral, military on monetary aid to Portugal. What is happening in the Portuguese territories is a serious and alarming strain on international relations and peace and security on the African Continent. Our sympathies go entirely to the freedom fighters in these territories and we continue to hope that Angola, Mozambique and other territories under Portuguese domination will attain freedom and independence in a not too distant future.

Whilst listening to the petitioners from these territories, both at Lusaka and at Dar-es-Salaam, we were all horrified and greatly distressed to learn of the atrocities that are being committed on the African people by the Portuguese authorities and of the systematic manner in which national activity is being suppressed, and eliminated. Apart from co-sponsoring resolutions we have taken action against Portuguese colonialism.

Mr. Chairman, the problem that concerns us here is that of South West Africa. Some 18 years ago the delegation of India first brought up this matter before the United Nations. South Africa is the only State that has failed to accept the obligations incumbent on it under the trusteeship system set out under the Charter of the United Nations. This Committee is fully entitled to discuss South West Africa. Indeed we have done so several times and not accepted the view that it would be subjudice to do so. By perpetuating and extending the policy of apartheid, the South African Government is condemning the inhabitants of South West Africa to a life of misery and frustration. A country which has apartheid as a state policy, which flouts the universal declaration of human rights and the Charter of the United Nations and its resolutions forfeits the right to be called a civilised government.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation will refer to the question of South West Africa when the Committee takes up a detailed discussion of the territory. Similarly we shall address ourselves to the situation in Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland at the appropriate time. It is the responsibiliy and duty of each one of us here to contribute all that we can towards the rapid implementation of the declaration and the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples contained in resolution 1514. We must ensure that people everywhere live in freedom and dignity, in peace and in harmony. His Imperial Majesty, Emperor Haile Sellasie addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations on Friday, 4th October, 1963 said and I quote :-

"Twenty-seven years ago, as Emperor of Ethiopia, I mounted the rostrum in Geneva to address to the League of Nations an appeal for relief from the destruction which had been unleashed against my defenceless nation by the Fascist invader. I spoke then both to and for the conscience of the world. My words went unheeded, but history testifies to the accuracy of the warning that I gave in 1936.

"Today, I stand before the world organization which has succeeded to the mantle discarded by its discredited predecessor. In this body is enshrined the principle of collective security which I unsuccessfully invoked at Geneva. Here, in this Assembly, reposed the best, perhaps the last, hope for the peaceful survival of mankind.

"In 1936, I declared that it was not the Covenant of the League that was at stake, but international morality. Undertakings, I said then, are of little worth if the will to keep them is licking.

"The Charter of the United Nations expresses the noblest aspirations of man : the abjuration of force in the settlement of disputes between States; the assurance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion the safeguarding of international peace and security. But these, too, as were the phrases of the Covenant, are only words, their value depends wholly on our will to observe and honour them and give them content and meaning.

"The United Nations continues to serve as the forum where nations whose interests clash may lay their cases before world opinion. It still provides the essential escape valve without which the slow buildup of pressures would have long since resulted in catastrophic explosion, Its action and decisions have speeded the achievement of freedom by many peoples on the continents

129

of Africa and Asia. Its efforts have contributed to the advancement of the standard of living of peoples in all corners of the world.

"For this, all men must give thanks. As I stand here today, how faint, how remote, are the memories of 1936. How different in 1936 were the attitudes of men. We then existed in an atmosphere of suffocating pessimism. Today, cautious yet buoyant optimism is the prevailing spirit."

Mr. Chairman, this Committee can do no better than to function in a spirit of cautious yet buoyant optimism, so at all people everywhere live in freedom, peace and harmony.

INDIA ETHIOPIA USA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE ZAMBIA PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA SWAZILAND SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Indo-Pakistan Agreement for Cease-fire in the Rann of Kutch

The Governments of India and Pakistan signed in New Delhi on June 30, 1965, an agreement for cease-fire in the Rann of Kutch in Gujarat State.

Mr. Azim Hussain, Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, and Mr. Arshad Hussain, Pakistan's High Commissioner in India, signed the agreement on behalf of their respective Governments.

The following is the text of the agreement :

Whereas both the Governments of India and Pakistan have agreed to a ceasefire and to the restoration of the status quo as at 1 January 1965, in the area of the Gujarat/West Pakistan border, in the confidence that this will also contribute to a reduction of the present tension along the entire Indo-Pakistan border.

Whereas it is necessary that after the status quo has been established in the aforesaid Gujarat/West Pakistan border area, arrangements should be made for determination and demarcation of the border in that area;

Now, therefore, the two Governments agree that the following action shall be taken in regard to the said area :

Article 1.

There shall be an immediate cease-fire with effect from 0030 hrs GMT 1 July 1965.

Article 2.

On the cease-fire :

(i) All troops on both sides will immediately begin to withdraw;

(ii) This process will me completed within seven days;

(iii) Indian police may then re-occupy the post at Chhad Bet in strength no greater than that employed at the post on 31 December 1964;

(iv) Indian and Pakistan police may patrol on the tracks on which they were patrolling prior to I January 1965, provided that their patrolling will not exceed in intensity that which they were doing prior to 1 January 1965 and during the monsoon period will not exceed in intensity that done during the monsoon period of 1964;

(v) If patrols of Indian and Pakistan police should come into contact they will not interfere with each other, and in particular will act in accordance with West Pakistan/India border ground rules agreed to in January 1960;

(vi) Officials of the two Governments will meet immediately after the cease-fire and from time to time thereafter as may prove desirable in order to consider whether any problems arise in the implementation of the provisions of paragraphs (iii) to (v) above and to agree on the settlement of any such problem.

Article 3.

(i) In view of the fact that

(A) India claims that there is no territorial dispute as there is a well-established boundary running roughly along the northern edge of the Rann of Kutch as shown in the pre-partition maps, which needs to be demarcated on the ground. (B) Pakistan claims that the border between India and Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch runs roughly along the 24th Parallel as is clear from several pre-partition and post-partition documents and therefore the dispute involves some 3,500 square miles of territory.

(C) At discussions in January 1960, it was agreed by Ministers of the two Governments that they would each collect further data, regarding the Kutch-Sind boundary and that further discussions would be held later with a view to arriving at a settlement of this dispute;

As soon as officials have finished the task referred to in Article 2(vi), which in any case will not be later than one month after the ceasefire, Ministers of the two Governments will meet in order to agree on the determination of the border in the light of their respective claims, and the arrangements for its demarcation. At this meeting and at any proceeding before the tribunal referred to in Article 3(ii) and (iv) below, each Government will be free to present and develop their case in full.

(ii) In the event of no agreement between the Ministers of the two Governments on the determination of the border being reached within two months of the cease-fire, the two Governments shall, as contemplated in the joint communique of 24 October, 1959, have recourse to the Tribunal referred to in (iii) below for determination of the border in the light of their respective claims and evidence produced before it and the decision of the Tribunal shall be final and binding on both parties.

(iii) For this purpose there will be constituted, within four months of the cease-fire, a Tribunal consisting of three persons, none of whom would be a national of either India or Pakistan. One member shall be nominated by each Government and the third member, who will be the Chairman shall be jointly selected by the two Governments. In the event of the two Governments failing to agree on the selection of the Chairman within three months of the cease-fire they shall request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to nominate the Chairman.

(iv) The decision of the Tribunal referred to in (iii) above shall be binding on both Govern-

ments, and shall not be questioned on any ground whatsoever. Both Governments undertake to implement the findings of the Tribunal in full as quickly as possible and shall refer to the Tribunal for decision any difficulties which may arise between them in the implementation of these findings. For that purpose the Tribunal shall remain in being until its findings have been implemented in full.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

TUNISIA

Indo-Tunisian Friendship Agreement Signed

An Agreement of Friendship and Technical Economic and Scientific Cooperation between Tunisia and India was signed on June 24, 1965 at Tunis. Mr. Ismail Khellil, Ambassador and Director of International Cooperation, signed on behalf of Tunisia, and Shri S. Than, Director of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Commerce, signed for the Government of India.

The Agreement envisages notably the exchange and loan of expert personnel for training, technical documentation and equipment, cooperation in production, enterprises and the setting up of joint ventures.

During discussions the Tunisian Delegation explained to the Indian side various projects included in their Four-Year Plan for which they desired technical and scientific assistance from India. These projects, which were aimed at the promotion of Industry and Agriculture in Tunisia included notably the Chemical, Mechanical, Textile and Hydraulic Industries and the development of Atomic Energy for the purposes of development. The Indian Delegation showed great interest in these various Tunisian projects and informed the Tunisian Delegation that the Government of India was prepared to examine them and assist by putting at the disposal of Tunisia her experienced technicians and eventually necessary equipment. These schemes under consideration would be subject of individual protocols which would be

131

concluded in the near future under the provisions of the Agreement of Friendship and Cooperation.

Both the Delegations expressed mutual satisfaction at the conclusion of the Agreement which opened up a wide area of cooperation.

This is the first Agreement of its kind concluded between Tunisia and a developing country of Asia and conforms to the spirit of the Joint Declaration of the Seventy-seven Developing Countries adopted at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

TUNISIA INDIA USA **Date :** Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Speech at the University of Sussex

After his five-day official visit to Canada, the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, arrived in London on June 15, 1965 to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. On June 16, the University of Sussex conferred upon the Prime Minister an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws at a special convocation held at the University premises at Brighton.

Speaking on the occasion Prime Minister Lal

Bahadur Shastri said :

I have to thank you all most sincerely for the honour done to me by conferment of the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws in this University. I am particularly happy to receive this distinction from a university which is moving away from convention and tradition and breaking new ground in the field of education. I myself am a graduate of a rebel institution-the Kashi Vidyapeeth, which was founded at the height of our freedom struggle to provide education to students who had come out of their schools and colleges at the call of the national movement. It is only natural, therefore, that I find myself in sympathy with those who seek new ways and are prepared to tread new paths to spread learning amongst all who aspire for it.

Standing in your midst in these academic robes to receive this high honour, I keep wondering how much I really deserve it. But I know that you have primarily wanted to honour the first servant of the Indian people which I have the great Privilege to be. I know also that the people of India would not miss the significance of this gesture by the University of Sussex.

At this Proud moment I cannot help but look back to the hard struggle that fell to my lot before I received my first degree. nose of us who grew up during the tempests of the Gandhian era in our land had a very interrupted student life. We were at school when Mahatma Gandhi's call to leave our classes and join the freedom movement reached us. For those of us who responded it was a chequered student life afterwards, teaching ourselves in our prison cells, getting whatever formal education we could during the lull periods in the struggle. Even the university which I attended was a child of the Gandhian movement, whose fortunes fluctuated with its ups and downs. At the height of the struggle, both students and staff would find themselves in prison. During the quieter periods, we would come out and resume the broken threads of our studies. It was an education in which ideas and action were closely intermingled and we learnt not only from books but from the hard facts of life.

Your university is one of the youngest and most significant in this country and is the pro-

duct of the great ferment of educational ideas in post-war Britain. From what I have been able to see of it. there is a refreshing originality and spirit of innovation in everything about it. It is interesting to see how you have emphasised the unity of all knowledge and how your courses are designed to develop a rich and full personality in all your students to face the challenges of a technological age. We shall watch the results of these innovations with interest.

I am also very much fascinated by the multidisciplinary courses of your schools of studies divided into various cultural regions of the world. In particular. I look forward to the success of the School of African and Asian Studies. Britain has been the traditional home of oriental and African scholarship, but in the past this scholarship flourished in a different context based on Britain's dominion over many nations of Asia and Africa. Now the whole environment has changed. The fact that the School of African Studies in this

132

university has taken up studies in a different context where the relationship is one between free nations, is bound to make tremendous difference to its outlook. This School is bound to promote an increasing understanding between Britain and the new nations of Asia and Africa.

I wonder whether it is under consideration to bring professors from different countries of Asia and Africa to work on the staff of this university for a period of years. Such a step will help to promote even closer understanding at first hand.

I look forward to a continuously closer relationship between the universities of Britain and the universities of my own country. We inherited the university pattern of this country and there are already many links of scholarship between British and Indian universities. It is good to learn that British and Indian universities are already moving to implement the decisions of the Commonwealth Education Conferene at Ottawa last year for intensification of contacts between the universities in the Commonwealth. In India, we have designated a large number of university departments as centres of advanced research in a wide range or disciplines. These are being linked in special relationship with university departments in this country. The British Council and the U.K. Ministry for Overseas Development are rendering valuable help in this field. These links of scholarship would be another great bond for bringing our two peoples together. I should like to see one of your schools in the University of Sussex linked up with a university department in India. This would be a positive outcome of the symbolic link you have established with my country by conferring this privilege on me.

I am happy indeed to have had this opportunity of seeing the smiling southern coast of England and of associating myself with this new and daring university. The honour you have done me today flows from that wide perspective and idealism which is so much a part of your organisation of studies and I shall cherish it in the years to come.

USA CANADA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Speech at Royal India, Pakistan and Ceylon Society

The following is the text of a speech made by the Prime Minister in London on June 16, 1965, at a function of the Royal India, Pakistan and Ceylon Society :

Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful to the East India Association and the Royal India, Pakistan and Ceylon Society for inviting me to this function. I am extremely happy that this gives me an opportunity to meet so many friends of my country who have in one way or another been associated with India and have spent several years of their lives in my country. The existence of organisations such as yours has kept alive the long connections between our two countries. While official and diplomatic relations are important I think (the kind of links provided by organisations such as yours are it anything more valuable as these are not connected with the shifting sands of politics.

As you know just a little ove a year ago we lost the leader who had for 17 years guided our country through the maze of difficulties that face a country on achieving independence. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has left us both ideals that we seek to realise as well as firm foundations which he established and upon which we can work. He has left us the ideal of achieving a social welfare state where poverty will have been banished, where every man shall have equal opportunity regardless oil creed and colour.

The major instrument of achieving this social welfare state in an under-developed country has to be the government. You are all familiar with our five year plans. They provide both for state enterprise and private enterprise. When planning a social welfare state we do not envisage any kind of rigid structure. One major element in this implementation of these plans is made up of foreign exchange for which we depend upon credits and loans from friendly countries. I am happy to state that we receive these from your country, the United States and other members of the Aid-India Consortium as well as the Soviet Union and several East European countries. We are grateful for this aid and hope that it will continue in increasing measure because our needs at the moment are very great. Apart from the aid that we receive from foreign governments we welcome private investment from abroad and we hive taken measures which we hope will encourage some private investment in India.

Our Third Five Year Plan is now about to end and we shall shortly be entering into the period of our Fourth Plan. Looking to the tremendous needs of the country and the urgent necessity for quicker growth and development it has to be a plan much bigger in size than our previous plans. In tact it is expected to be bigger than the last three plans put together. This will need huge resources both internal and external. The country

133

will have to bear a heavy burden but there is no choke because we cannot halt in our onward march. Agriculture and industry are the two most important elements of the plan. Agriculture has assumed added importance because we have to reduce the present heavy dependence on imports and make ourselves self-sufficient in food. Not only that many of our agricultural products command good market abroad and we have to produce the necessary surplus for exports.

The implementation of the Fourth Five Year Plan is going to be a very challenging task and our people have to rise to the occasion. We also hope to get assistance from you and other friendly countries.

India is trading a. new path. It has decided to implement its economic programmes and policies through democratic means. This is not an easy venture and yet we have pursued it during the last fifteen years with considerable success. The pace may be somewhat slow here and there yet the ideal we have placed before us is good and noble and in the larger interest of humanity.

In the political field the concept of parliamentary democracy has been well and truly established. I am proud to say that despite many doubts that were expressed at the time of independence every Indian has shown himself to be capable and indeed eager to exercise his democratic rights which he cherishes. I think it will be hard for you to find any other democracy where there Prevails. despite several religions and languages, the kind of freedom that is enioved by all in India.

I think you will agree with me that the great experiment of parliamentary democracy and planned economy which does not exclude the private sector is a bold and ideal solution to the problem of our Asian and African countries. I think we have tried to show in India that it is possible despite severest handicaps of poverty, illiteracy and a huge population which is made up of persons of different religions and speaking different languages.

As you know we are a peaceful people and our whole emphasis since independence has been not to make India a military power but to devote all our resources and energies to economic growth. China on the other hand has built up the largest conventional forces in the world. It has also entered the field of nuclear power with a big bang. It seems more and more essential that China is brought into the world committee of nations and subjected to the disciplines inherent therein so that the present acute tensions and conflicts are somewhat lessened and reduced.

The Chinese nuclear explosions have naturally caused us 'much concern. We are strengthening and modernising our armed forces and this has inevitably placed a great burden upon the country. But in the field of nuclear energy we have decided not to use our nuclear capacity for destructive purposes. I think it is not too difficult for any one to visualise the result if more countries like India set out to develop nuclear weapons. It will see the world going almost headlong down the steep slope of nuclear proliferation. The very fact that we have decided to refrain from such a step despite the considerable dangers to which we are exposed is a measure of our devotion to the cause of world peace.

INDIA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA CHINA

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Speech at a- Press Luncheon

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri attended a Press luncheon organised by the Indian Journalists' Association in London on June 17, 1965. Addressing a gathering of about two hundred and fifty representatives of the World Press and other distinguished personalities, the Prime Minister said

Mr. President and Friends,

I am indeed grateful to you not only for the

excellent lunch, but also for arranging this admirable opportunity of meeting so many distinguished persons for the world of the Press. It is quite evident that the Indian journalists in London hold a truly unique position.

As you know, I have just returned after a fiveday visit to Canada. Although I was able to see only a very small part of that vast country, I was very much impressed by its beauty and by the sincerity and friendliness of the Canadian Government and people. My talks with Mr. Lester Pearson and his colleagues were very cordial throughout and we found ourselves in agreement in important matters we discussed. I think our two countries which have already done so much to maintain peace in different areas of the world can cooperate very fruitfully in seeking a solution to some of the difficult problems that still exist.

It gives me great pleasure to be in London just now for the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. It is the first time that I am participating in this unique gathering. I am looking forward to the discussions which will go

134

on during the next few days and I hope that these will lead to at least some casing of the many tensions and difficulties with which we are all faced. I will not dwell further on this be. cause you will be following the discussions from day to day.

AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE AT ALGIERS

Almost immediately after the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, there will be the Afro-Asian Conference at Algiers. As one of the original sponsors of the first Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung in 1955, India is prepared to do all it can to make the conference a success. Unfortunately, some differences have already arisen in the matter of admission of members etc., and unless these are amicably settled, there might be difficulties. It is also necessary that no bilateral disputes are taken up for discussion as otherwise it would lead to needless controversy. There are plenty of major problems to occupy the attention of the Afro-Asian countries, and it is very much to be hoped that they will be able to give a valuable lead in

respect of some of them. The foremost problem of course is the maintenance of peace. Closely linked with it is the problem of disarmament, while others of great importance are the ending of colonial and racial discrimination, and economic development and collaboration. The Afro-Asian nations are almost all of them in the category of under-developed nations and they have to decide together how they can help one another in their struggle for better lives for their people..

VIETNAM

The problem of problems at the moment is, of course, the problem of Vietnam. No doubt this problem will figure largely in the discussions both at the Commonwealth Conference and at the Afro-Asian Conference. It is difficult at the moment to suggest a way out, because the attitude on both sides has hardened so much, but the other countries of the world should persist in their efforts to bring about some relaxation of the situation. The endeavour should be to get the talks started, and if this can be achieved, this fact in itself will lead to a lessening of tensions. I think it will help if the air bombing of North Vietnam is stopped, because the only effect of such bombing is to make a bad situation worse. I hope that the North Vietnamese will also consider making a pause. The one thing that is certain beyond doubt is that the problem of Vietnam cannot be resolved through the process of armed conflict. There has to be a halt to the fighting from both sides. I hope that the call of the 17-Non-Aligned Nations will not go unheeded because there is no other path to a peaceful settlement.

As far as India is concerned, there is nothing we want more passionately than peace. No country can give greater proof of its devotion to peace than India already has by deciding not to go in for nuclear weapons, despite all the risks that such a decision entails. Considering the situation with which we are faced on our northern borders it would have been understandable if we had also elected to develop our considerable nuclear capacity for defence purposes, but any such step by us or by one or two other powers might well have started a race for nuclear weapons, and this is a race which once begun will hardly ever stop.

DEMOCRATIC EXPERIMENT

We in India are wholly pre-occupied in the gigantic task we have taken up of raising the standard of living of our people. The 460 million or so of our people constitute a sizeable part of the population of the world, and anything that is done to improve their lot is of advantage to the world community itself. Despite the almost overwhelming magnitude of the task, we have sought to achieve our objectives in an environment of freedom and social justice.

To an audience as knowledgeable as this, I do not have to trace the history of our democratic experiment, or of our economic progress, or of our efforts to bring the maximum measure of social justice to all our people. In all these endeavours, we are facing trials and difficulties which make news and attract the headlines. The steady continuing progress is not so spectacular and hence is less well known. Perhaps because of its very success, our experiment of achieving development within the framework of free institutions is taken for granted. Our methods of democratic socialism, our freedom of the press and public opinion, our record of impartial and readily available justice, could be the envy of many a more developed country. And I reiterate that we remain wedded to these methods whatever may be our troubles ahead.

In a nation whose population is now rising above the 460 million mark, our aim is that in another five years every child will be able to get free schooling up to the age of 14, that there should be, a minimum of medical assistance and housing for every family in the land and that every person would be able to get sufficient food and clothing. To many of you these aims seem very modest, and so they are. But to achieve even this, we have to strain ourselves to the extreme, and harness every limited resource for the development of both industry and agriculture.

I often hear criticism that we are embarking on too many expensive major projects which

135

fritter away our meagre resources. It is true that we have some large projects, but in the

sum total these are relatively modest. The overwhelming growth of population, particularly in the rural areas, can no longer be sustained by agriculture, however much we may improve it-and it is our determination to do so. But the larger part of the increase must be catered for in industrial projects if our people are to find a decent livelihood. And as we build our own steel plants, atomic power stations, supersonic aircraft and other complicated mechanical machines, we find that there is no skill or technology that we cannot master.

PROSPERITY ALL ROUND

In the world of tomorrow, there should be prosperity all round and there should be no distinction between developed and under-developed countries. In this current development decade proclaimed by the United Nations it is, however, essential that the needs of the, developing countries receive due attention.

During the two important conferences that will be taking place in the next few days, there will be a good deal of discussion amongst statesmen of the world and these will undoubtedly have beneficial results. Even more important, however, is the attitude of the common man in all the countries. If every citizen of the world is freed from want and poverty, and is given an opportunity to lead a reasonable happy life, then the present climate would definitely change for the better. That is why I would urge that the problem of raising the standards of living in the poorer countries of the world is one that admits of no delay. If our peoples are able to leave contended lives, if there is development of art and culture, if there is greater contact and association with the citizens of different countries, then we would have come very near to the goal we all seek to reach a world free from the fear of war and one at peace with itself.

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA CANADA ALGERIA INDONESIA VIETNAM PERU **Date :** Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Address to Indian Students in London

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, addressed a gathering of Indian students in London at Church House, on June 19, 1965.

The following is the text of the Prime Minister's speech

Mr. High Commissioner and Friends: I am indeed very happy to be in your midst this afternoon. As you are aware, I have come here to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. The foremost problem of the world today is peace. In different continents there are tensions and conflicts which indicate that peace is in danger.

VIETNAM

The most burning problem today is of South Vietnam. There are conflicts and clashes between the two Vietnams-North and South. Unfortunately, other powers have also become interested in it. There is the Geneva Agreement an agreement which led to peace in Vietnam for some time. But there was not full compliance with the terms of the agreement. In fact, there were violations and the result is that the conflict in South Vietnam is on the increase and there is a fear that it might lead to a conflagration, resulting perhaps in a world war.

It has naturally, therefore, attracted our attention first in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and it has been decided to send a delegation to the countries concerned for finding out the common grounds on the basis of which hostilities could come to an end and then consider other matters. It is true that there is no complete unanimity on this matter and there were different views expressed, yet by and large the conference felt that we could not wait and some one should move in the matter. I do not think that there is any kind of split in the conferences as such or that the delegation will not be able to proceed with the work. I do not think that this is a true state of affairs. However. it ail depends on how the countries concerned respond, whether North Vietnam, South Vietnam. China or the United States.

But I have said before, and I would even say today, that in order to create a better climate, a better atmosphere for having some sort of talks or discussions, the bombing should be stopped. I have every hope that this delegation which is going would adopt the same attitude. and if the bombing is stopped, then the hands of this delegation will be further strengthened. The first task of the delegation is to bring about cessation of hostilities. And once it is achieved then there will have to be some sort of a "Geneva" type of conference in which other political matters would be discussed. It is quite obvious that this problem in Vietnam could not be settled militarily. These conflicts will lead to nowhere and they Would intensify, resulting in killing and further sufferings to the people

136

of Vietnam. Therefore, it is essential that a formula should be found out to bring about some kind of a conference in which the parties concerned could sit round a table and find a solution for ending the present hostilities.

This matter, I need not add, is of the highest importance and I do hope that the present delegation or commission will be able to achieve something positive.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I know that India is deeply interested, in it., We have adopted an attitude in regard to this problem from the very beginning and we have tried to play some kind of a constructive role. However, for us the most important problem today is of economic development in India. We have other problems as well, but the economic development is the need of the hour. I have been asked to refer to other matters but I shall do so briefly. I might add that our instruments of action in regard to economic development are our plans, plans through which we act. As you know we are at the end of the 3rd Five-Year Plan. The Fourth Plan would commence from April next and this Five-Year Plan is going to be much bigger than our previous three plans. In fact it would be bigger than the 3 Plans but together. Whereas the First Five-Year Plan was of the size of Rs. 2,500 crores, Second, Rs. 5,500, the Third Rs. 10,500 and now the 4th Plan would be of the size of-tentatively-Rs. 21,500 crores. It is said that our resources are limited. Undoubtedly, we would need both internal as well as external resources for the implementation of our policies and programmes., I know it is by no means going to be an easy matter to get the necessary foreign exchange from foreign countries in the form of loans or in any other way. However, if we have to advance or progress, the country will have to make sacrifice and this generation will have to undergo sufferings in order to build up a future which would be fruitful for the generations to come.

In this plan we had naturally to give very high priority to agriculture. As you know, recently, last year we had to face severe difficulties on account of shortage of foodgrains. Our crops failed. There were drought and serious floods in certain areas. We were able somehow to overcome this situation, with the help of imports of foodgrains from foreign countries, specially from the United States of America. However, luckily this year we have had very good crops. Both wheat and rice, but we do want to continue imports for some time because it is important that we should build up a buffer stock, so that in times of need we could draw upon it and not be manoeuvred and put in difficulties because of certain tactics of the trade.

Therefore, it is important that we build up our reserves with the help of indigenous production as well as by imports at least for some time to come, as in the 4th 5-Year Plan we have proposed naturally to give the highest priority to agriculture. I have in fact suggested that for agriculture there should be almost a separate plan-a sub-plan, to co-ordinate plan of different activities of agriculture, whether it is irrigation, or power or other necessary items viz., fertilizers, implements, all these things, and there has to be a coordinated plan, a coordinated picture of our agricultural programmes during the next 5 years. So, I would merely say that the kind of propaganda which is often carried on, sometimes in foreign countries, about our food situation is rather exaggerated. Last year was a

difficult year, no doubt, but to suggest that people in India are starving or dving of hunger is wholly incorrect. There has not been one starvation death in the country even during the most difficult period we passed through last year. I am sometimes amazed to see some of the publications even in this country where the worst picture is painted of our economic conditions, of our social living. Well, there is freedom of the Press and we have nothing to say about it, but the people of this country have to realise that they are responsible for the conditions which prevail in India today. What India has achieved during the last 10 or 15 years is something to be proud of. Under the British regime rural areas were completely neglected and even in the cities what was the objective of the then British Government except producing a few clerks and some young men to serve in slightly higher capacity? However, I would not like to go into that, but I feel pained to find the way propaganda is carried on against us and our country.

As I said before, we naturally have given high priority to agriculture. I might say that we have given the highest allocations to agriculture, industries, education and health, and of course to irrigation and power. We have to build up our heavy industries. There are sometimes criticisms that we invest too much in industries. I need not tell you how important it is for us to develop our Industries. It is not only on agriculture we have to live, we would have to find employment for our young people coming out of colleges and universities. Besides that, we have to step up our production in different fields. It is, therefore, important that we should lay the utmost emphasis on industries.

I do realise that we have to depend on foreign countries for the implementation of our plans and I must say I do not feel very happy about it. But for the time being, there is no way out except to get assistance. But, mind you, most of

137

it is in the form of loans, and every pie has to be paid and is paid by us. So, it is our earnest desire, and it is important that we carry on with the help and assistance of others and I would only say that the world cannot really live if it is divided between the developed and under-developed areas. If there is a partition between developed and under-developed countries, it would lead to disturbance of the peace. It is in the interest of developed countries that they should help, and assistance should be made available to the under-developed countries from the developed ones.

Our effort is, and would be, to reduce our dependence on foreign countries., Some one asked me in Ottawa at a Press Conference as to how long we will continue to take the help ? I said that to my mind the maximum period should be 10 to 15 years. After that it should be possible for us to manage ourselves. I am sure we will make a success in this direction.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN INDIA

You have asked me to say something about the political situation in India. The Chinese aggression took place in October, 1962 and since then there is a stalemate. They are very much on our borders. The threat is constantly there. But in spite of our desire that this matter should be peacefully settled, there has been no response from China.. After all, we cannot continue that effort if there is no response from the other side. We have to build up our defence strength and we will see how to negotiate, but we can only negotiate on terms of honour and dignity. If an honourable settlement is possible, we will certainly welcome it, but not at the cost of the honour of our country.

Recently there has been an intrusion in the Rann of Kutch. I would not like to say much on it because there is an effort being made by the U.K. Prime Minister to bring about some kind of an agreement and I do think that something has to be done in this regard one way or the other as early as possible. I would very much like that this matter is peacefully settled but, of course, we are clear that the aggression has to be vacated. However, I shall leave the matter at that and see the result of our talks.

As I mentioned about the Chinese threat, we, should also consider their policies, their desire for expansionism, and their disagreement with the policy of peace and co-existence. These have created a very special situation for us. We wish China well. We want her to progress and develop. We have no objection to their carrying on propaganda of their views and ideologies. But we do feel that if there is any kind of active subversion taking place in the country, the Government will have to resist it. As I said that in the. matter of thinking and even in the matter of propagation of ideologies we do not want to come in the way, but if the security of the country is in danger, then no Government can put up or can tolerate any activity of any party and it is therefore that the Government of India had to take action against one wing of the Communist Party in India. There have been detentions and after that no further action has been taken. Undoubtedly, I regret that this kind of action should have been taken, but if in the conference of the Communist Party you find pictures of President of China and not that of Gandhi or Jawaharlal, you can well imagine where the loyalty of this party lies or where the principles of the party lie,-I would not go into further details. There are many such activities on the part of some of our Communist friends, who almost equate India and China. They say India is not trying for peace or coming to terms with China. They suggest that China has not aggressed. They even went to the length of suggesting that in a way India is at fault. These are naturally matters that cause us worry and anxiety and they vitiate the atmosphere in the country. In these circumstances, we have taken the least possible action., But of course it is for these friends to consider as to what their foreign policy is going to be in future. If they will reconsider their attitude, naturally we will be most willing to set them free and to give them every opportunity to function as they think best.

DETENTION OF SHEIKH ABDULLAH

Now, on the problem of Kashmir, etc. I would not like to go into. It is true, unfortunately we had to take action against Sheikh Sahib. I feel unhappy about it, but we gave full freedom to Sheikh Abdullah to come here and visit other countries, knowing as we did that he would voice his own point of view, which would be critical of India, in these countries. I knew it very well and yet as a democratic country we felt that we should not stop him going to other countries. He visited a number of countries and went much beyond what I had expected..

Last but not the least, his meeting with Chou En-lai created special doubts in our minds. I can quite understand his own opinion about Kashmir and the way he wants the Kashmir problem to be discussed. It is for him to propagate in India that there should be a special setup for Kashmir or that there should even be the principle of self-determination. All these things he can certainly do. But I do not know what transpired between him and Chou En-lai. This meeting, however, did give us an impression that he was seeking Chou En-lai's moral support, if not other kind of support from China. In these circumstances, we had to take the action, but as I said it is only detention, and it is entirely in the hands of the detenue to come out or remain inside.

138

DEMOCRATIC SET-UP

I would not like to take much of your time. As you know, we have a democratic set up in India and we are proud of our democracy. Round about you will find that in other countries there is some kind of a centralised Government and it is almost in India alone there are a Parliament, 15 legislatures and 4,000 members of Parliament and Legislative Assemblies.

You might have heard that there has been a coup in Algiers and I do not know the' exact latest report but some one in place of Ben Bella has taken over the Government. You hear a lot of criticisms of us and our Government. This kind of criticism is not bad in itself, though, of course, I would like that some restraint is exercised specially by the foreign correspondents. There is no harm done if criticism is made in a democracy which permits - freedom of speech and freedom of expression. There one man does not rule. The feelings of other people are not just suppressed. They get an opportunity to speak out publicly and it helps them to get their steam out and it helps the Government also.

We know what our shortcomings are, what our weaknesses are. I am one of those who welcome criticism and in a democratic set up Parliaments and Legislatures are the forums where the Government can be criticised. if there is a centralised Government, either the Government is there or the President is elected for ever. I think all the countries in the world, especially those who have achieved independence, will have to give a careful thought to this aspect of the problem and of the form of government and what should be the pattern of administration.

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND CHINA PERU LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CANADA ALGERIA

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreement Signed

An agreement for a loan of œ 5,000,000 (Rs. 6.6 crores) to the Government of India from the British Government was signed in New Delhi on June 5, 1965 by Shri P. Govindan Nair, Additional Secretary, Union Ministry of Finance, and Mr. John Freeman, British High Commissioner in India.

The loan is the first instalment of the offer, made by the British Government at the meeting of the Aid India Consortium held in Washington on April 21, 1965, of œ 30,000,000 (Rs. 40 crores) aid to be committed in 1965-66 as part of the British contribution towards the foreign exchange costs of India's economic development under the Third Five Year Plan.

The loan is made under the authority of the Export Guarantees Act of 1949. It is for a period of 25 years but repayments of principal will not begin until after the seventh year. The interest will also be waived during the first seven years of the loan, thus reducing the effective interest rate to between 3 1/2 and 4 per cent.

The Government of India will use the loan to provide exchange for the purchase of goods from

the United Kingdom.

INDIA USA

Date : Jun 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-US Loan Agreements Signed

India and the United States concluded in New Delhi on June 17, 1965 two loan agreements totalling \$ 193.8 million (Rs. 92.3 crores).

The agreements, signed by Mr. P. Govindan Nair, Additional Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, and U.S. Charge d'Affaires, Joseph N. Greene, Jr., raised the total of U.S. assistance to India to more than \$ 6 billion (Rs. 2,860 crores).

The larger of the two loans provides \$ 190 " million (Rs. 90.5 crores) for a broad range of commodity imports, most of which are essential' to India's industrial and agricultural production.

139

The second loan provides \$ 3.8 million (Rs. 1.8 crores) for the purchase of 21 diesel electric shunter locomotives. This is the seventh U.S. loan in support of India's rail transport improvement projects. U.S. assistance to rail transport now totals \$ 222.9 million (Rs. 106.1 crores).

The loans have been extended to India through the U.S. Agency for International Development. Repayment in dollars will be spread over 40 years. For the first 10 years interest will be at the rate of one per cent per annum. Thereafter the rate will be 21 per cent.

The larger, non-project loan will be used for

such vital industrial imports as non-ferrous metals, iron and steel, carbon black, vehicle parts and components, machinery and machine parts, sulphur, lubricants, wood pulp, tyre cord and chemicals. Also included are fertilizers and commodities needed for malaria control to support India's agricultural and health service development. The Indian Government will set the respective amounts of various imports.

The Government of India has specifically requested that a large portion of U.S. aid be in non-project form. This is in order to provide for essential needs of India's development which are not covered by aid for specific projects. India's increasing industrialisation has required additional foreign exchange to provide the raw materials and the semi-manufactured components required to fill the pipeline of new production and to build inventories for both export and domestic sales.

Non-project assistance provides a good share of the spare parts needed to keep many of the machines basic to India's industrial growth in operation. It also provides greater flexibility in development planning.

140

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1965

July

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record	1965	
Vol. XI	JULY	No. 7

CONTENTS

PAGE S ALGERIA Prime Minister Boumedienne's Message to President Radhakrishnan 141 Prime Minister's Message to Mr. Boumedienne 141 ARAB LEAGUE 141 India's Diplomatic Recognition : Letters Exchanged CZECHOSLOVAKIA Indo-Czech Cultural Exchange Plan Signed 142 FRANCE Protocol on Development of Franco-Indian Trade Exchanged 143 HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation 143 INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS India's Note to Security Council on Alignment of the Boundaries of Sind 145 (Pakistan) LAOS Vice-President's Speech at Dinner in honour of Prince Souvanna Phouma 146 Reply by Prince Souvanna Phouma 147 YUGOSLAVIA Prime Minister's State Visit to Yugoslavia 147 Prime Minister's Speech on the Occasion of Conferment on him of Honorary Citizenship of Belgrade Prime Minister's Speech at a Dinner by President Tito 149 151 Prime Minister's Speech at a Luncheon by the Mayor of Belgrade Prime Minister's Television Speech in Belgrade 151

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

ALGERIA INDIA NORWAY SLOVAKIA FRANCE PAKISTAN LAOS YUGOSLAVIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

ALGERIA

Prime Minister Boumedienne's Message to President Radhakrishnam

The following is the text of the message dated the 7th July 1965 from His Excellency Mr. Houari Boumedienne, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Algeria, to His Excellency Dr. Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India :

I am particularly pleased to express to Your Excellency my deep appreciation for the relentless efforts that you have made to ensure a full success for the second Afro-Asian Conference. The efficient interventions that you have made before the friendly Chiefs of States and the positive role that the Indian Delegation had played at Algiers show the great interest that you give to the Afro-Asian solidarity and to the future of the developing nations. Hence I am convinced that your action which was always positive will allow the next Algiers meeting to have by its wide participation the full success that the peoples attached to the Bandung principles are calling wholeheartedly for.

ALGERIA INDIA INDONESIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

ALGERIA

Prime Minister's Message to Mr. Boumedienne

The following is the text of the message dated the 15th July, 1965 from the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, to His Excellency Houari Boumedienne, Prime Minister of Algeria: Excellency,

I thank you sincerely for your message of the seventh July to the President. I am glad to know of Your Excellency's appreciation of the efforts made by them Indian Delegation at Algiers to ensure the success of the Second Afro-Asian Conference. We are firmly wedded to the principles of Bandung and it is our constant endeavour to promote Afro-Asian solidarity within the larger context of international co-operation among peoples and nations of all continents. We share your belief that wide participation will ensure the fullest success of the Afro-Asian Conference scheduled to be held in Algiers in November, 1965.

On behalf of the Government and people of India and on my own behalf please accept cordial good wishes for the wellbeing and prosperity of the people of Algeria and for your personal health and welfare. I hope that the existing good relations between our countries will continue and be further strengthened to our mutual benefit.

ALGERIA INDIA INDONESIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

ARAB LEAGUE

India's Diplomatic Recognition: Letters Exchanged

The Government of India has agreed to the, conferment of diplomatic recognition to the Arab League Office in Delhi. The Chief Representative of the Arab League in India and other

141

officers of the League's office will now enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities. The exchange of letters relating to this agreement took place on July 12 at the Headquarters of the Arab League at Cairo between Shri S. K. Chowdhry, Minister-Charge d'Affaires, Indian Embassy and Mr. Abdel Khalek Hassouna, Secretary-General of the Arab League. The letters were signed respectively, by the Indian Ambassador, Shri S. N. Haksar, on behalf of the Government of India and by the 'Secretary-General of the Arab League, Mr. Hassouna, on behalf of the Arab League.

India is the first country to extend such recognition to the League.

In the course of an explanatory letter from the Indian Ambassador, significance of the agree, ment was pointed out. It was stated : "Opening of the Independent Arab League Office in Delhi constitutes vet another step in reinforcing close and intimate relations between the Arab world and India; relations which have existed since ancient times. It is the desire of my Government that these bonds may be further strengthened not only for co-operation in international affairs but also in the fields of culture and economic collaboration. It is the expectation of my Government that the establishment of the Arab League Office in India will not only facilitate but give richer and more purposeful content to the historic relations between India and the Arab world".

Emphasising close links between India and the Arab world the letter observed: "Close and cordial relations which have been existing between India and the Arab world have been progressively reflected in the similarity of approach in international affairs and growing cultural and economic bonds between the Arab countries and India. Your Excellency is aware that my Government has lent consistent support to the rights of Palestine refugees to return to their homes, to the just rights of the Arab to the waters of the river Jordan and to the aspirations of the Arab people to foster unity among themselves so that they may be a force for peace, progress and stability in the world".

Indian Charge d'Affaires, Shri S. K. Chowdhry, while handing over the letter to the Arab League Secretary-General, said that it was a happy and a historic occasion and expressed the hope 'for the continued strengthening of ties between India and the Arab world. The Arab League Secretary-General described the agreement as another step towards strengthening and consolidation of cordial relations existing between India and the Arab world.

INDIA EGYPT USA JORDAN

Date : Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czech Cultural Exchange Plan Signed

The Cultural Exchange Plan for 1965-66 which had been discussed and agreed upon during the Education Minister, Shri M. C. Chagla's stay in Czechoslovakia was formally signed on July 29, 1965 by the Indian Ambassador, Shri M. P. Mathur and Dr. Kahuda, the First Vice-Minister of Education, Czechoslovakia, in the presence of Doctor Simovic, Deputy Foreign Minister and officers of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Education, Academy of Sciences, Oriental Institute, the Radio Department and the Indian Embassy.

Speaking on the occasion, Dr. Kahuda praised India for its policy of friendship with all countries and peaceful co-existence. He said that Czechoslovakia had so far not signed any such broad and elaborate Cultural Exchange Plan with any other country. This, he said, was full proof of the friendly and brotherly relations between India and Czechoslovakia.

The Indian Ambassador, in reply, said that the execution of the Plan envisaged the intensification of scientific, technical and cultural cooperation. This will further strengthen the already existing friendly relations between the two countries.

142

NORWAY SLOVAKIA USA INDIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Protocol on Development of Franco-Indian Trade Exchanged

A protocol on the development of Franco-Indian trade was exchanged in Paris on July 8, 1965. It records the results of the discussions held on 26 and 28 May by the Franco-Indian Economic Commission set up by the exchange of Franco-Indian letters of the 19th October, 1959. The Indian delegation was headed by Shri K. B. Lall, Indian Ambassador to the European Economic Community and the French delegation was headed by Mr. J. Wahl, Director in the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs. The Commission examined various questions relating to the development of trade between the two countries.

With regard to the imports of Indian products into France, the Protocol provides, inter-alia, that the French Government would endeavour to the best of their ability to pursue in future a policy of progressive liberalisation of trade exchanges, including increasing facilities for the access of Indian goods to the French market. it was also agreed that in order to comply with the common desire of both the Governments to increase Indian sales in France for the harmonious development of Franco-Indian trade, the French authorities would extend facilities to the various trade promotion activities, including the holding of exhibitions to be organised by India in France and the training of executives in marketing techniques.

Both the delegations agreed that it would not only be desirable to strengthen the already existing collaboration between the two countries in the fields of industrialisation and planning but also to establish regular contacts between competent French and Indian authorities for the purpose.

The two delegations also exchanged views on problems connected with the current international economic relations with special emphasis on questions concerning the developing countries.

FRANCE INDIA USA **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, broadcast the following message to the nation on July 1, 1965 :

Since I last spoke to you, several important events have taken place. Some have shocked us and caused us all the greatest anxiety and others have given us renewed confidence and faith in our ability to march ahead as a people and as a nation.

During the last few weeks I have travelled abroad and visited several countries. For me

personally this was truly a voyage of discovery. Wherever I went, I was received with cordiality and affection by governments and peoples. This was truly a welcome to the 470 million people of India whom I represented. The current series of visits began with a trip to the Soviet Union. In many ways this was a memorable visit. The U.S.S.R. Government and the people have abiding friendship for the people of India and they have stood by us all along, even in periods of stress and strain. They are anxious to be of increasing help in our economic development. This has been a very useful visit indeed.

Later, I was able to visit Canada and also to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London, stopping for a day in Cairo on my way. In all these countries there is goodwill for India in abundance. They are all our friends and our mutual relations are bound to act strengthened further. I need hardly talk to you in detail about the very close and friendly relations that bind the United Arab Republic

143

and India. Canada is another country which has been consistently friendly to India and particularly helpful in the efforts that we are making for our economic development and in the field of atomic energy. The reception accorded to me by the people of Canada was specially heartwarming.

For me the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was indeed a valuable experience. Heads of governments of so many countries belonging to different Continents had gathered together to discuss vital political and economic issues which were of common interest to all. Our deliberations and the conclusions we reached are bound to have an impact on current world events.

Wherever I went I found that the Indian people are held in high regard, as people who-are wise and mature and whose adherence to peace is a matter not of expediency but of principle. Our self-restraint has been appreciated and we are regarded as a people who can be trusted and relied upon to pursue a rational course of action. The, image of India is that of a large and stable democracy in an area which is of vital importance to the peace of the world.

Though the countries that I visited have different systems of economy and polity, I was struck most by a unanimity in their sincere and ardent desire for peace in the world. The Soviet Union in particular has gone through the horrors of war on its own soil in which millions of precious lives were lost. The people there are, therefore, naturally anxious that there should be no recurrence of war.

The Canadians have worked together with Indians in U.N. peacekeeping operations in different parts of the globe.

In all countries I visited, there was sincere appreciation of the peaceful policies which India has pursued ever since the attainment of independence. I explained to the leaders of various governments that India was firmly wedded to the path of peace. At the same time, I stated clearly that adherence to peaceful policies could not possibly stand in the way of the preservation of our sovereignty and territorial integrity. Tnevitably, the Indo-Pakistan dispute in regard to the Kutch-Sind border came up for discussion at certain places. Naturally there was great anxiety and also apprehension about a possible escalation of the border conflict. I explained to them our point of view and stated that despite the gravest possible provocation, we had acted with great self-restraint and that we were still willing to walk along the path of peace provided aggression was immediately vacated.

I know you have all been greatly concerned about the aggression that was committed on the Kutch border by Pakistan. Unfortunately, the relations between our two countries have not been happy and they were thrown into the gravest peril by an armed attack on our border positions. We defended our territorial integrity and made it known that the continuance of war-like operations would compel us to take such measures as appeared to be necessary for the preservation of our freedom. We also made it clear that aggression had to be vacated and that too with the least possible delay, if an escalation of the conflict was to be avoided. Subsequently, there was an intervention by the British Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson. We made it clear that there could be no cease-fire without

a simultaneous agreement about the vacation of aggression and the restoration of status quo made as on 1st January, 1965. Our basic stand in this matter was repeatedly stated in the Parliament.

As you would have read from this morning's papers a cease-fire agreement has become effective from early this morning. Simultaneously, Pakistan has agreed to the withdrawal of her armed forces from the area. On our part we have indicated that since we have no desire to keep up a war-like atmosphere, we would withdraw our troops from the present forward positions so that the possibility of a clash is obviated. On the question of patrolling, both sides have agreed that the position as it obtained on the 1st January, 1965, will be restored.

There will be no military or even police post of Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch and thus the aggression in this area is to be clearly and fully vacated. We had to agree to the patrolling of the Ding-Surai track, which in part passes through our territory, by Pakistan police as a part of the restoration of the status quo ante as (in 1st January, 1965.

This limited patrolling on a specific track is the only right available to Pakistan under the agreement, so far as the Rann of Kutch is concerned, India will, of course, continue to patrol from Chad Bet to Kanjarkot via Karim Shahi. The track passes through Biar Bet and Vigokot. We will also re-establish our earlier police posts, India's civil control over this area will thus be fully restored.

It is good that eventually reason has prevailed and a situation full of the gravest possible consequences has not been allowed to get out of hand. The recent events have clearly established that the use of force cannot really settle any problem.

My countrymen, I feel unhappy within myself to have to talk about conflicts and tensions. I stand unreservedly for peace, because apart from other wider considerations, peace is vital for the economic development of our country. We have to fight the scourge of poverty, disease

144 and ignorance. We have to produce more

goods and more services to meet even the bare minimum requirements of our people. We have to fulfil the promise that we made to our people when the country attained independence in August 1947. Since then we have come quite a distance, but the road ahead is still long and arduous. We are determined to march ahead and to overcome the many difficulties that lie in our way. Some of the problems that we have to face some time appear to be insurmountable. Take for instance, the foreign exchange difficulty. Our earnings on the exports are vet not enough to finance the purchase of raw materials and other essentials which we must import from abroad. We have had to impose severe restrictions on imports. It seems the country will have, to go in for greater discipline and hardship in the coming months. While any assistance from international institutions and friendly countries can be most helpful we have got to ensure that the serious disparity between our earnings and expenditure of foreign exchange is reduced to the minimum in the shortest possible time. Exports have to be encouraged in every way and imports have to be restricted severely. This provides a challenge to our industry to make the best possible use of indigenously available resources. In fact that will not be enough. All ingenuity and resources have to be mobilised to keep up and in fact to accelerate the pace of production. I would ask the men of business and industry to consider how best they can help themselves and the country in this difficult situation. Our food problem, though easier now, is by no means resolved. Though our food production has shown a substantial increase, our population is also increasing at a rapid pace. Whereas we have to give a further fillip to our efforts to improve food production, we have simultaneously to concentrate on an intensive programme of family planning and population control.

There is one other aspect of the food problem which I would like to stress specially. While increased production is undoubtedly the, need of the hour, the avoidance of waste is equally important. When the country is obliged to import foodgrains from abroad, every possible care has to be exercised to secure the maximum economy in use. Ostentation and a multiplicity of coarses at meals are totally out of place today. Hotels and restaurants should implement a policy of restraint and private individuals should also consider it their duty towards the country to ensure that there is no wastage.

Before I conclude I want to refer to only one other matter. While we all desire that the economic conditions of our people should improve, we have to be equally aware of the methods that have to be followed if 'this objective is to be achieved in a reasonable span of time. No country in this world has been able to make progress without hard and dedicated work and without a determined and united national will. We in India have decided to set up by democratic means a society in which the basic necessities of life will be assured to all. This task is truly Herculean. We have all to strive together. At this particular stage of our development we have all to give of our best to the country and that is possible only if we function as a united people in a disciplined manner. That way alone we can build up our economic and political strength. And let us not forget that the standing and the prestige of a country depend very largely on what the country can do for itself. Such an effort is well within our reach. For this we all have to recapture the old spark of the days of our freedom struggle and to go ahead with self-confidence.

I want you to feel the glow of belonging to a great country which has inspiring traditions and a glorious future ahead. I want you all to participate physically and emotionally in the adventure of building up a New India.

USA INDIA CANADA EGYPT UNITED KINGDOM PAKISTAN CHAD CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Note to Security Council on Alignment of the Boundaries of Sind (Pakistan)

The following is the text of the letter dated the 21st July, 1965 sent by Shri B. N. Chakravarty, Permanent Representative of India to the U.N., to the President of the Security Council. regarding Pakistan's contention about the correct alignment of the boundaries of Sind (Pakistan) :

145

With reference to the letter dated 7 June, 1965, addressed by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan (Document No. S/76423), I have been instructed by my Government to state that in view of other developments it is no longer necessary to dwell at length again on the merits of the Pakistan contention concerning the correct alignment of the boundaries of Sind (Pakistan).

The Government of India does not accept the so-called "chronological account" of events as given by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan which is not factually correct. I do not, however, consider it appropriate at this stage to refute the Pakistani version of events leading upto the armed clashes since an agreement has, as you are aware, been happily reached between the two governments in regard to the steps to be taken by both sides for the settlement of differences over the boundary. For the same reason, my Government does not deem it necessary now to go into the historical and administrative basis of India's unquestionable sovereignty over the entire Rann of Kutch.

My Government earnestly hopes that the agreement referred to in the preceding paragraph will ultimately lead to a final settlement of difference between the two governments on this question.

I shall be grateful if this communication is circulated to the members of the Security Council.

INDIA PAKISTAN **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

LAOS

Vice-President's Speech at Dinner in honour of Prince Souvanna Phouma

His Highness Prince Souvanna Phouma, Prime Minister to Laos, paid a two-day visit to New Delhi from July 26, 1965. On July 26, the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, gave a dinner in honour of the Prime Minister of Laos at Rashtrapati Bhavan.

The following is the text of the Vice-President's speech on the occasion:

Your Highness, Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are very glad that Your Highness has found time to visit us on your way back home from Paris in spite of many pressing engagements awaiting you in Vientiane. Your visit to Delhi has given an opportunity to exchange views with you on matters of mutual interest, and particularly on problems of Indo-China.

Your Highness, as you are aware, we have been closely associated, as Chairman of the International Commission in Laos, with the peacekeeping operations in your country. It is a matter of some satisfaction to us that the International Commission has, to some extent, been able to help the forces of peace to assert themselves. The International Commission depends for its functioning on the goodwill and co-operation of all concerned. We are thankful to you, Your Highness, for the assistance your Government has given to the Commission in fulfilling its tasks in Laos.

It is our earnest hope that the efforts of the International Commission backed by the Geneva Powers and supported by all the parties in Laos, will soon be able to bring an end to conflict in your country.

We have tried to be of some help to the people of Laos by sending a Medical Team to attend to their medical needs. It is a small gesture made in token of our brotherly feelings for the people of Laos and we are glad that your Government and people have received and welcomed the team in that spirit.

Events in Vietnam have caused great concern to all of us. We have been making efforts for an acceptable settlement of the Vietnam problem and it has, therefore, caused us disappointment that hostilities have been stepped up there with the possibility and danger of their spreading beyond the borders of Vietnam. We know that you are also greatly concerned about this.

Your Highness, our two peoples are bound by many ties, cultural, religious, literary, which have survived the passage of centuries and the impact of foreign domination. We look forward to the further strengthening of these.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would request you to join me in drinking a toast to the health of His Highness Prince Souvanna Phouma, to the wellbeing and happiness of the people of Laos, and to the firm and enduring friendship between our two countries.

146

LAOS USA FRANCE CHINA SWITZERLAND VIETNAM **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

LAOS

Reply by Prince Souvanna Phouma

The following is the text of a summary of Laotian Prime Minister's reply in French to the toast proposed by the Vice-President:

Mr. President, I am deeply sorry to express myself in French. I think in the French language I will be able to express correctly my thoughts. That is why I have chosen to speak in French.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to be in Delhi today and the have an occasion to contact the Indian leaders, specially the President of India with whom we were talking of many problems of common interest, of the geneva Conference, of the I.C.C. and many other problems.

India's help in the Geneva Conference and in the functions of the international Commission in Laos and also in the humanitarian field of the medical help, send to Laos, although a symbolic gesture, has gone right into the hearts of the Laotian people. I would like to express the thanks of the Laotian people to the Government of India.

I would like here to mention that India was one of the countries who were the sponsors for the first Bandung Conference. I really deplore the lack of spirit of Bandung in many of the nations who do not seem to observe the Panch Sheel principles. They are not implementing the principles to which they have subscribed....

Small countries like Laos place their hopes on the next conference of the Bandung type and the Non-aligned Conference.

You know the situation in Laos is worsening day by day and the national problem for Laos is really reaching a very gragic situation. The support of Government of India in seeking a peaceful solution and working the I.C.C. has to a very great extent helped the Government of Laos.

I was very much distressed to see in the newspapers this morning that Pathet Lao has criticised the functioning of the International Commission. Let me express here that the only hope we have got is the international organisation in Laos. The International Commission is the only organisation to which we can make an appeal at any time. I would earnestly hope that all counties will finance the international organisation and enable the organisation to fulfil efficiently its duty.

As for the convening of Geneva Conference,

Laos has expressed a condition that in the next Geneva Conference, the powers of the International Commission should be strengthened in order to bring peace in Laos. In this hope, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, let me propose a toast to the health of the President of India.

LAOS INDIA SWITZERLAND INDONESIA

Date : Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's State Visit to Yugoslavia

At the invitation of President of Yugoslavia His Excellency Mr. Josip Broz Tito and the Government of the Socialist Federal Repubic of Yugoslavia, the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bhadur Shastri, accompanied by Shrimati Lalita Shastri paid an official visit to Yugoslavia from July 28 to 31, 1965. On July 28, His Excellency the Prime Minister of Yugolsavia. Mr. Peter Stambolic and Madame Stambolic gave a luncheon in his honour in Belgrade

Replying to the toast proposed by the yugoslav Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri made the following speech;

I am happy to be here in your midst. I would like to express my heartfelt thanks for the warm welcome given to us. Immediately on my arrival in Belgrade. I was able to see a demonstration of the close friendship between our two countries. The reception accorded to us shows the immense goodwill the people of Yugoslavia have for Indians.

You Mr. Prime Minister, have visited our country once. I am sorry that it was on a tragic occasion when our dear and distinguished leader Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had passed away. He was one the greatest leaders of the freedom

147

movement and the builder of modem India. During our struggle for freedom, we fought our opponents without rancour or bitterness. The result was a peaceful transfer of power.

After the achievement of freedom, we have been engaged in economic development. Our problems are immense. We have made progress in the industrial and other fields. We are trying to build up our economic strength. We have taken various steps to build our country through Five Year Plans. Our objective is to achieve quick economic progress. We have full faith in ourselves. India will go ahead.

NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

It was during his (Shri Nehru's) life-time that our mutual friendship was built up on firm and unshakable foundations. He took a leading part in the evolution of the important and vital policies of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. He is unfortunately no more. But we pursue the same, old policies which are not only good for our country, but which have continuing validity in the much wider context of the present-day world conditions.

It is regrettable that the situation in the world today is fraught with danger. Bold and statesmanlike efforts are vitally necessary for arresting the present drift towards a catastrophe. We have to realise that we all live in this small planet, and that we are all mortals. We breathe the same air, share the bounties of nature, and equally cherish the future of our children. We have, therefore, to live and function together and not try to eliminate each other.

I am confident that peace would still be preserved and that we will all work towards this end. Yugoslavia and India have friendly ties. I am looking forward to our talks and discussions. These, I am certain, will be useful and fruitful. Let us together contribute in whatever measure it may be possible, to the efforts which are being made by responsible people everywhere for reducing tensions and for promoting an atmosphere of trust and goodwill. I know these ideals are closest to the heart of your great leader, President Tito, and indeed of the Yugoslav people.

May I thank you once again in all sincerity for your very kind invitation. I would now request your Excellency, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the health of President Tito, the Prime Minister and Madame Stambolic and to the welfare and prosperity of the people of this great country.

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA

Date : Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's Speech on the occasion of Conferment on him of

Honorary Citizenship of Belgrade

The following is the text of the speech made by the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, at a function held in the City Hall on July 28, 1965 to confer on him an Honorary Citizenship of Belgrade.

Mr. President, Honourable Members of the City Assembly of Belgrade, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am profoundly touched by the great honour you have conferred upon me by making me an Honorary Citizen of Belgrade. This is at once a privilege and a heavy responsibility. It is a privilege because Belgrade is a city with a unique history and will always find a glorious mention in its pages, especially in the defence of freedom. Even during the most difficult days of the last world war, the indomitable will of the people of this City could never be subdued. They fought the invader despite heavy odds, and kept aloft the banner of freedom. Undoubtedly, this is an inspiring example. The Honorary Citizenship of such a City casts upon me the responsibility to preserve and promote these traditions. Fortunately, we in India have also gone through a long period of trials and tribulations prior to the attainment of independence. We know full well what happens when freedom is lost. We are therefore, determined to maintain our sovereignty and territorial integrity,

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

It is unfortunate that some countries do not subscribe to peaceful co-existence. However, it is for those countries which believe in peaceful co-existence to carry on constant propaganda in favour of it, so that those who do not believe in it accept it. This will help in the maintenance of peace in the world. Your city has given a lead in this direction and I would like to pay my tribute.

As I came into your beautiful city this morning, I was deeply touched by the warmth and sincerity of the affection and kindness with which the great builder of modern Yugoslavia, President Tito, Madame Broz, other leaders of Government, and the many citizens of Belgrade welcomed us in their midst. Mr. President, you have expressed the hope that we, would feel at home in your lovely city. I want to assure you that we are already at home.

148

COMMON IDEALS

The city of yours so clean and so mordern, is a tribute to the industry of your people. It has gone through many vicissitudes and its spirit has always risen again every time in a better from. Today it is a thriving and growing center of culture and industry, besides being the seat of the federal socialist Republic of Yogoslavia. But even more then that the name Blgrade bring to our mind instantly one of the most important focal points in the word of today -a centre where statesmanship and wisdom combine in order to strengthen the force of peace and the fundamental policy of co- existence Belgrade and New Delhi have a direct link through the hearts of the people, for they beat in unison in support of common ideals. As a citizen of your great City, I pledge myself anew

to the service of these ideals and to there further promotion to the best of my endeavours

Mr. President, once again, I thank you for your kind references to me and for the honour bestowed upon me. I know the people of my country will greatly value this gesture.

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister Speech at a Dinner by President Tito

The following is the next of a speech made by the Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, at a dinner given in his honour by his Excellency President, Tito and Madame Tito at Bnoni on July 29,1965;

Mr. President, Madam Broz, Mr. Prime Minister, Madame Stambolic, your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I am truly delighted to be in your midst today, and I am thankful to you for your kind invitation and generous words of welcome. Even since our arrival in your country, We have been received everywhere with overwhelming affection by the people and by the leaders. The goodwill and friendship of the people of Yogoslavia, I assure you, Mr. President, is dearly cherished by the 470 million people of my country, and is most heartily reciprocated.

You Mr. President, are relied upon as our nearest friend and collaborator in the promotion of the ideal of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. The people of India respect your indomitable will, which enabled you to keep alive the freedom struggle of your country even during the darkest hours of the current century, when the concept of freedom itself was in jeopardy; and they admire of international relations. As there representative, I want to convey to you and to the friendly people of Yogoslavia our warmest greeting and goodwishes.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Yugoslavia has taken rapid strides in the process of economic development, and this remarkable progress has been achieved through dynamic and bold original effort. Now concept has been adopted and implemented with success in so many directions. We rejoice in this, and we are confident that your country will continue to make progress even at an accelerated pace.

We in India are engaged in a similar effort When independence was won, we embarked upon a programme of planned economic development with the objective of providing adeguate food clothing and shelter to our people and giving them a reasonable standard of living. We fnmly resolved to build up a Socialist society within our country by the cooperative endeavours of our people. The problems we face are enormous. The leeway of centuries has to be made good within a few dacades. We have therefore, concentrated attention all these year on the production of more food and more clothing, on the building of more schools, more hospitals, and on setting up many new project for power, irrigation, steel and fertilizer and other indestries. It is evident, Mr. President, that for the success of our efforts, peace is of vital importance. If our attention is diverted by tensions and conflicts, the pace of our economic development is bound to show down. This we cannot afford. We have, therefore, a vital stake in the preservation of world peace. the day when tension in one part of the world was of little concern to other areas, are no longer there. science and technology have reduced distance and made our planet an inter-dependent body, so that now a threat of conflict anywhere is a threat to peace everywhere.

NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Mr. President, I share your concern fully about the disturbing trends in the international situation. The gathering clouds are truly menacing. A similar situation was developing years ago when you, Mr. President, and my distinguished predecessor, pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, played a decisive role in formulating the policy of nonalignment and peaceful co-exittence, and gradually convinced government and peoples in many part of the world that we all had to live together on the basis of co-operation, if we wanted to live at all. An essential plank of this

149

policy was that each country was free to evolve independently its own economic and political policies which it considered best in its own circumstances. At the same time, despite differences in economic and political systems, the various countries had to get along together in a friendly manner. Initially, some thought that this idea was much too idealistic, but soon it was recognised that if peace was to be preserved, this was the only rational course of action. Gradually tensions lessened, and the major powers who were drifting apart, began to get closer together, and once rapport between governments is established it leads to better understanding and closer ties.

Unfortunately, these happy trends have been disturbed in recent times. The principles of peaceful co-existence and nonalignment have been subjected to heavy pressures from different directions. Some newly developing forces are vociferously decrying the concept of co-existence. They believe in the inevitabality of conflict and war between different social And economic systems. They seem to be callous to what may happen to humanity if their views were unfortunately to prevail. History seems to have turned a full circle so quickly, and we are once again face to face with a situation which may well lead to a catastrophe. Today, what is in danger is not merely peace, but the very existence of humanity itself. Weapons of destruction have been stoc piled. and if ever they arc used, mankind itself may be annihilated.

In this context, it is not a day too soon, Mr. President, to face the issues squarely and boldly. These issues can be evaded any longer only at the peril of humanity. Time has come once again for countries which believe in peaceful coexistence, to assert themselves decisively. It is for this reason that I attach the highest importance to my talks here with you, Mr. President. I need hardly tell you how heartened I feel at the thought that the two of us share fully not only a concern at the present international situation, but also a firm resolve to do whatever we can to arrest these disturbing trends.

Fortunately, pence has many adherents in the world, and those who believe in keeping up an atmosphere of strife and conflict are in a small minority. During the past two or three months, I have had occasion to travel to several countries. I found both governments and peoples everywhere fully supporting the cause of peace. I have no doubt, therefore, Mr. President, that we should persevere in our efforts with determination and dedication. Temporary set-backs should never deter us or dishearten us.

UNITED NATIONS

I believe, Mr. President, that in the ultimate analysis, the future of the world can be assured through the instrumentality of a powerful and active United Nations. It is unfortunate that this international organisation has run into serious difficulties. I would like to avail of this opportunity to appeal to both the Soviet Union and to the United States of America to make renewed efforts for resolving the present deadlock over the costs of U.N. peace-keeping operations, so that once again this international Organisation may begin to function as it should. The preservation of the strength and utility of the United Nations should, I suggest Mr. President, receive our joint attention.

DISARMAMENT

A variety of problems on the international scene keep arising from time to time. There is, for instance, the vital question of disarmament. We have been battling with this issue for a long time indeed. But time has come for us to get down to some concrete steps. The longer we delay, the less the possibility of our succeeding in retrieving the situation. Let us make sure that some progress towards disarmament is made before the point of no-return is reached.

BILATERAL RELATIONS

(Mr. President, I have talked so far of inter-

national issues only because I know these matters are of vital concern to you, as they are to us. I would now like to refer briefly to our bilateral relations. It is a matter of great satisfaction that the relations between our two countries are so close and friendly not only at the level of governments, but, what is more important, at the level of peoples. Visitors from India who come to Yugoslavia, go back with memories of kindness, consideration and warm hospitality everywhere. It is my sincere hope that people from Yugoslavia have similar experiences in my country.

In the economic field, our mutual cooperation and collaboration has grown rapidly in recent years. The trade has increased several fold, and vet all the opportunities have not been exhausted. I would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude and thankfulness to you for the generous economic assistance which Yugoslavia has extended to my country. I am confident, Mr. President, that our friendly relations will get still closer as a result of this visit, and our faith in each other, which stands on unshakable foundations, will get even stronger. I am further confident that India and Yugoslavia, together with other countries who are similarly wedded to the pursuit of peace, will persevere Jointly and continuously to assist in finding ways and means for resolving international differences and for promoting goodwill and harmony.

I want to close this address by wishing you, my brothers and sisters of Yugoslavia, continuing success and all prosperity. I would now

150

request you to join me in drinking to the health of His Excellency the President and Madame Broz, and of ail the people of this valiant and friendly country.

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA LATVIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's Speech at a Luncheon by the Mayor of Belgrade

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following speech at a luncheon given in his honour by the Mayor of Belgrade on July 31, 1965 :

I cannot describe adequately how deeply touched I am by the welcome accorded to me by the people and leaders of Yugoslavia. It has created a tremendous impression on my mind. All guests were treated to a vegetarian meal at the official luncheon given by the Prime Minister of Yugoslavia in my honour on the day of my arrival. Similarly, all guests have been treated to a vegetarian meal at the Mayor's luncheon on the last day of my stay in your country. This only shows that you respect our sentiments,

The pages of Yugoslav history are full of deeds of valour. You fought for freedom on a number of occasions. Now at last the destiny of your nation is in your hands and you are leading your country towards prosperity. Under the dynamic leadership of Marshall Tito, you have developed new methods successfully. What we admire most is your independent policy and your independent outlook. You are evolving your own economic programme under which producers and kisans are proposed to be given more remunerative prices. It is a wise policy. It is also our endeavour to ensure remunerative prices to cultivators.

COMMON OBJECTIVE

It is the common objective of our two countries to provide the basic necessities of life to the common man and to raise the living standards. of the people. We both are interested in the production of more goods. We want a social order which will enable people to participate in the social and economic life of the country more actively.

There are two fundamental questions facing the world-(I) to bring about a new social order and to raise the living standard of the people so

that no part of the world lives in poverty and (2) to ensure peace in the world so that economic development can take place unhindered.

Yugoslavia, under the leadership of Marshal Tito, has made a contribution in both these directions. Yugoslavia has kept aloft the torch of peace and economic progress. I am confident that we will be able to learn a lot from Yugoslavia.

India and Yugoslavia have had very close relations during the last ten years. I have no doubt that my visit has further strengthened these relations. I hope India and Yugoslavia will continue to come closer to each other. It is difficult to find an example of any two nations being so close to each other; there is hardly a parallel for such friendship.

The welcome accorded to us by the Yugoslav people and leaders has created a deep impression on my mind. It is difficult to forget this experience. I shall cherish for long the memory of my visit to Yugoslavia. We reciprocate the love and friendship of the Yugoslav people.

May I propose a toast to the health of President Tito, Premier Stambolic and the Mayor.

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's Television Speech in Belgrade

The following is the text of a speech made by the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, on the Television in Belgrade on July 31, 1965 :

I am very happy indeed to have had this opportunity of visiting Yugoslavia and meeting

your great national hero, President Tito, Madame Broz, your Prime Minister and his colleagues, and am greatly touched by the warm and affectionate reception with which my wife and myself have been received everywhere. I am especially thankful to you, all my friends, for your cordial and friendly welcome. On behalf of the people of my country, I extend to you hearty greetings and warm good wishes.

MUTUAL COOPERATION

India and Yugoslavia have been close friends for more than a decade now. During this period,

151

both political and economic relations have developed rapidly, and the two countries have cooperated in many fields of activity. My current visit to Yugoslavia and my discussions with the leaders of your Government have convinced me that our mutual relations will not only grow friendlier and stronger, but also find new avenues for fruitful cooperation. You may be aware that at the United Nations and in international forums the representatives of India and Yugoslavia keep themselves in close touch and work together. President Tito and myself, both, consider it necessary that every opportunity should be taken to strengthen our mutual cooperation.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

The most vital issue before the world today is that of the preservation of peace. India and Yugoslavia have always stood for peace. They believe that if mankind is not to be annihilated, all the countries, of the world should agree to live together in an atmosphere of mutual goodwill and respect. That is why we adhere strongly to the principles of peaceful co-existence. We believe that each country should have the fullest liberty to pursue such economic and political policies as are best suited to the requirements of its own people, without any interference, direct or indirect, from outside. Fortunately, besides Yugoslavia and India, there are so many other countries who sincerely believe that peaceful coexistence and nonalignment are the best of policies to be pursued with a view to keeping world free from tensions and conflicts.

ABIDING FRIENDSHIP

The people of Yugoslavia know the horrors of war. They have fought valiantly in the defence of their country and have undergone many hardships. In the years after the war, Yugoslavia has built itself up economically in a remarkable manner. I am particularly happy to see the progress which your great country has made under the dynamic leadership of President Tito. Many industries have been developed, and the people are enjoying continuously improving standards of living. I wish all success to the efforts which are being made in your country for further development, and I wish you all prosperity and happiness. I am confident that the abiding friendship between the peoples of India and Yugoslavia will be further strengthened in the years to come.

152

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA **Date :** Jul 01, 1965

August

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vol. XI AUGUST 8

No.

CONTENTS

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS ES

PAG

President's Independence Day Message 3	15
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in the Disarmament Commission 5 India's Letters to the Security Council on Pakistan's Attempt to Kashmir Issue 16 2	
PAKISTAN Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Kutch Agreement 64 Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Kutch Agreemen	1 t 1
66 Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation on Kashmir Situation 68	1
Defence Minister's Statement in Parliament on Pakistani Armed Kashmir 1 69	Attack on
UGANDA Prime Minister's Speech at a Dinner in honour of Dr. Obote 73	1
Reply by Dr. Obote 1 75	
Dr. Obote's Speech at a Dinner in honour of Prime Minister Lal Shastri 1 76	Bahadur
Reply by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri 77	1
India-Uganda Joint Communique 77	1
YUGOSLAVIA Indo-Yugoslav Joint Communique 79	1
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA	

USA INDIA PAKISTAN UGANDA YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Independence Day Message

Broadcasting to the nation on the eve of the Independence Day (August 15), the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, said Friends,

It is a great pleasure for me to say a few words to our nationals at home and abroad on the eve of the eighteenth anniversary of our Independence Day.

Our Constitution which we adopted in 1950 embodies the quest for a more decent world, a better social order, a life for man free from a sense of insecurity and the oppression of the spirit. It emphasises the cardinal principles, of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. It is a revolutionary document which gives our people reasons to hope for a better society and the means to win it, but this revolution has yet a long way to travel. To reach it we should strive to become modern in outlook and dedicated to change.

Ours is an open society based on free press, free speech, free association and the rule of law. Through these we strive to hold our people together, weld the variety of our country into a whole and raise the unity, depth and quality of our life.

We believe in the rights of man, whatever be the colour or creed, caste or community of a person. This requires us to abolish social discrimination and wipe out economic disparities which are the result of poverty, illiteracy and ill-health. To some extent we have succeeded in removing these social and economic barriers; yet many people suffer from social disabilities. The weight of the past in regard to caste restrictions is still oppressive and stifling.

Economic progress is one of the tests of the success of democracy. Through the development Of science and technology we can achieve it. Industrialization is an experience we have to pass through, if we are to survive with honour. It is the great solvent of caste and custom. The socialism we adopt is expected to break down social stratification. By socialism we do not mean merely the State ownership of some basic industries or getting things done under State auspices which might not be done by private enterprise. Our socialism aims at providing the basic necessities of life to the common people. Their aspirations to be adequately fed, clothed, housed and educated should be met speedily, if the situation is not to deteriorate.

For some time past the food situation has been causing considerable concern. In the Last eighteen years we have repeatedly promised to our people to make our country self-sufficient in the matter of foodgrains. But it is still a distant goal. It is true that there has been some improvement over the position which prevailed last year, when the availability of foodgrains, became inadequate and in some States there had been periods of deep anxiety. We took a number of measures to control the situation, including summary trials of hoarders and profiteers. We set up fair price shops to ensure equitable distribution of the available supplies. We are now considering statutory rationing in cities. It is our obligation to see to it that the measures we adopt are implemented fully and fairly. Administrative efficiency and honesty are called for.

In any scheme of increasing agricultural production, the farmer is the pivot. He has to be assured of a price for the produce, which will act as an incentive for increasing production. An Agriculture Prices Commission has been set up to keep the situation under constant review and recommend suitable prices for agriculture produce.

In spite of increased food production, with the onset of the lean season, the prices are showing an upward trend. Our Government is aware of the serious difficulties facing us and is taking steps to improve the position. These steps, I dare say, will be taken speedily and effectively.

Our dependence on imports of food produces a mood of complacency and creates a sense of false security. We have to work for a selfreliant, self-sufficient economy. National planning is essential with regard to procurement of food and its distribution. A new momentum will have to be imparted to agricultural production. Minor irrigation projects and small industries are to be spread all over the country. The Fourth Plan will Jay special emphasis on the essential requirements of rural development.

Since independence, the economic policies of our Government have, been framed with the object of promoting economic development and securing for the people a steady improvement in their standards of living. In the course of three Five Year Plans, we may claim some success in this matter, but we have to go a long way to reach the state of self-sustained economic growth. Some of our industrial machinery remains unused for lack of raw materials which we have to import.

In the last two years, the burden of defence has been added to that of development and our economy has been under considerable strain. The sharp increase in prices and the difficult foreign exchange situation are illustration of it. Our objective is to realise, as speedily as possible, economic independence. This means that we have to strive hard to achieve progressive increases in productivity, savings and exports. We may have to adopt austerity measures which should apply to all, the affluent and the poor, the high and the low.

Our problems are getting more numerous and complicated. Any hasty or wrong decision with regard to any of them has harmful effects. The problems that we face are undoubtedly difficult but they are by no means insurmountable. With courage and with faith in our ideals and our convictions, we must march ahead. Group rivalries in some of the States which are of the nature of internal struggles for power are affecting our administration, and setting a bad example to the youth. We should aim at the welfare of the nation and work for it with the discipline of detachment.

What has sustained us all these centuries is our direction towards the creative spirit. We found our supreme mission in the kingdom of the spirit, in the struggle of ideas and moral principles. We do not belittle the body and its needs but we recognise the importance of the inner life. The most formidable defence of our country lies in the sacrificial spirit of our people and the support which we can derive from our industrial economy.

Education is the chief means by which we can transform our society. Through it we can purge our minds of age-old prejudices and set our faces against the trivialities of life. The future depends on what we are in our thoughts and actions.

Indiscipline or disrespect for authority is the direct antithesis of democracy and social order. Students in particular have to realise the social consequences of their acts. Better relations between students and teachers will improve the general atmosphere in educational institutions.

Teachers, who occupy an important place in our society, deserve to be treated well. In these days of high prices, the salaries they get cannot be regarded as adequate. We have to select competent teachers at all levels and provide them with the requisite facilities, including freedom from perpetual worry about the elemental necessities of life.

Our world is now unified as never before. We should see to it that disputes are settled by law and reason. AU forms of violence are symbols of human failure. As responsible human beings, in this nuclear age, it should be our objective to work for a policy of peace, friendship and disarmament. If we profess fidelity to the principles and institutions of the United Nations and use military power in our actual dealings to enforce our views, we will be condemned as hypocrites. If we believe in peaceful co-existence and not power politics we should not look upon our enemies with disdain and we should not assume that we are always right and our enemies always wrong. We must achieve a world of law and free choice, banishing from it violence and coercion. Not merely charity, but humane, peaceful settlement of international disputes should also begin at home.

We are living in a highly dangerous world. We tremble with horror at the spread of death and destruction in Vietnam. There are two possibilities open, enlargement of the war with its dreadful consequences or a negotiated settlement even if the latter means some sacrifice. We should support the efforts now being made to restore peace in Vietnam. Nothing in the realm of human affairs is inevitable. The game is not lost, so long as we act on the assumption that it can be won. Let us act with courage and decision in all matters concerning our internal politics and international relations.

154

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA VIETNAM **Date** : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in the Disarmament Commission

Shri V. C. Trivedi, India's Representative, made, the following statement at the 223rd session of the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva on August 12, 1965

It is a matter of considerable, gratification to the Indian Delegation that our Committee has reconvened this summer after a long recess. All of us are convinced of the earnest desire of the peace-loving peoples of the world for the continuance of patient but purposeful negotiations on issues of disarmament and we are happy that we have once again resumed our negotiations in this Committee. Personally, I am also proud of the privilege of joining my colleagues on the Committee after a long absence.

in this context, the Indian Delegation would like to place on record their appreciation of the agreement of the two Co-Chairmen, representing the U.S. and the Soviet Union, to reconvene the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. We have always believed that all of us, countries large and small, have a significant role to play in the quest of humanity for peace and security. At the same time, we are aware that international progress in this direction depends in a great measure on the cooperative efforts of the leaders of these two great and powerful countries. This is particularly valid in respect of the issues that we negotiate in this Committee. The two superpowers have at their disposal an awesome panoply of destructive power and it is to them primarily that the nations of the world look for bringing the world back to the path of stability and sanity. It is, therefore, a matter of great satisfaction to us that, thanks to the agreement between the Co-Chairmen, we are once again engaged in the most urgent and vital task facing humanity today, namely, negotiations on issues of disarmament as well as reduction of tensions and building of mutual confidence,

It is in this spirit that we welcomed the initiative of the Soviet Union to convene the Disarmament Commission in April this year. This initiative led to a fruitful and constructive debate on the basic: problems which arise in any consideration of disarmament and eventually the Commission was able to adopt two resolutions with overwhelming majorities. These two resolutions represent the combined I will and the common aspirations of the international community as a whole. The deliberations of the Disarmament Commission, which lasted for nearly two months had a message, and that message is aptly contained in these two resolutions.

It is necessary, therefore, that we devote some attention to these resolutions which received the massive support of the membership of the United Nations. As it happened, both these resolutions were tabled by large groups of non-aligned delegations and we of the Indian Delegation were highly gratified at the part we were privileged to play in the success of the resolution.

The first resolution dealt with the question of the convening of a World Disarmament Conference. Following the proposal made by the Heads of State and Government of non-Aligned countries in Cairo in October, 1964, this resolution recommended to the General Assembly of the United Nations to give urgent consideration to that proposal. We have no doubt that the General Assembly will devote its full attention to this recommendation and examine the various issues relative to the successful holding of a fruitful conference. References have been made to this resolution in our debate and I think it is useful to clarify some of its aspects. As we all know, the international community has been devoting attention to questions of disarmament long before the United Nations came into existence. The very first resolution of the United Nations related to an aspect of disarmament. Recently, however, and particularly since the establishment of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, these issues have been debated, studied and negotiated more exhaustively and comprehensively than ever before.

International consideration of the problems of disarmament has all along followed two courses. Firstly, as disarmament is a matter of vital concern to the entire mankind and reflects the hopes and aspirations of the peoples all over the world, it has been discussed in various bodies representing the nations of the world. The Disarmament Commission, the First Committee of the General Assembly and the Assembly in its plenary sessions have deliberated fruitfully, and adopted appropriate resolutions, on the questions of disarmament. The representatives of the non-aligned nations who assembled first in Belgrade in September, 1961 and then in Cairo in October, 1964, believed it was also desirable to have another and more representative gathering to deliberate on this issue. The Disarmament Commission

155

agreed to this recommendation. and we have no doubt that the U.N. General Assembly will also agree to it and adopt appropriate preparatory steps towards an early convocation of that Conference.

I spoke of two courses or methods. The first method is thus that of considering the questions of disarmament in deliberative bodies or ad hoc gatherings like the Disarmament Commission, the General Assembly, regional and other Conferences and the World Disarmament Conference. The second course is that of negotiation as distinct from deliberation. It is realised by all persons, who have thought seriously about disarmament, that it is not possible to negotiate details of disarmament either of a treaty on General and Complete Disarmament or of agreements on collateral measures in a large body, ad hoc or permanent, of 114 or 120 or so representatives meeting for comparatively short periods. Such negotiations need long, patieat and technical consideration and scrutiny by a smaller group. Negotiations on disarmament have, therefore, been conducted in smaller Committees of Experts, whether consisting of five representatives or ten or seventeen. As it has been generally appreciated, we have now established, after a period of trial and error, an appropriate body-the Eighteen-Nation Committeeto deal with the task of negotiation. as distinct from the task of debate, deliberation and adoption of resolutions on broad issues of disarmament.

Speaking on behalf of the sponsors of this resolution in the Disarmament Commission, therefore, I emphasised this point in some detail. In fact, the resolution of the Disarmament Commission on the World Disarmament Conference recognised the importance of the efforts being made both in the fields of deliberation and negotiation and emphasised that a debate in a forum like the World Disarmament Conference would give powerful support to the praiseworthy efforts which were being made all the time. This, in fact, was what the Cairo Conference felt and was what the Disarmament Commission approved. What was needed, the Commission said, was that the process set in motion by the U.N. bodies and by our Committee should be developed further. It cannot be the function of the World Disarmament Conference to undertake any detailed negotiations on disarmament nor should it equally be the task of the E.N.D.C. to devote its attention to the deliberative or debating aspect of disarmament.

I have spoken at some length on this matter as I wish to emphasise unequivocally that the task of our Committee-the E.N.D.C.-still remains, and will continue to remain, as essential as it is urgent. The great contribution that the Cairo concept made in that regard was to support the continuing international efforts on disarmament, as fully reflected in the preamble of the resolution of the Commission.

The membership of the Disarmament Commission was of course already conscious of this twocourse approach. Appropriately, therefore, it passed two resolutions, the first dealing with the proposal of a more representative deliberative conference and the second dealing with the question of negotiations.

The second resolution is thus of direct concern to our work in this Committee. In this connection, I think it is useful to devote some attention to the relevance of the various provisions of the resolution to the question of our programme of work. It has been suggested that this resolution requires that we devote our discussions mainly to two issues, namely, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and a comprehensive test ban treaty. To our mind, this is not the import of this resolution. In fact, the operative paragraph 2 of the resolution has several sub-paragraphs and the 'very first sub-paragraph clearly refers to the urgency of efforts to develop a treaty on General and Complete Disarmament and to consider the various proposals made during the debate in the Commission. The Soviet Union and many other countries made some very pertinent proposals particularly in regard to the reduction and eventual removal of foreign troops and foreign bases and to a conference to consider the question of a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union, in fact, advanced these ideas in the form of two draft resolutions. Similarly the U.S. and other countries put forward some promising ideas, including a freeze on production of certain nuclear delivery vehicles and a freeze on production and transference of fissile material to peaceful purposes. The U.S. also put its ideas down in the form of a draft resolution.

What I wish to emphasise is that the Disarmament Commission certainly did not, even if it were in a position to do so, preclude discussion in our Committee on any of these subjects. That was certainly not the intention of Me authors of the draft resolution nor was it, as I said, the final view of the Commission. We have, therefore, to consider seriously these issues, particularly those raised by the Big Powers.

Sub-paragraph 2(a) of the resolution is thus of as much importance as other sub-paragraphs and we hope that we shall be able to devote attention to the, question of General and Complete Disarmament and to other collateral measures "to relax international tension and halt and reverse the arms race". I appreciate, of course, that time is the crucial factor and that we shall need to organise our programme of work bearing in mind the limited time at our disposal.

The second sub-paragraph referred to the question of extending the scope of the present Partial Test Ban Treaty to cover underground tests and desired that this be considered as a matter of priority. In our mind and in the mind of many non-aligned delegations, this is easily the most urgent and the most important task facing the Committee at this stage. We do not have much time before the General Assembly takes up items on disarmament and we believe that this is one field in which it is possible to report at least some progress. The Commission also gave, special priority to the question of a treaty or convention to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and a programme of certain related measures. On consideration of the requirements of time, ripeness for solution, urgency and the political and disarmament value of the measure, however, we believe that it is essential for us to devote particular and primary attention to the question of reaching agreement on a comprehensive test ban.

The Indian position on this issue is well known. We have maintained that all nuclear tests are basically evil. They encourage evil and sooner this evil is dealt with the better. We raised our voice against these explosions right from their unfortunate inception and over eleven years ago, we addressed an appeal to the Disarmament Commission and the Sub-Sommittee on Disarmament to consider immediately the question of a stand-still agreement in respect of these test explosions pending progress towards some solution, full or partial, in respect of prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

We have consistently advanced this view all throughout and have particularly emphasised the deleterious genetic and somatic effects of test explosions. We said so again a couple of months ago when the Peoples' Republic of China exploded a second nuclear weapons device in the atmosphere as a direct and callous affront to all humanity even when the Disarmament Commission was actually in session. It is a sad commentary on the state of the world when a country flouts with impunity the combined will of the rest of the world and wages a blatant attack on the health of humanity.

I appreciate that we in this Committee can only

156

express our anguish and our regret that this has happened. As a negotiating forum, however. we should look forward. and the step that we look forward to is the achievement of a comprehensive test ban treaty, or to use the language of the Disarmament Commission resolution, extension of "the scope of the partial test ban treaty to cover underground tests". This is also the message that our Committee gave at the conclusion of its 221st meeting.

The Indian Delegation has already formulated its views at the last session of the Committee in the memorandum appended to the Committee's report. We said: "We consider it imperative, that all underground tests should be discontinued immediately, either by unilateral decisions based on the policy of mutual example or in some other appropriate way, while negotiations are going on for reconciling the differences between the nuclear powers". We put forward a further suggestion for the consideration of the nuclear powers. We said that they might enter into another partial treaty for cessation of tests above a limited threshold and that this threshold could be lowered subsequently as a result of the exchange of scientific and other data and of appropriate- negotiations. Lest there be any misunderstanding, we should like to clarify that such scientific exchanges were suggested for the specific purpose of lowering the initially-agreed threshold.

It was nearly a year ago that we presented this memorandum. Since then, there has been further technological progress in the fields of detection and verification and if at all, our conviction has grown stronger that it is desirable for the nuclear powers to take a bold decision, and for the sake of argument, some theoretical risks in order to achieve one more significant landmark in our path of progress towards disarmament

The nuclear powers have taken such decisions in the past and the peoples of the world owe a debt of gratitude to the wisdom and the vision of the leaders of these powerful and peace-loving nations. Humanity continues to hope that the Big Powers will once again institute a measure like the joint agreed principles, the partial test ban treaty, the prohibition of orbiting of weapons of mass destruction in outer space and the reduction in production of fissile material for weapons purposes. These were bold decisions and theoretically there were some risks involved. We trust that the nuclear Powers will follow the same highminded pattern and achieve a satisfactory agreement in our Committee so that this evil of underground explosions is eliminated for ever from the earth. Delay only gives false excuses to the chauvinists among us who glorify war and to whom peaceful co-existence is a crime.

Then there was paragraph 2(c) of the resolution of the Disarmament Commission, which recommended that special priority be accorded also "to the consideration of the question of a treaty or convention to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, giving close attention to the various suggestions that agreement could be facilitated by adopting a programme of certain related measures".

The Indian Delegation expressed its considered views on the subject in the debate in the Cornmission. Although there were variations in emphasis or detail, these views received the support of a large number of speakers. They were in agreement with the basic thesis that it was unrealistic

157

to ask countries to forswear for ever a programme of nuclear weapons production, when the existing nuclear powers continued to hold on to their awesome arsenals.

It is not only the nonaligned delegations who support this thesis. In his message to the Cornmince on its resumption, the Secretary General said : "nose who have already embarked upon nuclear weapons development continue to perfect and increased their stockpile of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, a growing number of States capable of nuclear weapons development will be faced with extremely grave decisions in this area which will have profound repercussions. Responsibility and restraint are needed on the part of both the nuclear and non-nuclear States. Decisions in the field of nuclear weapons development have a contagious and cumulative effect whether in the 'curbing or in the broadening of the nuclear arms race". Countries belonging to the two power blocs have also appreciated the logic and rationality of this approach. In his statement at the 220th meeting, Mr. Tsarapkin referred to the question of elimination of already accumulated nuclear material, "although it is precisely those

materials which constitute the threat. A long time ago, the Soviet Union put forward the Gromyko proposal designed to reduce the existing nuclear delivery vehicles to the lowest minimum level in the first stage of disarmament. We have had occasion to commend to this Committee the principle underlying this thesis. Philosophers tell us that it is wrong to talk of what might have been but we venture to think that if our suggestion had found favour at that time, the international community would not have been facing today what our friends call a prospect of nuclear anarchy.

I spoke of both the power blocs. In the Disarmament Commission, Lord Chalfont said : "There is an imperative need to make a start here and now down the long road we have to travel. The first priority is to halt and reverse the direction of the present uncontrolled arms race, and particularly the mounting production of these evercostlier weapons of mass destruction. That is the central problem which poses a growing danger for all of us. It lies right at the heart of any discussion about disarmament. We believe that even now, at this moment, the order and stability of the world could be assured by a reduction of nuclear weapons to lower, safer and less-costly levels". Again, referring to the perverse and incomprehensible notion of nuclear clubs and monopolies, he said : "Much of this, it must be said quite bluntly, is the fault of the existing nuclear powers". In a recent debate in the House of Commons, the British Prime Minister referred to the draft of a non-proliferation treaty which the United Kingdom was working on and said : "This treaty is not based on any exclusive attempt to preserve nuclear privileges for a small group of powers

In the July issue of the Foreign Affairs, Mr. Foster contributed one of the most thoughtprovoking articles on disarmament ever written on the subject. To be sure, one may not agree with everything that Mr. Foster has said in that article, but we note that in his excellent survey of the situation, he said : "in stressing that such measures as reductions in Soviet and American nuclear capabilities are important if we are to succeed in dealing with nuclear proliferation, it should be made clear that it is not a question of our setting a good example, a factor of regrettably little influence in international affairs, but rather the fact that we would, by negotiating such measures, be giving evidence of our determination to reverse the arms race and move towards a world order in which the role of nuclear weapons would be diminished. Lacking at least reasonable prospects of movement in this direction, it is hard to see how, in the long run, we can hope to put any limits on the membership in the nuclear club".

The distinguished Foreign Minister of Italy spoke to us only a few days ago and suggested that a thorough consideration be given by the Committee to the idea of a commitment by the nuclear countries to a certain programme of nuclear disarmament in the context of an agreement on nonproliferation. -

I do not wish to burden the Committee with more quotations. The non-aligned delegations have indeed spoken on many occasions on this central theme, namely the unrealistic and the irrational proposition that a non-proliferation treaty should impose obligations only on non-nuclear powers, while the nuclear powers continue to hold an to their privileged status or club membership by retaining and even increasing their deadly stockpiles. The Heads of State and Government who assembled in Cairo in October 1964 particularly asked the nuclear powers to conclude non-dissemination agreements and to agree on measures providing for the gradual liquidation of the existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. They said that it was as part of these efforts that the nonnuclear countries would declare their readiness not to produce or acquire these weapons.

Here we must make a clear and unambiguous distinction between. the national decisions of countries on the one hand and the obligations to be assumed by them as signatories to an international instrument, on the other. As you know, India is the only country besides the four nuclear powers, who has got a chemical separation plant in operation, producing kilogramme quantities of plutonium. If any country wishes to embark on a nuclear weapons programme, it must have a chemical seperation plant or a gaseous diffusion plant. India is the only non-nuclear weapon country which has this facility. And yet our Prime Minister has repeatedly declared that India

158

does not intend to enter the nuclear weapon race. It believes that nuclear energy must be used only for peaceful purposes. But this is our national decision, a decision which we have taken on a through examination of relevant political, economic and strategic factors and we are determined to stand firm in our decision.

An international treaty is, however, a different proposition What we are discussing in this Committee is not the national decisions of countries but the international requirements of a rational realistic and non-discriminatory agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. What we are examining is the needs of the international community, not of individual nations. It is in that context that we put forward our five-point intograted approach in the Disarmament Commission and it is in that context that we ye dealing with that problem in this Committee.

When we are talking, therefore, of non-proliferation, the fundamental problem we have to consider is that of the proliferation that has already taken place. The Oxford Dictionary defines the word 'proliferate as follows : "Reproduce itself, grow, by multiplication of elementary parts". We are talking about proliferation of nuclear weapons not of the proliferation of a socalled closed club. The relevant pre-ambular paragraph of the resolution of the Disarmament Commission thus says : "convinced that failure to conclude a universal treaty or agreement to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons leads to the most serious consequences.

A non-proliferation agreement is, therefore, basically an agreement to be entered into by the nuclear powers not to proliferate nuclear weapons. Other provisions are consequential and subsidiary. A prohibition to proliferate applies firstly to those who are in a position to proliferate or reproduce themselves and on secondarily to those who may subsequently be in such a position.

No international treaty can, therefore, be acceptable which issues dictates only to non-nuclear countries not to do this or that, particularly when the countries possessing nuclear weapons do not assume any prior commitments themselves. In India, we have a word in our language derived from the name of an emperor who lived in the seventeenth century. He himself was a drunkard, but he prohibited drinking in the empire and his name has for ever been associated with such un-

just fiats.

We have all been talking of the desperate urgency of a non-proliferation agreement; but it appears to me that the basis of such urgency is different among different speakers. There is urgency in everything connected with disarmament, but relatively speaking, the urgency of stopping non-nuclear countries from producing nuclear weapons is so, minor compared to that of stopping the existing nuclear menace. As we said in the Disarmament Commission, "unless the nuclear powers and a would-be nuclear power undertake from now on not to produce any nuclear weapon or weapon delivery vehicle and, in addition, agree to reduce their existing stockpile of nuclear weapons, there is no way of doing away with the proliferation that has already taken place or of preventing further proliferation.

in this connection I would like to say a word on the use of the word "further" in regard to proliferation. We are unable to understand the relevance of this word in the pre-sent stage. There was no doubt a time when the use of that word had some meaning. That is no longer the position now. The question that we ask is "how further is further?" The world has gone beyond the days of 2 nuclear powers, who further became 3, who further became 4 and now further a 5th country wants to force itself into this dangerous club. How long then shall we be using the word "further"? What shall we say after 10 or 20 countries have thought it fit to indulge in this deadly game? Shall we still use the word "further"? Or is there, any sacred number or date beyond which proliferation becomes further proliferation?

It is essential, therefore, that we deal with the fundamental problem of the existing proliferation. Further proliferation is in fact a consequence of existing proliferation and unless we deal with the disease itself, we can effect no cure. By ignoring the disease and trying to deal with vague symptoms and unreal lists of probable nuclear countries, we shall only make the disease more intractable.

I referred to the 5-point proposal put forward by us in the Disarmament Commission. We said that this was an integrated programme and that adoption of one or two isolated measures within that programme was not adequate. We particularly referred in this context to the question of an undertaking through the United Nations to safeguard the security of non-nuclear nations. There seems to be a feeling in some quarters that an attempt to meet this requirement in some measure or the other would be adequate. As far as we are concerned, this is not a correct or complete reading of our proposal. I do not wish to go at this stage into the credibility or otherwise of such an undertaking nor into its difficult mechanics. All I wish to say is that this particular point is not the basic feature of our proposal. What we wished to do was to present a comprehensive proposal and we included certain peripheral elements for the sake of comprehensiveness. These peripheral elements have a certain moral and psychological value, but that is all. The basic feature of the proposal is, however,

159

the one relating to "tangible progress towards disarmament, including a comprehensive test ban treaty, a complete freeze on production of nuclear weapons and means of delivery as well as a substantial reduction in the existing stocks". For a rational and acceptable treaty on non-dissemination, this is the essential requirement, the others are peripheral.

At this stage, it is necessary to remove a misunderstanding. We are not trying to embrace a wide field of disarmament in our approach on nonproliferation. There are scores of measures of disarmament and we all know that draft treaties on disarmament presented by the two sides cover numerous aspects of the process of achievement of a disarmed world. What we suggest, namely, a stoppage of production of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles and reduction in their stockpiles is only a small part of the comprehensive programme of disarmament and we refer to this small part in the context of non-proliferation because that is the real cause of proliferation, or I should say, the real essence of non-proliferation.

In this context, I should like to refer again to the important statement made by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Italy. He referred to the obstacles facing agreement on an acceptable treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and mentioned the misgivings of non-nuclear nations about renouncing these weapons for ever without some progress in nuclear disarmament by the nuclear countries themselves. Mr. Fanfani then went on to say : "But if it were not possible within a reasonable time to prepare such a draft comprising obligations both for the nuclear countries and for the non-nuclear countries, the Italian delegation would reserve the right to appeal to the non-nuclear countries to take an initiative which, without prejudice to their own points of view, would establish a certain period for a moratorium on the possible dissemination of nuclear weapons. One could imagine that the non-nuclear countries, in particular those closeto nuclear capability, might agree to renounce unilaterally equipping themselves with nuclear arms for a predetermined length of time, it being understood of course that if their demands, referred to above, were not met during that time limit they would resume their freedom of action"!

This is certainly a fine sentiment and deserves respect not only because it is expressed by the distinguished Foreign Minister of a great country but also because it can perhaps be dovetailed into a satisfactory and rational arrangement.

As we have said the fundamental issue of nonproliferation is that of halting and reversing the existing proliferation. It is on this central theme that we have formulated our five-point pro. gramme. Comments have been made that this integrated programme, although it is rational, is not capable of immediate implementation. We, ourselves, do not think that a programme of this nature is beyond the wisdom and the capacity of nations. At the same time, I appreciate that it is possible to conceive of a staggered programme of action, bearing in mind of course the integral nature of the programme as a whole.

The problem of proliferation admittedly relates to nuclear and non-nuclear powers, primarily to the former and secondarily to the latter. In view of this, I wonder if it is possible to envisage a treaty or convention in two stages, the first stage relating to nuclear and the second stage relating to non-nuclear powers. the transition from the first stage to the second stage being regulated by the Fanfani appeal.

What I would, therefore, like to suggest for the consideration of the Committee is a programme of the following nature. The first stage of the treaty, or call it the partial treaty like the one on nuclear tests, for example, should incorporate provisions which are the obligations of the nuclear powers. Under this partial treaty, the nuclear powers will firstly undertake not to pass on weapons or technology to others under a formula acceptable to the two power blocs. Secondly, they will cease all production of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles and agree to begin a programme of reduction of their existing stocks. Thirdly, they may also agree to incorporate in this partial treaty the other measures suggested by us in our five-point programme as these provisions have a moral and psychological value.

This would be the first stage of the treaty or a Partial Non-proliferation Treaty. After this treaty comes into force and steps have been taken by the nuclear powers to stop all production and embark on reduction of stocks, there will be the second stage of the treaty or the comprehensive treaty, which will provide for an undertaking by non-nuclear powers not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons. The transition between the first stage and the second stage of the treaty or between the Partial Treaty and the Comprehensive Treaty may be regulated by the formula suggested by Mr. Fanfani.

It appears to me that this may be another way of dealing with the question of non-proliferation if it is not possible to agree immediately on a comprehensive treaty based on our five-point proposal. The basic fact remains, however, and it is that the present unstable and dangerous state of affairs has resulted from the proliferation that has already taken place and that it is an early removal of that state of affairs which will make a comprehensive non-proliferation treaty realistic and abiding. As long as we are clear about the diagnosis of the disease, it is not difficult to find appropriate remedies.

160

Our ultimate objective is clear. In the economic field, the "have nots" have adopted for themselves programmes of economic development so that eventually, with international co-operation, they increase their national wealth and become haves". Conversely, in the disarmament field, our objective is to achieve, in a spirit of mutual compromise and accommodation, a situation under which the "haves" reduce their war arsenals and eventually become "have-nots".

An opposition to the concept of nuclear monopoly or privileged club-membership is thus our fundamental response in any examination of a draft treaty or convention on non-proliferation It is pertinent to note in this connection that references are being made in various places to an extraneous matter, which has only marginal relevance to the question of non-poliferation of nuclear weapons or to that of disarmament as such. I am referring to the suggestion relating to the institution of I.A.E.A. or similar international safeguards over the peaceful nuclear activities of nations. Of course, the question of safeguards against diversion of nuclear materials for weapons purposes as a separate issue deserves our earnest consideration and we have welcomed the decision of the U.S. Government and others to place some of their reactors under I.A.E.A. control. I am only referring here to the question of a treaty on non-proliferation.

The Government of India have had occasion to express their views on this subject in many forums including the I.A.E.A. and I had made a statement in this Committee itself last year. I do not, therefore, wish to go in to this issue in any detail at this stage.

Institution of international controls on peaceful reactors and power stations is like the attempt to maintain law and order in a society by Placing all its law-abiding citizens in custody, while leaving its law-breaking elements free to roam the streets. I suppose one can say that this is one way of keening the peace, but surely. It is more rational to keep the law-breaking elements under restraint rather than to do so to the law abiding citizens. Re-actors engaged on peaceful pursuits and atomic power station of the developing countries do not in themselves nose any threat to the security of the international society. It is the chemical separation plants and the gaseous diffusion Plants which Produce the fissile material used in bombs and it is these facilities which need to be controlled in any system of controlled disarmament. If one wishes to control swords, one need not impose control on pig iron plants, but only on factories which manufacture steel for the swords. Any proposal therefore, which contemplates international control only on the peaceful activities of reactors and power plants but

leaves free the vast weapon-producing facilities of nuclear powers--their gaseous diffusion plants -does not attempt to tackle the real problem.

Here again, I am. referring to international treaties and conventions as distinct from national decisions. We in India, for example, have perfectly satisfactory arrangements for safeguards with friends who have assisted us in the past and we are determined to observe and implement them. But that is entirely different from entering into an international instrument providing for I.A.E.A. or other international safeguards over the reactors and power stations of the developing countries.

Before I end, I would like to refer to paragraph 2(d) of the second resolution of the Disarmament Commission. All that this recommended was that we should keep in mind the principle of converting to a programme of economic and social development of the developing countries a substanial part of the resources gradually released by the reduction of military expenditure. The Committee was not asked to negotiate on this matter. It was only a kind of background which we had to keep in mind in our negotiations on actual measures of disarmament and reduction of tensions. In his statement before the Disarmament Commission, Lord Chalfont spoke of the philosophy of the British Government on the close link between defence and disarmament and of the need of its defence policy to contain within itself the seeds of future progress towards disarmament. Similarly there is a link between disarmament and the availability of capital and technological resources for the development of developing countries. All that the resolution says, therefore, is that we should bear this link in mind when we talk of disarmament and negotiate measures of disarmament.

I mention this at this stage as it has some relevance to the question of safeguards on atomic reactors. In the developing countries. there reactors, are instruments of economic development and we should give careful thought before considering any Proposal which, without achieving anything really worthwhile in the field of genuine disarmament, only hinders the economic development of developing countries.

I would like to conclude with the stirring appeal made by His Holiness the Pope only last

Sunday. He denounced these nuclear weapons as disastrous and dishonourable weapons" and said: "We pray that all shall ban the awful technique which creates these weapons. multiplies and stores them for the terror of mankind and we pray that such death-dealing weapons have not killed world peace even in attempting to achieve it nor impaired for ever the honour of of science nor extinguished the serenity of life on earth."

161

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA CHINA ITALY RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Letters to Security Council on Pakistan's Attempt to Confuse Kashmir Issue

shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, delivered on August 27, 1965 the, following two letters to the President of the Security Council protesting against Pakistan's attempt to confuse the Kashmir Issue, and the unlawful signing of the Protocol of the Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement:

I am instructed by my Government to refer to the letter dated April 20, 1965 (S/6292) from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan.

The letter purports to be a reply to my predecessor's letters dated 26, 1964 (E/6125) and March 5, 1965 (S/6218) addressed to you. The Permanent Representative of Pakistan has thus attempted to confuse the issue by referring to two different and mutually exclusive subjects. My predecessor's letter dated December 26, 1964, concerns the legitimate acts of the Indian Union to regulate questions of law and order in one of its constituent States. My predecessor's letter dated March 5, 1965, on the other hand, protests against the illegal actions of the Government of Pakistan in a part of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir which it has unlawfully occupied and which it is committed to vacate. If the Permanent Representative of Pakistan seeks to equate Pakistan's illegal actions with India's constitutional measures, he is only trying to throw dust in the eyes of the members of the Security Council.

In reply to my predecessor's letter of March 5, 1965 (S/6218) the Permanent Representative of Pakistan claims that the so-called "Azad Kashmir Government Act of 1964" was a "legislation of the Azad Kashmir Government". This is a sly attempt to mislead the Security Council into acquiescing in the existence of Pakistan's illegal set-up called the "Azad Kashmir Government". The Council is, no doubt, aware that the U.N.C.I.P. at its twentyninth meeting held on 5 August 1948 decided to "avoid any action which might be interpreted as signifying de facto or de jure recognition of the 'Azad Kashmir Government" (S/1100, para 69). In 1948 Sir Mohammed Zafrullah Khan, then Foreign Minister of Pakistan, informed the Commission that even his own Government had not granted legal recognition to the so-called Azad movement (S/1100, para 132). "The Commission has never negotiated with its representatives; having no international standing, the organisation can have no international responsibility" (S/1430, para 203).

The Pakistan Government cannot therefore seek shelter behind its own creature kept in illusory power by its own guns. The plight of the puppet regime was described by a Pakistani journalist in the Ittefaq, published in Dacca on 8 August, 1964 :

"...... the conditions in Azad Kashmir are such that the Department in Rawalpindi is more powerful than its President. The Joint Secretary of the Kashmir Department is Resident and Adviser. His authority is final"

The Joint Secretary is a Pakistan official appointed by the Government of Pakistan.

The fact of the matter is that the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has no answer to my predecessor's letter of March 5, 1965. Instead, he has taken a flight into fancy and overcrowded his letter with irrelevancies, untruths and halftruths which deceive no one. It was Sheikh Abdullah who stated in Srinagar on 17 October, 1948 :

"The truth of the whole matter is that Pakistan is based on untruth, deceit and fraud. They attacked peaceful Kashmiris, but for a long time denied that they had anything to do with it till at last the United Nations Commission saw things for themselves and unravelled things for Pakistan. Pakistan wanted to enslave us by force of arms. How could we join that Dominion ? On the other hand, India came to our rescue and defended our freedom".

(Address after Id prayers at Idgah, Srinagar. 'National Herald' 17 October, 1948).

I shall be grateful if this communication is circulated to the members of the, Security Council

The following is the text of the second letter :

I have the honour to refer to the letter addressed to you on 17 May, 1965, by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan (S/6360) in reply to my predecessor's letter dated 27 April, 1965 (S/6303) regarding the unlawful signing of the Protocol of the Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement.

The Government of Pakistan's whole case appears to be based on the groundless assumption that 'India's locus standi in respect of Kashmir is no different from, or greater than, that of Pakistan." As it is widely known, the aim of the Security Council Resolution of 17 January, 1948, and the U.N. Commission Resolutions of 13 August, 1948, and 5 January, 1949, all three of which India and Pakistan accepted, was to deny to Pakistan the fruit of its aggression. Several members of the Security Council, permanent and non-permanent, have put it on record that the position of India and Pakistan in Kashmir is not similar, as the following extracts will show :

162

U. S. Representative in the Security Council on 4 February, 1948 :

"External Sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir is no longer under the control of the Maharaja With the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India this foreign sovereignty went over to India and is exercised by India and that is how India happens to be here, as a petitioner."

Representative of U.S.S.R. at the 765th Meeting of the Security Council : "The question of Kashmir has been settled by the people of Kashmir themselves. They decided that Kashmir is an integral part of the Republic of India." Representative of the Netherlands at 611th Meeting of the Security Council :

"We know of course that in 1947 the then ruler of. the State of Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India by an instrument which was accepted by the then Governor General of India, Lord Mountbatten." Representative of Colombia at 768th Meeting of the Security Council

"The Commission never recognised the legality of the presence of Pakistani troops in Kashmir."

Representative of Czechoslovakia in the Security Council on 12 May, 1964 :

"We proceed from the fact that within the scope of the constitutional arrangement that enabled the will of the Kashmir population to be expressed, the question of the home rule position of Kashmir has been solved. In this connection I should like to recall the statement made by our Prime Minister at a Press Conference in Calcutta on 14 April, 1958. When asked by a correspondent, our Prime Minister answered inter alia : 'I consider the Kashmir question to be settled. It was done so in accordance with the will of the Kashmir people. I regard Kashmir as an integral part of the Republic of India."

Representative of Venezuela in the Security Council on 20 June, 1962 (S/PV/1014) :

"Even if Pakistan were to have any doubts regarding the will of the people of Kashmir to unite with India by means of the accession of their State to India, in law Pakistan could not help the rebels-if they were rebels-nor assist the invaders-if they were invadersmuch less could it intervene directly with its regular forces in Kashmir."

The mere fact that the UN Commission considered the presence of Pakistan troops in Jammu and Kashmir a material change in the situation and placed an obligation on Pakistan to withdraw its troops from the State makes it quite clear that Pakistan has no locus standi in the State, much less any authority to negotiate an agreement about Kashmir's border with the Peoples' Republic of China.

No less misleading is the Pakistan Representative's statement : ". . . further, it has been made clear that the Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement fully protects any contingent interest India might have in Kashmir by providing for a renegotiation of the Agreement alter final settlement of the Kashmir dispute". The facts given in paras 2 and 3 above fully expose the hollowness of the suggestion that India has only contingent interest in Jammu and Kashmir. Besides, authoritative statements made by the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China leave no doubt about the attempted misrepresentation by the Pakistan Permanent Representative of the provision for a renegotiation of the Agreement. As far back as 1963, the President of Pakistan was reported by the Dawn of Karachi of 30 March, 1963, to have said :

"Refuting the Indian propaganda that the Pakistan-China Border accord was aimed against India or had violated the UN Security Council Resolution, the President declared that India had no right to interfere in Pakistan's domestic affairs. We are not going to consult India on a matter which is for the betterment of our country.' "

The finality of the border agreement was proudly declared by Chou En-lai who, speaking at a banquet given by the East Pakistan Governor in his honour at Dacca on 24 February, 1964, said :

The Karakorams have become bonds of friendship between the Chinese and Pakistan peoples".

Premier Chou En-lai would not have been so lyrical over a provisional arrangement.

In view of these facts, the language which my predecessor used in para 3 of his letter dated 27 April, 1965, and to which the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has taken exception-namely that the formal signing of the so-called Boundary Protocol by Pakistan and the People's Republic of China is an act of international brigandage-was not only fully justified but was the only way to describe the blatant defiance by Pakistan of the UN Charter and international law. I shall be grateful if this letter is circulated to the members of the Security Council as an official document.

163

INDIA PAKISTAN USA THE NETHERLANDS COLOMBIA NORWAY SLOVAKIA VENEZUELA CHINA LATVIA

Date : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Kutch Agreement

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on August 16, 1965 regarding the Kutch Agreement

Mr. Speaker, Sir,

I beg to move "that the statement laid on the Table of the House by Prime Minister on the 16th August, 1965, on the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat-West Pakistan border be taken into consideration."

The House will recall that the last session of the Lok Sabha devoted considerable time and attention, and rightly so, to the developing situation between India and Pakistan on the Kutch-Sind border culminating in the inroads committed by Pakistani armed forces in the Rann of Kutch. I had made a number of statements in the House. It would be recalled that as a result of Pakistani armed intrusions into the Rann of Kutch and their aggression committed against us, there was serious danger of a military conflict between India and Pakistan, which, in the very nature of things, could not have been confined merely to the Kutch-Sind border. As I said in my statement in this august House on April 28 that was one of the most fateful moments of our times and both India and Pakistan stood poised at the crossroads of history. I made it quite clear then and afterwards that we are a nation pledged to peace, but that, at the same time, we are determined to defend our country.

Throughout those difficult days we were subjected to great provocation. Pakistan did everything to wash away the bridges of peace and to engulf the two countries in a military conflict the consequences of which would have been grave for both. However, the firm steps that we took, including the despatch of troops to the frontiers to meet the threat posed by the concentration of troops on the other side, made Pakistan realise that it could not hope to get away with aggression.

I cannot but make a reference to the present situation as it exists in Kashmir. It is a new situation, full of the most serious potentialities. Large number of raiders in civilian disguise but heavily armed have come across the cease-fire line and are indulging in serious acts of sabotage and destruction. These raiders are being spotted out and dealt with firmly and effectively. The number of those killed, wounded and captured is now fairly large. Our valiant security forces, both army and police, are acting with exemplary valour.

The two situations to which I have made a reference arose at different points of time and I have no doubt whatsoever that the manner in which Government dealt with them was the best possible in the circumstances. I would urge the House to consider the Gujarat-West Pakistan Border Agreement in the light of the stand the Government had taken while the Parliament was still in session and which was stated in this august House on more than one occasion.

May I now refer to the Gujarat-West Pakistan Border Agreement in some detail. As the House is aware, on April 28, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, wrote to me and to President Ayub Khan expressing great concern at the situation that had developed in regard to the Kutch-Sind border. He suggested a cease-fire to be followed by withdrawal of troops and restoration of the status quo on 1st January, 1965 and thereafter talks between the two governments. These proposals basically conformed to the stand consistently taken by the Indian Government in the fruitless exchange of notes which had taken place between the governments of India and Pakistan in the months of March and April. 1, therefore, replied to Mr. Wilson accepting these principles. Thereafter followed a long process of negotiations on details through the intermediary of U.K. High Commissioners in India and Pakistan and the U.K. Government. Eventually, on the 30th June, 1965, an Agreement was signed between India and Pakistan.

The main elements of this Agreement are : A cease-fire on both sides to be followed by withdrawal of forces and restoration of status quo as prevailing on the 1st January, 1965. Once these are accomplished, there is to be a meeting between the Ministers of India and Pakistan and if such meeting is unable to resolve the boundary issue, a three-man impartial tribunal is to be constituted to give its findings on the subject. A time-table is set out in the Agreement for these various steps. The withdrawal of forces from the Rann of Kutch is to be completed within seven days of the cease-fire. Restoration of the status quo in its entirety, including resumption of normal police patrolling, is to be completed

164

within a month from the date of the cease-fire. The Ministers' meeting is to conclude discussions within two months add the tribunal is to be set up within four months of the cease-fire.

The Agreement is in conformity with the Indo-Pakistan Border Agreements of 1959 and 1960. In connection with the latter, I would like to recall that those Agreements were placed before the House on the 16th November, 1959 and 9th February 1960 respectively and statements thereon had then been made by the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and the Minister of State, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.

Hon'ble Members will recall that in my statement before the House in the last session, I had said that we would agree to talks but only if Pakistan's aggression was vacated and the status quo ante was restored. I had also stated that Pakistan would have to vacate Kanjarkot. All this has been complied with. There is no Pakistani post now in Kanjarkot. Biarbet and other points which they had occupied have also been vacated.

As regards patrolling also, the position would be restored as on 1st January, 1965. The officials of the two governments have met to sort out details.

I should like to say a few words with regard to the status quo ante. The Agreement restores the status quo as on 1st January 1965. Generally speaking, implicit in the concept of status quo is adherence to a position prevailing at a given time. In agreeing to the restoration of the status quo ante, we have not introduced any new principle.

The question as to what was the actual position in regard to various matters on the 1st January 1965 was one of fact and not of any sovereign rights. The restoration of that position was considered essential in order to get Pakistan's aggression vacated-aggression which Pakistan had committed in April 1965. The interim period. while the question of demarcation of the boundary is being pursued, would be of a short term duration. As I have said already there is a definite time-table for the entire work to be completed even if it becomes necessary to refer the matter to a tribunal. It is perfectly clear that the boundary would be demarcated on the basis of documentary evidence and the de facto interim position would have no relevance whatsoever.

One matter about the Agreement which has caused some comment is that of patrolling. On this question also, the actual position obtaining on the 1st January, 1965, had to be restored, Pakistan Government put forward the claim before the United Kingdom Government, who welt acting as the intermediary' that it was patrolling on that date over a wide area in the Rann of Kutch. This claim was found to be without foundation except with regard to a small track close to the international border, over which Pakistani patrols were said to have passed while moving from Ding to Surai both Of which Jay in Pakistani territory. This position had to be accepted as a part of the over-all restoration of the status quo ante, on which, from the very beginning, India had taken a firm stand. I should make it clear, however, that the use of this track does not in any manner confer any rights on Pakistan. The authority Of India is complete and extends to the whole of the Rann of Kutch.

A few words more about Kashmir before I conclude. AD my colleagues and I myself share fully the grave anxiety which I know fills the minds of all Hon'ble Members. As the Hon'ble Members are aware, the armed raiders have crossed the cease-fire line deceitfully in civilian disguise. According to information available and as has just now been said by the Defence Minister these people had been specially trained to indulge in acts of sabotage and destruction by the armed forces and officers of Pakistan. Our security forces are dealing with these raiders in the only manner appropriate to the situation. Amongst those arrested, there are some officers and from the statements made by the prisoners it would appear that the present operations have been planned and are being directed with the approval of the highest authorities in Pakistan.

The situation in Kashmir is completely under control. The raiders are being tracked down even with the help of the local Population. It may take a little time to apprehend all the raiders but the operations are proceeding satisfactorily. The Government and the people of Kashmir are prepared to face the challenge and I would like to pay my tributes to the courage of the people and to the boldness and determination shown by the Government of Jammu & Kashmir under the distinguished leadership of G. M. Sadiq Sahib.

Hard days lie ahead, but we have to face the future with bold resolution. The price of freedom is paid not once but continuously. We have to be prepared as a country to pay that price.

So far as Government are concerned. we have dealt with the developing situation, whether in

relation to Kutch or in relation to Kashmir in the best manner possible in our circumstances. Government will continue to do so in the days ahead. but their hands would be greatly strengthened by the mighty support it gets from this House.

165

PAKISTAN USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Kutch Agreement

The following is the text of the statement made by the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, in the Rajya Sabha on August 19, 1965 on the Kutch Agreement :

Mr. Chairman, Sir,

I rise to move-

"That the Statement made by the Prime Minister in the Rajya Sabha on the 16th August 1965 on the Indo-Pakistan. Agreement of June, 1965 relating to Gujarat West Pakistan border be taken into consideration."

The Hon'ble Members would recall that in my statements in this House in the last session I had stated that we would agree to a cease-fire only on the basis of a simultaneous agreement for the restoration of the status quo as on the 1st January, 1965. It-was also stated by me that Kanjarkot in particular would have to be vacated, so also Biarbet and other points forcibly occupied by Pakistan. This was the situation when the last session of this august House came to a close. Subsequently, we were informed that Pakistan had agreed to the vacation of aggression and to the restoration of the status quo as on 1st January, 1965. It was in this context that the Government of India signed a cease-fire Agreement effective from the 1st July, 1965. Following this, Pakistani Armed Forces had to withdraw completely from the soil of India and the various posts which Pakistan had set up, whether of army or of police, were removed. In other words, the basic conditions laid down by us were duly complied with. Pakistan has no army any where in the Rann of Kutch now nor does it have any police post.

As a part of the restoration of the status quo ante, we have agreed to the patrolling by the Pakistan police on a small track within the Indian territory close to the international border. A temporary agreement on our part to Pakistan police patrols using this track while moving from Ding to Surai, both in Pakistan, cannot and does not amount to any territorial rights being vested in Pakistan. This arrangement will last only till the boundary has been demarcated. There is one other point which I wish to make before this House for the dispassionate consideration of the Hon'ble Members. I know that such consideration becomes difficult in the context of the subsequent developments which have taken place in Kashmir-an aspect to which I will revert a little later. For the moment I would request the Hon'ble Members to consider this matter only in relation to the conditions that were obtaining' at the time when the Agreement was negotiated.

The terms of the Agreements were settled through negotiations and they were not laid down by one party or the other. I would urge that the Agreement be viewed in its totality. The acceptance of the de facto position in regard to patrolling was in no case a surrender of our sovereignty.

During the last session of Parliament, I had stated that if Pakistan vacated the aggression and the status quo ante was restored, we would be willing to revert to the procedures agreed to earlier between the two Governments for the demarcation of the boundary. The Agreement of 1959 and 1960 which was concluded, includes a provision to this effect. A discussion at official level has already taken place to settle certain details. This was to have been followed by discussion at the Ministers' level. In the event of the failure of talks, the matter was to be referred to an impartial tribunal for a final decision.

We have given the most earnest consideration to every aspect of this Agreement and have come to the conclusion that we should abide by it and implement it. We have, at the same time, recognised that no useful purpose will be served by a meeting between the Foreign Ministers of the two countries to see if agreement could be reached and a reference to the Tribunal rendered unnecessary thereby. It became quite clear to us during the last few days that in the present state of tension which has been created by Pakistan, no agreement at Ministers' level was even remotely possible. We, therefore, took the initiative in having the meeting cancelled and the matter will now go to the Tribunal, as in terms of the agreement, it was to go if no agreement between Ministers could be reached.

I would at this stage like to explain why the Agreement refers both to the determination and the demarcation of the boundary. It has been the Government of India's consistent stand that the boundary in question is already well established and officially settled and that what remains to be done is its demarcation on the ground. On this point, however, Pakistan has had a difference of opinion with us. Pakistan's contention has been that the boundary is yet to be determined. This difference had to be resolved either by negotiations or by reference to an impartial tribunal. The Government of India had accepted this position in 1959 and 1960 agreements. The present Agreement also provides for the observance of the same procedure. The claim of the Government of India that there is already a well established boundary has been clearly stated in the body of the Agreement. Pakistan has stated its own case also. As I

166

have already stated the matter will now go to a tribunal which will give its verdict on the alignment of the boundary. Owe the boundary has been determined in this manner, the next step of demarcation on the ground would be taken.

As I had said earlier, we have in this agreement also adhered to the earlier stand that there is no territorial dispute involved. We have clearly stated our stand in the agreement. The apprehension that the agreement converts the dispute from one of border into that of a territory is not well-founded. Even Pakistan refers primarily and basically to the border. The actual words used are :

"Pakistan claims that the border between India and Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch runs roughly along the 24th Parallel is clear from several pre-partition and post-partition documents and therefore the dispute involves some 3,500 miles of territory."

The extract which I have just now read from the Agreement clearly shows that Pakistan also is referring to the alignment of the border. its contention, however, is that instead of boundary running to the north of the Rann of Kutch, it runs along the 24th Parallel. And this claim Pakistan seeks to base on pre-partition and postpartition documents. The question for determination then according to both India and Pakistan is that of the subsisting border between the two countries on the basis of documentary evidence.

I would also like to add that it does not of course follow that wherever Pakistan raises trouble, we should immediately agree to refer the matter to a tribunal. We can never be forced into such a decision. Kashmir certainly does not come into this category at all. There is no border problem involved in it.

The general view held in the Parliament at the time when the Rann of Kutch problem was being debated was that, if at all possible, we should try to settle the matter peacefully.. This basic position has been complied with. We had clearly demonstrated that our professions in regard to peace were being followed by us in practice. It is absolutely incorrect to suggest that we had bought peace at the expense of our territory. I think that the course we adopted at that time was the course of wisdom and sanity. It is somewhat natural that we should see things in the present context. But we have to realise that this agreement was arrived at a different context altogether. It would certainly be advisable that this agreement is kept absolutely separate from the border disputes on our frontiers in other areas. Kashmir as I have said does not come into the picture at all. That the matter in dispute

is one of border is also brought out in the subsequent provisions of the Agreement, For instance, the contents of Article 3(1)(C) of the Agreement refer only to the determination of the border. Even with reference to the verdict of the tribunal, both the Governments jointly state in the Agreement that the issue before the tribunal will be that of the determination of the border.

I would also like to make it clear that the tribunal would not be called upon to lay down a new boundary between India and Pakistan. The tribunal's sole task would be to identify and to determine that boundary between India and Pakistan in this sector, after partition and after the accession of the State of Kutch to India. Moreover, such identification or determination would have to proceed solely on the basis of evidence produced and not on the basis of any other considerations.

In regard to the work of the tribunal, the Agreement clearly provides that the decision will be given on the basis of evidence produced before it, indicating clearly that no decision can be taken on any extraneous considerations.

Some people have criticised the fact that neither Indians nor Pakistanis would serve on the tribunal. In their view it would have been better to have had one Indian,' one Pakistani and one foreigner only. On the other hand we felt that if the tribunal is composed of men of proved international reputation and ability, a decision on merits would no doubt be assured. Nor would it be reasonable to assume that the members of the tribunal would be swayed by any considerations other than those of merits.

We feel deeply concerned over the recent developments in Kashmir. A large number of raiders have entered into Kashmir valley and they have done so in civilian disguise. They have all been trained by the Pakistani army, and also fully armed and equipped. Their objective has been to create disruption and disorder in Kashmir, but their attempts have been effectively foiled. The whole world now knows the whole truth about the situation in Kashmir.

The complicity of Pakistan has been exposed. The fighting which has been unleashed by Pakistan deceitfully through the armed personnel in civilian disguise, is contrary to every known canon of behaviour even in times of war. By now Pakistan must know that her adventures will cost her dearly and that they will not be allowed to succeed. The calculations of Pakistan in regard to the attitude of the local population have proved wrong. They have resisted the raiders and cooperated with the authorities. I must pay a special tribute to the people of Jammu & Kashmir and to the State Government under the able leadership of G. M. Sadiq Sahib for giving a blow to Pakistan's high ambitions.

167

The security forces, both army and police, have shown gallantry of a very high order. They have had to face an opponent in sneaking disguise, which makes their task all the more difficult. But they have met the situation most effectively. They are combing out the raiders and this process would be pursued and they will be allowed no quarter. In many ways the new challenge is unprecedented. We have to be careful and cautious. We cannot afford to have any internal quarrels in the present state of affairs. I would appeal to the nation that we have to stand as one man and put aside our disputes and differences to say the least, for a later date. I know, our countrymen will not lag behind. We Cannot afford to be complacent. We have to be watchful in regard to the situation in Kashmir and all possible steps will have to be taken to fight the present menace. I see no reason for us to feel deterred. The united might of 470 million people backed by dedication and a determination to defend our territorial integrity whatever the sacrifice, will provide the most effective answer to the present challenge. Let us show that we love not our comfort but our freedom. Let this lead go forth from this House to the people.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation on Kashmir Situation

The following is the text of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's broadcast to the nation on August 13, 1965 on the situation in Jammu and Kashmir.

Friends,

I want to speak to you tonight about- the situation in Jammu and Kashmir. The events of the last few days have caused us all deep concern and great anxiety. I would like to tell you first what has actually happened and how things stand today.

About a week ago, Government received information that armed infiltrators from Pakistan and Pakistan-occupied Kashmir had crossed the ceasefire line in civilian disguise and that they were indulging in sabotage and destruction at a number of places. During these few days, the raiders have attacked strategic places such as bridges, police stations and petrol depots and they have obviously acted according to a plan prepared for them by those in Pakistan who are directing these operations. There is no doubt that this is a thinly disguised armed attack on our country organised by Pakistan and it has to be met as such. Our valiant security forces. both Army and Police, are meeting the situation firmly and effectively. Swift action has since been taken to locate the infiltrators. Several engagements have occurred at a number of places and heavy casualties have been inflicted. So far 126 infiltrators have been killed. Our security forces have also captured 83 officers and men. Other groups have since been surrounded and are about to be apprehended. Mopping up operations are now in progress and Pakistan's latest attempt at creating disorder in Kashmir is being crushed. No quarter will he given to the saboteurs. We have Of Course to be continuously vigilant in Kashmir because the possibility of attempts being made to create further trouble cannot be ruled out.

Pakistan has on the one hand sought to deny its complicity and on the other she has put herself forward is the chief spokesman for the infiltrators. The world will recall that Pakistan had created a similar situation in 1947 and then also she had initially pleaded innocence. Later she had to admit that her own regular forces were involved in the fighting.

Pakistan is trying to conjure up the spectre of some people in revolt; she is talking of some Revolutionary Council and of a lot of other things. All this is a mere figment of Pakistan's imagination. Pakistani propaganda is blatantly and completely untrue. The people of Jammu and Kashmir have shown remarkable fortitude. They still remember how the Pakistani raiders pillaged and plundered on an earlier occasion. There is no revolution in Kashmir nor is there any revolutionary council. The people of Jammu and Kashmir have in fact themselves given the lie to Pakistan's propaganda.

The more important question before us now is not that of these infiltrators and their activities, because we are quite clear as to what to do with them. The real question is that of our relations with Pakistan.

In April last they committed naked aggression on our Kutch border. We acted with great restraint and forbearance despite serious provocation. We left them in no doubt, however, that if they did not vacate the aggression forthwith, we would have to take requisite military steps to get the aggression vacated. Eventually, the armed forces of Pakistan had to go back from Indian soil and it was reasonable-to hope that our mutual relations might take a turn for the better.

168

In this context, it is amazing that Pakistan should have embarked upon yet another adventure On this occasion the method adopted and the strategy used show signs of a new tutelage, possibly a new conspiracy Only one conclusion is now possible and it is this : Pakistan has probably taken a deliberate decision to keep up all atmosphere of tension. Peace apparently does not suit her intentions. We have, therefore, to reckon with this situation in a realistic manner. We have to consider how best to deal, with the dangers that threaten our country. We have also to state our views categorically so that there are no miscalculations.

If Pakistan has any ideas of annexing any part of our territories by force, she should think afresh. I want to state categorically that force will be met with force and aggression against us will never be allowed to succeed. I want also to tell our brothers and sisters in Kashmir that the people of the entire country stand solidly with them, ready to make any sacrifice for the defence of our freedom. I know that every youngman in our country is prepared today to make even the supreme sacrifice so that India may continue to live with her head aloft and banner high.

When freedom is threatened and territorial integrity is endangered, there is only one duty the duty to meet the challenge with all our might. We must all fully realise that the country faces its severest trial today. At this hour, across our vast borders are massed forces which threaten our continuance as a free and independent country. We have all to stand together firmly and unitedly to make any sacrifice that may be necessary. In normal times we may well have our individual loyalties-loyalties to policies and programmes about which there can be genuine difference of opinion amongst different sections and groups. That is an essential part of our democratic set up. But when our very freedom and sovereignty are threatened, all these loyalties have to be subordinated to that ultimate loyalty-loyalty to the Motherland. I appeal to all my countrymen to ensure that our unity is strengthened and our internal peace and harmony are not disturbed in any manner. Any one who acts to the contrary win act against the interests of the country. I want to make it known trial we shalt allow no quarter to any one who indulges in anti-national activities. I must refer with great regret to the disturbances which unfortunately took place in some towns of Bihar and in Calcutta, Hyderabad and one or two other places. What has happened there will help no one. Let there be no recurrence of such incidents. I might also urge the brave Sikh people in particular to keep up their old tradition of keeping the country above everything else. I

do fervently hope that they win not think in terms of any agitation or protest.

In another two days, we shall complete 18 years of independence after centuries of foreign rule. Each year shows a thinning out of the generation which strived, struggled and suffered in order that the generations to come may live in freedom. Each year sees a higher proportion of our people for whom foreign rule is something to be read about in history books and not a part and parcel of their own personal experience. This is particularly true of the student community in schools and colleges. They are fortunate that they have lived their fives in freedom; but it would be unfortunate if they take freedom for granted, or forget that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Undoubtedly we are passing through perilous times. But these are also the times of great opportunities. With unity among ourselves, and with faith in our future we should do all we can to preserve our freedom and sovereignty and we should march ahead confidently towards the attainment of the national objective; which we have set for ourselves.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA **Date** : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Defence Minister's Statement in Parliament on Pakistani Armed Attack on Kashmir

The Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, made the following statement in Parliament on August 16, 1965 on the Pakistani armed attack on Jammu and Kashmir:

I rise to make a statement on the situation along the Cease-fire Line and elsewhere in Jammu and Kashmir as well as along the Indo-Pakistan borders. As Honourable Members are aware, for the last 11 days we have had to face a new development posing a threat to the security of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This threat has taken the shape of an organised incursion of armed personnel disguised as civilians from across the Cease-fire Line. It was on the 5th August that a large group of infiltrators appeared in the area South-West of Gulmarg. Prompt steps were taken to locate them and after an exchange of fire with our Security Forces, the infiltrators fled under cover of darkness. A quantity of ammunition left by the raiders was recovered.

169

Since then reports of other groups infiltrating into different parts of Jammu & Kashmir have been received and prompt steps have been taken to meet the situation. In the clashes from the initial encounters onwards, the infiltrators have suffered substantial casualties. In the process of retreat they have left behind large quantities of arms and ammunition, clothing, cooked food, medical supplies, compasses, maps, etc.

While some of the infiltrators encountered near the Cease-fire Line have retreated across it, some others have penetrated further towards our side and regrouped themselves. All these infiltrators have had as their aim the blowing up of strategic bridges, the raiding of supply dumps, the destruction of places of strategic importance incendiaries and the killing of VIPs. It also appeared that their aim was to reach quickly the city of Srinagar and to create commotion there. They have operated during night to reduce chances of being seen and intercepted.

PLANNED PREPARATIONS

From the intelligence gathered by us and confirmed by the statements made by the infiltrators captured by us, it is quite clear that preparations for this incursion were made in Pakistan many months ago. The headquarters training these infiltrators was located near Murree and the Commander of the 12th Infantry Division of Pakistan was incharge of this training.

The infiltrators were backed by a so-called Sada-e-Kashmir radio broadcasting from the town of Khari, six miles from Muzaffarabad, while they carried posters and proclamations of an alleged revolutionary council. The arms and ammunition taken by us show quite clearly that they are of the type used by the Pakistan army. In some cases efforts have been made to erase the marking. In some other cases markings exist to indicate the Pakistan origin. On others there are no markings at all, which shows that they were specially manufactured for these operations, evidently by the Pakistan ordnance factories. Also, some of the weapons could only be obtained from abroad with the expenditure of foreign exchange obviously provided by Pakistan.

The infiltrators are by and large personnel of the so-called Azad Kashmir battalions of the Pakistan army which is a force Pakistan employs to man the Cease-fire Line. They are officered by Pakistani Army personnel and are supported by so-called Mujahids and Razakars, who apart from carrying arms are also given lesser jobs as Porters. The infiltrators are equipped with rifles, sten guns, light machine gums, grenades, rocket launchers and explosives of which we have recovered large quantities. Whenever they have met our Security Forces they have not only suffered heavy casualties but have also either surrendered or abandoned large quantities of arms and equipment in their flight.

We were aware that Mujahids, Razakars and personnel of the Azad Kashmir forces were being trained in guerilla tactics but could not be aware of the exact type, time and place of the operations Pakistan intended to carry out. It will be appreciated that the aggressor always has an advantage as he aggresses at the time, place and ground of his own choosing. Consequently, they were able to make some advance into our territory at some points in the initial phase until such time as their pattern of operations became clearer to us. In this initial phase, they caused minor damage to some bridges but this damage was speedily repaired and all our road communications remained fully in use.

KASHMIRIS DEFY INTRUDERS

Perhaps the most important aim with which the infiltrators were charged was to enter the city of Srinagar, coinciding with an expected demonstration by some political parties on August 9, in the hope that they could so disorganize the affairs as

to give the resulting situation the complexion of an armed rebellion. The main aims of the infiltrators have not been realised. The Security Forces engaged them well outside Srinagar town and checked their progress. Their hope of important captures, such as the Srinagar airfield, was futile and, at this stage I might say that Srinagar airfield and other important military installations have always been carefully and well guarded.

The people of Kashmir by and large, whatever the difference between the political parties, have shown little sympathy towards the infiltrators and have in fact, found them a nuisance to their daily existence. In many cases the information about the appearance of these infiltrators was supplied to the State Government and intelligence agencies by the local people. The city of Srinagar remains calm and the people go about their avocations as usual. Usual good neighbourliness between the communities exists and the town is full of tourists. The shops are open and transport plies as usual.

In the course of challenging some suspicious people, the police has had to resort to occasional firing on two nights in and around Srinagar but this has not disturbed the life of the people. INFILTRATORS COMMIT ATROCITIES

Although the infiltrators seem to remember the lessons of 1947, (when their brutalities and avarice of the raiders earned them the hatred of all they came in contact with) they have not been able to refrain from indulging in acts of harassment. There has been burning of schools, Panchayat Ghars and villages and firing upon people

170

who tried to put out the fires. Places of worship have also been fired at by the infiltrators. Unarmed villagers have been killed by them and having soon exhausted or lost the rations they brought with them, instances of taking of rations by force from villages have come to light.

On the night of August 14, a few Pakistani saboteurs set fire to a mohalla on the outskirts of Srinagar, resulting in the burning of 300 houses. Some Pakistani saboteurs with incendiary material in their possession have been captured. This appears to have been a desparate bid to terrorise people and thereby create a commotion. As I-have said before, we were aware that Pakistan was giving training to certain numbers of armed personnel in guerilla warfare but the exact time and place of the infiltration was not known to us. Our forces along the Cease-fire Line were mainly responsible for the stoppage of any major military attack across this Line but as Honourable Members will realise it is impossible to prevent infiltration of people in small groups across 470 miles of extensive and difficult terrain. The Cease-fire Line was, as Honourable Members are aware, fixed ad hoc and does not follow natural features providing easy defence against infiltration. The infiltrators came in small groups which then regrouped themselves later on.

SABOTEURS BEATEN BACK

In view of the surpise tactics adopted by the infiltrators, and the type of the fire-arms that they carried, they were able to inflict some casualties on policemen guarding vital points, 21 of whom have died; but no vital point fell into the infiltrators hands. In addition to 21 policemen killed, 5 officers and 41 ORs of the Army have died fighting the infiltrators. We have killed 2 officers and 151 other infiltrators and their bodies have been picked up. Another 300 are estimated to have been killed and many others wounded; 84 infiltrators including two officers have been captured by us.

Amongst the arms and ammunition captured by us are substantial quantities of rifles, sten guns LMGs, thousands of rounds of ammunition of various kind, mortar bombs, rocket launchers and rockets and explosives, wire cutters, binoculars, compasses, transister radios and signal equipment have also been captured. Clothing, blankets, food and medicines, etc., have been captured from the infiltrators in large quantities. Reports are continuing to come in of more losses suffered by the infiltrators. Apart from the valley, the infiltrators have been engaged all along the Ceasefire Line where the maximum engagements have taken place. It may, however, take some time before these Pakistan trained and inspired infiltrators are totally eliminated.

The complicity of Pakistan in this whole affair can be seen by the news coming from Pakistan radio and from that printed in her newspapers. In the beginning she said nothing but subsequently the claims made, have been so exaggerated and so fantastic that one is clearly led to believe it is what Pakistan expected rather than what has actually happened that Pakistan had published.

U. N. ASSURANCES FAIL

Following assurances from the United Nations observes against repetition of Pakistani attacks on our vital supply route and the posting of the United Nations observers at Kargil and Skardu, our troops vacated the Pakistani posts in the hope that Pakistan would thereafter desist from its provocative activities. I am afraid these hopes have been belied and the United Nations observers let down. Apart from the large-scale infiltration arranged by Pakistan and sabotage activities indulged in by the infiltrators, generally, the Kargil area has been a specific object of Pakistan aggression, nullifying all assurances given by the U.N. to us.

I do not wish to minimise the serious situation that has been created for us once again in the State of Jammu and Kashmir which is a threat to the territorial integrity of our country. We feel deep concern for the suffering being caused to our brethren in J. & K. We will meet this new threat created by Pakistan in an effective manner and I have no doubt that the security forces, with the help of the people of J. & K. will be able to meet the situation, even though it may take some time. We are also undertaking immediate measures to provide relief to those who have suffered at the hands of the infiltrators.

We have apprised the Secretary-General of the United Nations of these grave and blatant cease-fire, violations by Pakistan. We have drawn the attention of all friendly Governments to this new phase of Pakistani aggression in Kashmir and hope that they will use their influence to make Pakistan desist from action which is against the Charter of the United Nations, against International Law and against the principle of good neighbourliness and which is fraught with grave consequences.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the courage and resourcefulness displayed by the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Shri Sadiq, his colleagues and the State administration in meeting this threat. I would also like to express my great appreciation about the gallant manner in which the Police forces deployed in Jammu and Kashmir have discharged their duties in meeting the infiltrators. Finally, I am sure you would join me in paying a warm tribute to our brave armed forces for the courage

171

and skill with which they are dealing with the situation. I have no doubt that they will come out victorious.

As regards the Rana of Kutch the Prime Minister is making a statement. I place on the Table of the House a statement regarding other incidents on the Indo-Pakistan borders.

VIOLATIONS OF CEASEFIRE AGREEMENT

A feature of the developments in J. & K. has been that even though the incidents along the ceasefire line and the violations of the ceasefire agreement had recorded an all time high in the previous six or seven months, because of Pakistan's persistent efforts to keep up tension, synchronising with the appearance of infiltrators, Pakistani forces on the cease-fire line have stepped up their activities inordinately, as if to give cover to the infiltrators and to distract the security forces from dealing with them.

In the seven months period from January to July, the number of incidents on the ceasefire line was over 1,800 compared to 1522 in the whole year 1964 and 448 in the year 1963. An unusual interest was shown by Pakistan against our line of communication to Leh which was threatened repeatedly in the Kargil area, where it runs close to the ceasefire line. On the night of May 16/17, 1965, Pakistani troops started heavy fire on our picquets and attacked with force. Our troops hit back effectively and after repulsing the Pakistani attack also dislodged them from two of their posts, which were occupied by our troops.

The capture of these Pakistan posts was a remarkable feat of courage and endurance by our troops involving the scaling of over 4,000 feet of steep cliff and fighting at an altitude of 13,000 to 14,000 feet. The Pakistanis suffered heavy casualties-33 killed, 49 injured and 3 captured, of whom one died. We ourselves inevitably suffered casualties for the gaining of the objective of protecting the vital Srinagar-Leh Road, over which supply moves for Indian troops guarding the northem border. A large quantity of arms and equipment was also recovered from the Pakistanis. Pakistan, after suffering the reverses, brought in very large reinforcement and repeatedly attempted to re-capture its lost posts. All these attempts were foiled by the Indian Army.

There has been no activity generally on the Punjab and Rajasthan borders though there have been incidents in which the Pakistani Rangers have given support to armed civilians entering into India or covering up the escape of an outlaw.

PAK FIRING IN EASTERN SECTOR

I had informed the House on May 11, that there was firing in the Lathitilla-Dumabari sector during February and March this year but that a cease-fire was effected on March 29, 1965. After a lull of a month, the East Pakistan Rifles again started firing in this sector on April 29, 1965. Since then sporadic firing continued till June 30. After another lull of a month, East Pakistan Rifles again fired in this area on July 31 and East Pakistan. No such meeting has, howranging a demarcation of the boundary in this area. provoked firing on May 3, 8 and 17, 1965.

A joint meeting of the sector commanders of both the sides, held at Sutarkandi, failed to arrange a cease-fire. Earlier on April 8, 1965, the Pakistain High Commissioner in India had given an aide-memoire to the Foreign Secretary suggesting that this problem could be taken up at the next meeting of the Chief Secretaries of Assam and East Pakistan. No such meeting has, however, come about. The Radcliffe Award is clear regarding the boundary in the Lathitilla-Dumabari area. Pakistan has frustrated all efforts for arranging a demarcation of the boundary in this area. We on our side cannot accept the principle of resolution of boundary demarcation by form.

The Indian village of Govindpur in Cachar District in Assam was the target of wanton firing by East Pakistan Rifles for several days in April 1965 and an unarmed Indian patrol moving with a flag, as prescribed under the Ground Rules, was fired upon. Dawki in the United Khasi and Jaintia Hills District of Assam was another place where the East Pakistan Rifles resorted to unprovoked firing on May 3, 8 and 17, 1965.

TRIPURA-EAST PAKISTAN BORDER

As Hon'ble Members must have noticed, there has been fresh firing by Pakistanis on Belonia town in Tripura. Since May 3, Pakistani armed forces personnel have been harassing inhabitants on the Indian side and interfering with the use of the Muhari river. On May 16, 1965, East Pakistan Rifles started shooting and fired 4,000 rounds on the town of Belonia. The firing has since then continued intermittently. We have protested to Pakistan. Indian forces have returned the fire in self-defence. One Indian has been injured. Six Pakistanis are believed to be killed and three injured. It is a pity that Pakistan should seek to use force, as it has been doing, to stop works for protection of erosion by the Muhari river on the Indian side, particularly when this errosion is caused by spurs put up by Pakistan to direct the river current to the Indian side.

PAK VIOLATIONS NEAR AGARTALA

On August 6, East Pakistan Rifles patrol dressed in civilian clothes, violated our territory in area Radhanagar near Agartala and opened unprovoked fire on our civilians working in the area injuring two of them, Our border police which rushed for rescue was also fired upon by East

172

Pakistan Rifles patrol. Our patrol had to return fire in self defence. Two members of the East Pakistan Rifles patrol were also wounded. Some arms, ammunition, clothing equipment including three East Paflistan Rifles berets with cap badges etc. were captured by our patrol.

WEST BENGAL-EAST PAKISTAN BORDER

As the House is aware, Dahagram area was the scene of firing incidents in March this year. The meeting of the Chief Secretaries of West Bengal and East Pakistan which was consequently held in April decided on various measures to reduce the tension. However, only recently, on May 29/30, 45 Pakistani nationals accompanied by 5 armed Pakistani Policemen from Dahagram, trespassed into village Fulkadabari on the Indian side and raided the houses of 4 Indian nationals, assaulting the inmates, ransacking their houses and carrying with them clothes, cattle and other property. A protest has been lodged with the Pakistan High Commission in India.

The raising of the bed of a half-mile stretch of road in our territory (Tin Bigha) passing by the side of Dahagram has been made an excuse by Pakistan for harassment of the Indian labourers working on the road. Apart from protests, East Pakistan Rifles' personnel have on May 8 threatened to open fire on Indian labourerS working there. This is notwithstanding the fact that, in 1963, Pakistanis built an embankment very close to our border opposite our B.O.P. Ghojadanga in 24 Parganas, and the fact that another embankment is under construction near the border in Khulna District, opposite our border post in 24 Parganas.

Recently, on July 17, about 400 armed Pak nationals backed by E.P.R. personnel trespassed into Indian territory in District Nadia and attempted forcible occupation of some plots of land and harassed Indians sowing paddy thereon. They attempted to demolish a culvert over a small canal within Indian territory. They also attacked the Indian patrol who had to fire back in selfdefence. Two Pakistani nationals were injured.

As in the case of the Cease-fire Line, Pakistan appears to be keeping up tension in various sectors of the India-East Pakistan border in support of its political objectives, notwithstanding the casualties it suffers in-the process. Inevitably, our own people in the sectors concerned have been subjected to harassment and loss. We are, however, determined that Pakistan should not get away with the impression that it can secure its political objectives by the use of force. We will try and make such adventures unprofitable for Pakistan.

PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA ANGUILLA INDIA **Date :** Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UGANDA

Prim Minister's Speech at a Dinner in honour of Dr. Obote

At the invitation of the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, His Excellency Dr. A. Milton Obote, Prime Minister of Uganda, paid a State visit to India in the first week of August, 1965. On August 2, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri gave a dinner in honour of the visting Prime Minister.

Speaking on the occasion, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentelmen, we feel greatly delighted to find you in our midst and we are happy that you have decided to come here although you had to visit a number of countries and I know it must have been strenuous for you and for your other colleagues. If I may say so, you and some of your other colleagues are no strangers to India. You have come here before and it is good to see you again, an old friend of India, and we are happy that you have come here this time as the first Prime Minister of Uganda.

During the last 30 or 40 years, the world has seen a great change, a revolutionary change. We were some time back colonies of the British Empire or of some other countries. The end of the first World War created a new awakening amongst the Asian countries and India was the first country to start a great movement against the then British Empire. We adopted a new method and a new technique in our struggle for freedom. We carried on this agitation and then after about 27 years and at the end of the second World War we got our freedom. Since

173

then almost all the Asian, countries who were under subjection started becoming free and they became independent. It has been a very happy feature indeed but the story would have remained incomplete if this urge of freedom and independence was not to manifest itself in the African Continent. During the last 10 or 12 years, there has been a great resurgence of freedom movement in Africa and one after the other, the African countries have become free.

COLONIALISM

It is a matter of sincere gratification. that almost all the countries in Asia and Africa are free today and are trying to shape their own destinies as they consider best for themselves and for their people. It is unfortunate that there are still countries in Africa which remain as colonies. Naturally our thought go to the people of Angola and Mozambique and also Southem Rhodesia. The sufferings of the people are immense and there is absolutely no sympathetic chord ever felt Or realised amongst the Portuguese in so far as the freedom struggle of these colonies is concerned.

South Africa is another country which is almost a menace to human freedom and its policies are most retrograde. We do feel that the fight against colonialism and apartheid should continue and every country must lend its full support to the colonies and to those who are fighting against the wrong policies of South Africa. Colonialism of course is now reduced in extent and yet there are hard nuts to crack.

I know you are one of those who have always stood against colonialism and who are also today lending full support to the, people of the colonies who are fighting for their freedom. I need not say that both India and Uganda have the same stand and the same approach in regard to this particular matter. The world will not live in peace if colonialism still persists. Therefore, I think it is the bounden duty of all those countries who have achieved their freedom to fight against colonialism and see to it that it comes to an end fully and completely.

NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

I know Uganda and India believe in the policies of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. As you are aware, our great and distinguished leader, Pandit Jawaharlalji, was instrumental in evolving these policies. Things are changing fast in the world and yet the more we examine it the more we find that the policies of nonalingnment and co-existence are the best in the present situation and specially for those countries who attained their independence during the last few years who have yet to build up their economy and their country as a whole. Besides that, in order to achieve peace in the world it is desirable that different ideologies and different patterns of Government should be allowed to coexist and it will just not be possible to have some kind of regimentation in thinking and approaches to different and various problems. Peaceful co-existence is vital and important for maintaining peace in the world. And non-alignment certainly limits the sphere of conflict and non-aligned countries can play an important role in limiting the conflicts which exist in the world at present and also the clashes which take place sometime in different parts of the world.

Non-alignment gives you freedom to think and work on your own lines and peaceful co-existence provides full opportunity for different ideologies and different patterns of Government to function in different countries.

I am glad that you in your country have adopted a very fair and liberal policy insofar as immigrants to Uganda are concerned. You have in your Constitution provided equal rights and opportunities for all who live there. As a policy we have always advised the people of Indian origin who have established themselves in other countries to become citizens of those countries and throw their lot with the people and the Government of the country where they live in. I have every hope that in other countries the same policy which you have pursued would be adopted. As far as possible, we have to fight racialism and it would be really good if different races and religions live in peace and in harmony whether it is India or other countries in the world.

I am sorry that you have to curtail your programme. I know there is an important conference to be held very soon and you have to attend it. Still we are happy that you are amongst us and there will be no curtailment in the Delhi programme. You have been a great fighter, a great leader for the freedom movement. You have undergone terrible sufferings. You are now the leader of the Government of Uganda and you are in the midst of building up your economy and make it a much richer nation. We have our trade with Uganda and we want that it should further increase and expand. It is our bounden duty to build up the economy of our countries. It is the people who are to be thought of first and therefore in this great task which has been entrusted to us we must go ahead with vision, courage and determination.

I would not like to take much of your time but may I express once again my sincere gatification on your visit. Your excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, may I now request you to drink a toast to the health of the Prime Minister of Uganda.

174

UGANDA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA **Date :** Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UGANDA

Reply by Dr. Obote

in his reply, the Prime Minister of Uganda, Dr. Obote said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: Let me first thank you, Mr. Prime Minister, for your very kind words in welcoming us here to this great and illustrious country. In the first place, I would like to say we were most grateful indeed when we received your invitation to visit India. For me and to sonic of the members of my delegation, this is not our first visit. But, nonetheless, we are exceedingly happy that we have had this opportunity to leave our desks at home to meet old friends and to make acquaintance with your people and exchange views with the Ministers of the Indian Government and other leaders. It is true that before we came here, we went to various countries. You yourself have just completed a very strenuous visit to Yugoslavia. I have been to that country and I know how they would love a visitor to see every bit of their country. think you are no exception at all but you are still in a position to receive us and talk to us. We are also in the same spirit. There is something more to that. Having passed through various countries before coming here, we seem to have to some extent some of the latest information available about some of the most difficult problems now facing the world and I am quite sure that our coming here at this particular moment is most opportune that it will be beneficial not only to our two countries but also to some other countries who have shared the policies and views and objectives which your country and mine too share. This, Mr. Prime Minister, is a country that has made tremendous history and has brought into being a force which is still alive and strong and vigorous. After the Second World War, India was able to gain independence. I am not too sure whether the leaders of India and the people in India do appreciate the great services they have done to the subject races. If it is realised that before India's independence, India was the hero of the subject races, if it is again realised that after India's independence, a chain reaction was created, that moved through Asia, crossed the Indian ocean, and crossed over to the Atlantic, a large part of Africa became independent, then one would realise the service that India did. This of course is not to say that in other countries, whether in Asia, Africa, people did not struggle or were not talking about independence. Whoever broke the chain must be given due credit and this is what I am doing now. You won the race. You won the race in order to open the door of independence of other countries. Immediately after opening that door, you created some of the most important basic policies that most countries found it fit to adopt. You made reference to the policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. We subscribe to this policy. On top of that you have undertaken to construct your economy and you adopted some basic policies for doing so. Some of us have made some study of what you have been doing here and Uganda can draw lessons from what you have been doing. I am sure you must have run into a lot of difficulties here and there but in Africa, at least in Uganda, I can tell you that immediately on independence, we decided that in order that we may be able to

learn, we should not fear changes and we should not fear to make mistakes. We found that the greater the mistakes we made the more easily we learnt from our own mistakes and therefore we do not mind very much taking our own decisions, decisions which are likely to be different from the best advice that may be given to us, possibly from those who ruled before. But certainly this is independence. If we are proud of our independence, we must be able not only to have this little independence but also free in our thoughts to think and take decisions in the circumstances obtaining in our country. But Africa, Mr. Prime Minister, has held a different role in the world. It is difficult to understand Africa and I think that is why we are still having colonies in Africa, in the form of Angola and in the form of Mozambique. I think that is why we are having racial governments like the one in South Africa and one in Southern Rhodesia. But I have no doubt that one day these areas would be free and I have no doubt that when they become free, some of the people who are today opposed to changes will feel ashamed. We have great experiments going on in Africa. Practically every African State is a laboratory. If you take Ghana being the first of the African States to obtain independence after the Second World War, if Ghana fails, most of us who followed later would be in some difficulties. Many people would say that if it took Ghana 8, 9 or 10 years to build, it would take Uganda the same time or 15 years. So Ghana is also a laboratory. If you take Nigeria, one of the biggest of our countries, there also is a big experiment going on. Nigeria's size, wealth and resources available there will show some of the countries outside Africa that Africa cannot only have small State but can also have big States, prosperous and happy. Near us, is Kenya and this is the greatest example that we can give to Dr. Salazar. Before Kenya's independence, the white settlers felt that independence was going to bring death. bloodshed and racialism. Today, some of them who left Kenya before independence, are thinking of going back.

175

What Africa requires is confidence. If other people choose to distrust Africa, if they think that Africa must first of all go a hundred miles before they follow and only go 20 miles so that there is a difference of 80 miles, I think such a course cannot work with Africa. What is going on now is most exciting : the opening of new avenues and in Uganda we are trying to do this with our best available resources we have. We have the resources in personnel, we have the natural resources and we have made some research in the matter of immigrants. To me they don't worry me. I don't say that is a problem. We have tried to adopt in Uganda this policy of basing our thoughts and our action on the needs of the individual, on the safety of the individual, on the rights of the individual, on the freedom of the individual and we have refused to believe that this individual is either short or tall, is either male or female or is black or otherwise. We have treated that individual as an individual. Consequently we are also a laboratory in our own small way.

If one day the unity of Africa comes and forms a United States, some of our people would think of placing the capital somewhere around that area. We will unite the French-speaking world in Africa with the English-speaking world. We will also unite the Muslims in the north with Africans in the south. This is a position of pride but at the same time it is also a position of challenge. We are proud to be there and we are trying to meet the challenge that our geographical position has given to us. Because of this geographical, position and because of the problems tacing each African Government, we have some trouble coming from the Congo and I do not know how exactly how we will be able to solve the problem of Congo. Being in our position we do not believe that-it will be possible to settle the Congolese problem merely by the point of the gun. I am sure India should be the first country to realise this. During the struggle for independence in India-and I am only talking through history books, there was a bit of gun struggle but it did not stop the Indian leaders or the Indian people to continue and even to grow in strength to demand independence. The same has been true in practically every African State. Where you have political belief in the hearts of the people, the gun will not remove it. This is the tragedy of the Congo. They believe that they will unite the Congo by the point of the gun. I think they would fail. We are very close to them and we have run into trouble because we believe that gun is not the solution. This is a challenge to its and to our pride. If we can use our small 'voice to

assist the Congo to find peace we would have done a great deal to find a solution to the problems facing Angola and possibly to the problems facing Southern Rhodesia and that might have greater meaning to the solution of problems in South Africa. Mr. Prime Minister, Africa is on the move, Africa is changing, there are many things happening at the same time.

May I, Ladies and Gentlemen, Your Excellencies, offer you the toast to the health of the Indian Prime Minister.

UGANDA USA INDIA YUGOSLAVIA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GHANA NIGER NIGERIA KENYA MALDIVES CONGO SOUTH AFRICA

Date : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UGANDA

Dr. Obote's Speech at a Dinner in honour of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri

His Excellency Dr. A. Milton Obote, Prime Minister of Uganda, gave a dinner in honour of the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, in New Delhi on August 5, 1965.

Proposing a toast to the President of India, the Uganda Prime Minster said :

I should like to thank all of you, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, for accepting our invitation and being here with us. We feel greatly honoured and although we may leave tomorrow morning without meeting each one of you individually, let me assure you that you have given us tonight a memorable occasion which we will not forget.

We had useful discussions with the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the Indian Government.

We have visited places around Delhi. We have

had talks with the other people who are not in the Indian Government.

Addressing the diplomats, the Uganda Prime Minister said : I wish you the best success for your mission in India. I am sure you will find no difficulty in interpreting Indian scenes to your Governments.

To the Indian Government, I wish you all success in all your endeavours and I assure you that in Africa some eyes are directed at you. Your successes will be appreciated by us. Your failures will disappoint us. In this spirit, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you humbly to rise up and to drink with me the toast of H.E. the President of India.

176

UGANDA INDIA USA **Date :** Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UGANDA

Reply by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri

Replying to the, toast of His Excellency the Prune Minister of Uganda, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said:

Mr. Prime Minister, ladies and gentlemen: the Prime Minister of Uganda has just now said that we have entered into an agreement just, on the spur of the moment. I wish the politicians in the world would arrive at agreements so soon and without any difficulty at all on many complicated matters that face the world. However, I have to carry out that agreement not only in spirit but in words. I do not think therefore I am expected to say much.

I, however, must thank you, Mr. Prime minis-

ter, for your visit to our country for which we are extremely delighted.

I am quite sure our talks were useful and fruitful.

Uganda and India are friends and our bonds of unity have been strengthened by your visit. I must say these bonds of unity will grow stronger day by day.

I am glad that you will carry pleasant memories of your visit to this country.

May I now request you, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, to drink a toast to the health of the President of Uganda,

UGANDA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

Date : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UGANDA

India-Uganda Joint Communique

The following is the text of a joint communique issued in New Delhi on August 6, 1965 on the visit of the Prime Minister of Uganda to India :

On the invitation of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister of India, His Excellency Dr. A. Milton Obote, Prime Minister of Uganda, paid a State, visit to India from the 1st to 7th August, 1965. He was accompanied, among others, by Hon. S. N. Odaka, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Hon. L. Lubowa, Minister for Commerce, and Hon. J. S. M. Ochola, Deputy Minister for Tourism.

After four days' stay in the capital, Prime Minister Obote and his party visited Bombay where they had opportunity of seeing something of India's progress and development. Prime Minister Obote and his party were received everywhere in India with spontaneous expressions of warmth and cordiality which is in keeping with the historic bonds of friendship existing between the peoples of India and Uganda.

Prime Minister Obote called on the President of India and had series of talks with Prime Minister Shastri. Those participated on the Uganda side included H.E. Dr. A. Milton Obote, Prime Minister, Hon. S. N. Odaka, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Hon. L. Lubowa, Minister for Commerce, Hon. J. S. M. Ochola, Deputy Minister, Mr. Z. H. K. Bigirwenkya, Permanent Secretary, Mr. L. Katagyira, Secretary for Planning and H.E. Mr. G. W. M. Kamba, High Commissioner. The Indian side included Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, Foreign Minister, Shri Dinesh Singh, Deputy Minister, Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary, Shri M. A. Husain, Secretary, Shri A. S. Dhawan, High Commissioner and

Shri K. R. P. Singh, Director. The talks were held in an atmosphere of great friendliness and cordiality reflecting mutual goodwill, trust and understanding. They covered a wide range of matters of mutual interest to the two countries as well as important international issues.

The two Prime Ministers took the opportunity of informing each other of the efforts that were being made in their respective countries for the social and economic betterment of their peoples and reference was made to the various development projects which both countries have undertaken. There was general agreement that each country could benefit by the other's experience in the field of social and economic development and that there was scope for extension of mutual cooperation in all spheres.

AFRICAN UNITY

The Prime Minister of India welcomed the dynamic and progressive developments on the African continent, specially the formation of the Organisation of African Unity which was a historic steps signifying the emergence of Africa as a powerful new factor for peace and international cooperation and for promoting solutions to African problems without outside interference. He paid special tribute to Prime Minister Obote's positive role in the promotion of understanding and amity between African states and condemned outside interference and pressures designed to disrupt African unity. He also expressed support to Uganda in her struggle to preserve bet independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Prime Minister of Uganda paid tribute to India's vital role and contribution in pioneering

177

the movement for the liberation of all dependent peoples and the liquidation of colonialism. He noted with satisfaction India's policy of active support to the liberation movement in Africa, Asia and in other parts of the world. He also expressed his appreciation of the role played by India in promoting international peace and security in the world.

Recalling the Bandung principles and the Declaration made by non-aligned countries in 1964 in Cairo the two Prime Ministers reaffirmed the principle of respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of states and in that context declared that historic and well-defined boundaries of states should be regarded as inviolable. The two Prime Ministers condemned the threat or use of force in settling territorial or boundary disputes and affirmed that these disputes should be settled by peaceful negotiations.

NON-ALIGNMENT

The Prime Minister of Uganda and India made a review of the world situation in the light of their common adherence to the policy of positive non-aligament and peaceful co-existence. They expressed their conviction that this policy which most of the newly independent countries of Africa and Asia had adopted had contributed substantially to the lowering of world tensions and the broadening of international cooperation among nations. Both Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction that the Second Conference, of Non-Aligned Nations held in Cairo in October 1964 had given an added impetus to the objectives common to the non-aligned countries.

COLONIALISM AND NEO-COLONIALISM

The two Prime Ministers reiterated their strong opposition to all forms of colonialism and neo-

colonialism and expressed their whole-hearted support for the peoples of Asia, Africa and other parts of the world who are still struggling for the achievement and consolidation of their independence. They in particular extended their full support to the people of Angola, Mozambique, the so-called Portuguese Guinea and other Portuguese colonies in Africa and Asia struggling against Portuguese colonialism. They strongly condemned the attempt of the white minority to dominate Southern Rhodesia and expressed the view that no solution except the one based on one-man-onevote would be acceptable. They further expressed the hope that the struggle of the people of Congo (Leopoldville) for preservation of their freedom and independence against foreign interference in their internal affairs would be fruitful. They endorsed the constructive efforts of the OAU to find a political solution of this problem. In this context the Prime Minister of India expressed his full support to the African Liberation Movements in their struggle for political freedom and the attainment of their legitimate rights.

APARTHEID

The two sides strongly condemned the, racialist policy of apartheid pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa, which is a crime against humanity and threat to world peace, and amity. Both sides called for the full and expeditious implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations regarding the Union of South Africa and South West Africa.

The two Prime Ministers expressed the hope that with the help and constructive efforts of all participating countries the Second Atro-Asian Conference would be successful and help in the achievement of common objectives and strengthen Afro-Asian solidarity.

DISARMAMENT

The two sides expressed their conviction that general and complete disarmament under effective international control was vital for the survival of mankind and peace and progress in the world. They welcomed in this context the Partial Test Ban Treaty as an important step towards prohibtion of nuclear tests and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. They urged all states to abide by its spirit and provisions and called upon all states which have not yet signed the Treaty to do so without further delay. Both sides condemned all nuclear weapons tests in environments prohibited by the Test Ban Treaty. They strongly recommended that this Treaty should be extended to cover underground tests as well and that pending the extension of the treaty, all such tests should be discontinued immediately. They expressed their support for the denuclearisation of Africa and Asia in the interest of consolidating international peace and security.

UNITED NATIONS

The two Prime Ministers emphasised the vital role of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and the promotion of international cooperation despite difficulties and temporary setbacks which the United Nations has had recently to face. They reaffirmed the determination of the two countries to collaborate in the strengthening of the United Nations and its ancillary bodies. They welcome the adoption of Resolution 1991 (XVIII) by the General Assembly which provided for enlarged membership of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council and expressed the hope that those members who have not yet ratified the amendment would do so as speedily as possible, so that the amendment is brought into force without further delay.

VIETNAM

The two Prime Ministers noted with grave concern the serious situation in Vietnam as a threat

178

to world peace and security and agreed that the problem called for a political rather than a military solution within the frame-work of the 1954 Geneva Agreements. They held that a Geneva type of conference should be held as early as possible to seek a solution in conformity with the legitimate aspirations of the people of Vietnam for freedom and independence. The stoppage of hostilities including stoppage of bombing of Democratic Republic of Vietnam would create a peaceful climate for the holding of this conference. They agreed that efforts should be made in concert with other non-aligned countries to find a peaceful solution of the Vietnam problem.

ECONOMIC COLLABORATION

The two Prime Ministers and their Ministers of Commerce reviewed the economic and commercial relations between India and Uganda and, while noting the progress made, agreed that the two Governments should undertake periodic studies of practical measures designed to increase trade between them. It was agreed that an Indian Trade Delegation should shortly visit Kampala in order to finalise the Trade Agreement which has already been under discussion between the two Governments.

The Prime Minister Of Uganda expressed his appreciation of the Government of India's desire to promote close technical and economic collaboration between the two countries. The Prime Minister of Uganda received the report of the Indian Technical Team on the establishment of sugar factories in Uganda and both sides felt confident that the first factory would be established in the near future. It was also agreed to examine the possibility of starting other industries in Uganda. The Indian side offered technical training facilities for Uganda technicians in Indian industries which offer was welcomed.

Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri accepted with thanks the cordial invitation extended to him by H.E. the Prime Minister, Dr. Obote to visit Uganda. The date of the visit will be fixed later according to mutual convenience.

UGANDA INDIA USA INDONESIA EGYPT ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA CONGO SOUTH AFRICA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND PERU

Date : Aug 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-Yugoslav Joint Communique

The following is the text of a joint communique issued on August 2, 1965 after the conclusion of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's visit to Yugoslavia :

At the invitation of the President Josip Broz Tito and the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Prime Minister of India Lal Bahadur Shastri and Madame Shastri paid an official visit to Yugoslavia from 28 to 31 July, 1965.

During his visit to Yugoslavia, the Prime Minister of India Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had talks with the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito, and the President of the Federal Executive Council, Petar Stambolic. In these talks took part, also, on the Indian side : Sardar Swaran Singh, Foreign Minister, Shri R. S. Mani, Ambassador in Yugoslavia, Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary to Prime Minister, Shri C. S. Jha, Foreign Secretary and Shri C. P. Srivastava, Joint Secretary to Prime Minister. On the Yugoslav side in the talks took part : Marko Nikezic, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Nikola Dzuverovic, Federal Secretary for Foreign Trade, Gustav Vlahov, Federal Secretary for Information, Ivo Sarajoic, Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Radivoj Uvalic, Ambassador of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to India and Blagoje Popovski, Minister plenipotentiary, Secretariat of State for Foreign Affairs.

FRIENDLY TIES

In the course of these conversations, which were conducted in an atmosphere of traditional friendship, frankness and mutual confidence, views were exchanged on the development and further strengthening of relations between the two countries and on the most important international issues.

Both sides noted with satisfaction that cooperation between the two countries had been developing very successfully in all fields. The exchange of visits of representatives of the two countries has been the source of increased understanding and promotion of friendly ties between the Governments and peoples of both countries.

179

Both sides affirmed their desire and readiness for

the further all-round promotion and expansion of their bilateral relations.

The two sides noted with satisfaction the manifold increase in trade between the two countries which had already taken place over the last 5 years. They agreed that each country should have increasingly greater access to the market of the other.

They further agreed that besides the manysided development of exchange of goods, there was need to pay special attention to promoting cooperation in the field of industry. Such cooperation could extend to the setting up of industrial and other projects in third countries. It should also include sharing the fruits of technological developments in each country on a mutually advantageous basis. In this context, the Yugoslav side expressed its readiness to continue its policy of active participation in building industrial projects in India.

The two sides felt that exchanges and visits of scientists, cultural delegation and journalists had helped in enlarging the scope of cooperation between the two countries and they agreed to take further steps to encourage and to expand the area of such activities.

The two sides further agreed that there was a good deal which each country could learn from the experience of the other in regard to matters pertaining to economic development and the effort to build up a new society. They felt that a steady and continuous exchange of opinion on the socioeconomic experience of each country would be of considerable value and assistance and should, therefore, be encouraged.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

The two sides exchanged views on the international situation. They noted that international relations have seriously deteriorated recently and that at the present moment, the world is again faced with a danger to peace and security. The two sides consider that in the present-day world, the pursuit of a policy of peace and peaceful co-existence among nations is the only alternative to war. Such a policy provides the best basis for the solution of problems and disputes between nations. Implicit in such a policy is the acceptance of the sovereign equality of States and the elimination of the concept of domination of one State by another, politically, economically or otherwise. The two sides will continue to cooperate in the United Nations in the task of the codification of the principles of peaceful co-existence.

Both sides were of the firm opinion that the principles of peaceful co-existence, if universally observed. would facilitate the rapid emancipation of all colonial territories and peoples. They recalled that the declaration adopted by the Cairo' Conference of non-aligned nations in this respect emphasized such basic principles as abstention from threat or use of force against States, the inviolability of frontiers and the sovereign equality of States.

NON-ALIGNMENT

Both sides re-affirmed their adherence to the policy of non-alignment which has made a vital contribution to the maintenance of world peace. It successfully contributes to the solution of urgent world problems, and in particular, corresponds to the vital interests of newly-liberated and developing countries. Both sides are convinced that the policy of non-alignment provides the best basis for progress and development and for the strengthening of national independence, particularly in developing countries.

The two sides expressed concern at outside interference in one form or another in the affairs of sovereign States in many parts of the world, and the growing tendency to use force for the settlement of international disputes. Situations are created thereby which breed favourable conditions for larger and more dangerous conflicts and for the suppression of the freedom of independent nations. The two sides considered that non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and peaceful settlement of all disputes between States which are essential elements of the policies of peaceful co-existence and non-alignment, must be the foundation on which international relations should be built up, and should be observed by all States. The two sides condemned the attempts at solving border and territorial disputes by use of force.

VIETNAM

The two sides devoted considerable attention during their talks to the deteriorating situatiton in Vietnam and exchanged views on how the dangerous drift towards war could be avoided.

If a dangerous and wider war in Vietnam is to be averted and world peace is to be preserved, there is no alternative to a political solution within the framework of the Geneva Agreements which the two sides strongly support. For this purpose it is of utmost importance that the parties concerned in the Vietnam situation meet at a conference table. At any such conference the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam should take part.

There should be a stoppage of bombing of DRVN which would create favourable conditions in which there could be appropriate responses on all sides, leading to a conference). The two countries agreed that they would undertake, together with other non-aligned countries, efforts for finding out a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese

180

problem and for the realisation of the aspirations of Vietnamese people for peace and independence

COLONIALISM AND RACIALISM

The two sides pledged their full support to the struggle for the eradication of all forms of colomalism and neo-colonialism, the existence of which is in open contradiction with the united Nations declaration on granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. They strongly supported the legitimate rights of the people of Angola and Mozambique and of the so-called Portuguese Guinea who are fighting for their national liberation against colonial domination and suppression. They re-affirmed their strong support for the legitimate rights of the African people in Southern Rhodesia who have be-en denied human rights and fundamental freedom. They strongly condemn the policy of racial discrimination pracused by the Government of the Republic of South Africa and support the struggle of the people of South Africa for liberation from racialism and colonialism. They oppose all forms of racial discrimination and in particular the policy of apartheid. Both sides considered that imperialism and colonialism are among the basic causes of international tension and are a permanent threat to

world peace. The two sides agreed that lasting peace cannot be achieved as long as unequal relations exist and peoples under foreign domination are deprived of the right to freedom.

The two sides expressed their hope that the people of the Congo (Leopoldville) would achieve their legitimate rights and enjoy their freedom and independence without outside interference. The assistance of the Organization of the African Unity can play a constructive role in this respect

UNITED NATIONS

The two sides devoted during the talks, particular attention to the crisis in the United Nations, which is affecting adversely the present state of affairs in international relations. They are seriously concerned over the fact that the world organization is not capable of carrying out normally its functions precisely at a time when the international situation is deteriorating and which encourages various aggressive tendencies and actions.

The two sides are of the opinion that it is necessary to make every effort for ensuring the normal functioning of the United Nations, without further delay.

Both sides underline the need for early implementation of U.N. decision on the enlargement of the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations, so that the independent countries of Asia and Africa may have a broader and more, equitable representation in the organs or the world organization. It is their firm belief that the United Nations remains an irreplaceable instrument of peace and cooperation between countries based on equal rights, and the only international body through which all Member States can make their contribution to the positive settlement of outstanding world problems. The two sides also consider that it is indispensable to implement the principle of universaity or the United Nations.

DISARMAMENT

The two sides consider that in view of the present world situation and the increasing danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons, the question or general and complete disarmament has assumed a most urgent character. Both this question and the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons have to be considered as matters of highest priority. They welcome the reconvening of the disarmament Committee in Geneva and earnestly hope the Committee will succeed in working out agreements which will initiate in practical terms general and complete disarmament and prevent the danger of proliteration of nuclear weapons. To these ends it is necessary to agree to further measures within the framework of an agreed plan of general and complete disarmament, and to a treaty of non-proliferation. The two sides recognise in this connection in particular the urgency and importance of undertaking measures towards nuclear disarmament.

Both sides favour an early convening of a world conference of all States by the General Assembly, as recommended by the U.N. Disarmament Commission at its recent meeting.

The two sides, while recognizing the value of the Partial Test Ban Treaty as a first step, consider that no further time should be lost in reaching agreement on the prohibition of underground tests as well. They express the hope that the Disarmament Committee will direct its efforts towards this end.

The two sides regret that despite repeated resolutions of the United Nations and the Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo Declarations, certain powers have carried out or intend to carry out nuclear tests. The importance of the cessation and total prohibition of nuclear tests in the context of the present world situation cannot be over-emphasized.

The difference existing between the developed and developing countries constitute one of the continuing causes of instability in the world. The two sides emphasize the necessity of ensuring equal conditions for cooperation and the elimination of all forms of discrimination in economic relations between developed and developing countries with the aim of gradually reducing the exist-

181

ing differences. They reaffirm their readiness to take the necessary steps for the implementation of the conclusions and recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

The two sides expressed the conviction that the friendly visit of the Prime Minister of the Republic of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, as well as the comprehensive exchange of views on this occasion, will promote the further strengthening and expansion of relations between the S.F.R. of Yugoslavia and the Republic of India and contribute significantly to the cause of peace in the world.

The Prime Minister of the, Republic of India, Lal Bahadur Shastri, expressed his deep appreciation for the warm hospitality extended to him and to members of his party during his visit to Yugoslavia. He invited the President of the Federal Executive Council, Petar Stambolic and Madame Stambolic and renewed the invitation to the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito and Madame Broz, to visit the Republic of India at a convenient time. The President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the President of the Federal Executive Council accepted the invitation with pleasure,

182

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA EGYPT VIETNAM SWITZERLAND MALI ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA SOUTH AFRICA CONGO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDONESIA

Date : Aug 01, 1965

September

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record	1965	
Vol. XI	SEPTEMBER	No.
9		

CONTENTS

PAGE

S ARAB LEAGUE SUMMIT Prime Minister's Message

183

INDONESIA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on the Mob Attack on Indian Embassy in Djakarta 183		
Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on the Demonstration at the Indian Consulate in Medan 184		
KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS Prime Minister's Reply to Message from the U. N. Secretary-Gen	eral 185	
Prime Minister's Reply to U Thant's Letter of September. 12	187	
Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on U Thant's Mission	188	
Prime Minister's Reply to the Debate in Parliament on the Security Council Resolution of September 20 190		
Sardar Swaran Singh's Letter to the U. N. Secretary-General on the Security Council Resolution of September 4 191		

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speeches in the Security Council 193

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speech in the Debate in Parliament on the Security Council

Resolution of September 20	206	
Syed Mir Qasim's Speech in the General Assembly	214	
Shri C. S. Jha's Speech in the Security Council	223	
Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speeches in the Security Council	229	
India's Aide Memoires to the U. N. Secretary-General	239	
India's Letters to the U N. Secretary-General on Violations of the Cease-fit		

India's Letters to the U N. Secretary-General on Violations of the Cease-fire b y Pakistan 240 India's 'Utter to the U. N. Secretary-General on the Creation of a Single Observer Group 242

PAKISTAN

President's Broadcasts to the Nation on Pakistani Aggression against India 243		
Vice-President's Broadcast to the Nation	246	
Prime Minister's Broadcasts to the Nation on Pakistani Aggression against India 248		
Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on the Cease	e-fire 252	
Defence Minister's Statements in Parliament on Pakistani Aggression against India 254		
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA Prime Minister's Statements in Parliament on Chinese	e Ultimatum 257	
SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement in Parliament	259	

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDONESIA INDIA PAKISTAN CHINA

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

ARAB LEAGUE SUMMIT

Prime Minister's Message

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, sent on September 15, 1965 the following message to the Chairman of the Conference of the Council of the Kings and Heads of State of the Arab League : On the great historic occasion of the third Conference of 'the Council of the Kings and Heads of States of the Arab League, I have great pleasure in sending to the august gathering the warm and cordial good wishes of the Government and people of India for the success of the Conference.

The friendly relations between the Arab World and India are historic and traditional extending ever many centuries. There has always been rich and fruitful cultural exchange and ever increasing trade.

India and all member states of the Arab League cherish the principles of non-alignment, peaceful co-existence, disarmament, anti-colonialism and anti-racialism. The Arab countries and India have lent each other significant support whenever forces of colonialism have attempted to reassert themselves whether in India or in the Arab World. These principles have also been the basis of close cooperation in and outside the United Nations and in other international conferences.

India, on its part, firmly adheres to this policy of friendship' with the Arab countries and has every sympathy with the aspirations of the Arab nation. At the Indo-Arab Seminar held in Delhi in February this year, several recommendations made to strengthen Indo-Arab relations in the cultural, educational and scientific fields, are in the process of implementation in cooperation with the Arab League. India is happy over the fact that it is the first country outside the Arab World where the Arab League has established an independent mission.

India is also happy to note that this meeting of the Kings and Heads of States of the Arab League is taking place when, after nearly three years of strife, peace has been established in the Yemen. We are confident that peace in the Yemen will further strengthen Arab unity and make it possible for the Arab nations to play an increasingly greater role for strengthening world peace and promoting human welfare.

Please convey to Their Majesties the Kings and Their Excellencies the Heads of Arab States gathered in Casablanca the esteem and regard of the Government and people of India. I wish them and you all success in your deliberations.

USA INDIA YEMEN

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Sardar swarm Singh's Statement on the Mob Attack on Indian Embassy in Djakarta

The following is the text of a statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the Lok Sabha on September 10, 1965, regarding the attack on the Indian Embassy in Djakarta on September 9, 1965 :

Government have received a report of the incident that took place on the morning of 9th September, 1965. A crowd of about 700. Indonesians approached the Indian Chancery building in Djakarta and indulged in indiscrimi-

183

nate and wanton destruction of property in the Chancery, including files, furniture and office equipment. The mobs smashed the Ambassador's official car and one car belonging to an Embassy staff member and burnt another belonging to a local visitor. They also smashed the photographs of Mahatma Gandhi, the President and the Prime Minister. The national flag was also brought down by the crowd. Another crowd numbering a hundred proceeded to the Indian Information Office and hoisted the Indonesian flag there. They removed the Indian State emblem and smeared the display windows with red paint and slogans claiming the building as Indonesian property were written on the building. Our Public Relations Officer and the Information staff were prevented from entering the building. The crowd was rough with the Public Relations Officer and pushed him shouting, "Go home, India".

Our Ambassador in Djakarta has informed us

that he is lodging a strong protest against this wanton destruction of property and insult to the Indian flag, the Indian State Emblem and the Indian leaders. We are also claiming compensation for the very extensive damages caused. The Indonesian Chief of Protocol called on the, Indian Ambassador on behalf of the Indonesian Foreign Minister and expressed regret at the incident. He returned the Indian flag which the mob had removed from the Chancery. He denied that the Government had any foreknowledge of the incident. The Indonesian Ambassador in Delhi was called this morning to the Ministry of External Affairs and was told of the very serious view taken by the Government of this incident.

The House is aware of the close relations that have always existed between the people of Indonesia and India and the traditionl bonds of culture and friendship that unite them. Indonesia and India worked in close collaboration during Indonesia's struggle for independence and this was followed in the common struggle for the liberation of others still under colonial domination. The Government is pained that the Government of Indonesia should have allowed such an attack on our Embassy, which is against all accepted international conventions and rules relating to protection of diplomatic missions.

INDONESIA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Demonstration at the Indian Consulate in Medan

The following is the text of a statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the Lok Sabha on September 22, 1965 regarding the reported seizure of Indian Consulate in Sumatra and Indians' property in Indonesia : The Government of India have learnt with great regret that, on the morning of 13th September, 1965. the North Sumatra Youth Front staged a big demonstration at the Indian Consulate in Medan. Despite protests by the Consul, the demonstrators pulled down the Indian National Flag from the Consulate building and replaced it with the Indonesian national flag. The demonstraors also pulled down the Indian national emblem and name plate on the Consulate, and carried them away alone with two book shelves containing library books. They tried to take away the portrait of the Indian President, but were prevented from doing so by the Consul.

Earlier the Consul had written to the Governor of North Sumatra to provide all protection to both the personnel and property of the Consulate. The police on duty however did nothing to prevent the demonstrators. It is clear. beyond doubt, that the Indonesian Government could not discharge its international obligation of giving protection to foreign missions stationed in Indonesian territory. The Consul has reported that he was seeking an appointment with the Governor of North Sumatra. Our Ambassador in Djakarta has lodged a protest with the Indonesian Foreign Office.

Labels reading "under protection of the Indonesian Government" have been pasted by the police on all Indian shops and houses in Jakarta on 18th September. According to the police this action was taken to protect the properties and prevent untoward incidents. The Indian merchants were also told that although the properties belonged to them, they would not be able to sell their houses and shops or transfer them. Our Ambassador is discussing this question with the members of the Indian community.

The Governor of West Java has issued a decree according to which Indian property was taken over into protective custody of the Government for security reasons, with effect from 11th September. The Chief of the Police of the Province has been given the power to exercise his discretion to release the property at any time from the continuous operation of this decree.

The Gandhi Memorial School in Jakarta which is owned and managed by Indians which had been

taken over by the Indonesian National Front, has now been allowed to open. The Khalsa School in Medan has been taken over by Government authorities.

184

INDONESIA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Reply to Message from the U.N. Secretary-General

The following is the text of the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's reply to the message received from U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, on September 2, 1965 in connection with the developments in Jammu and Kashmir :

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your message received on September 2.

I appreciate the considerations that have prompted you to address an appeal to us and to Pakistan in connection with the recent developments in Jammu and Kashmir. Our Permanent Representative in New York has been in frequent touch with you and has kept you informed of the situation as it has developed since August 5. I have no doubt that from ill the information that you have received from the United Nations Observers in Kashmir and on the basis of your own assessment, it is clear that the root cause of the present dangerous situation is the undertaking of massive infiltrations of armed personnel from the Pakistan side, well organised and trained in sabotage and subversive warfare, the whole operation being conceived, planned and executed by Pakistan. The infiltrators are, in fact, members of the Pakistan armed forces.

These infiltrations are still continuing Such action by Pakistan is a clear violation, of the Charter of the United Nations and of the ceasefire agreement, and is against all canons of international law and code of good neighbourliness. It is to meet this thinly disguised invasion that the Government of India while showing every forbearance, have been forced to take preventive military action.

In your message, you have appealed in the interests of peace that we should indicate our intention to respect the ceasefire agreement, that there should be it cessation of crossings of the ceasefire line by armed personnel from both sides of the line and a halt to all firing across the ceasefire line from either side of it. While I appreciate the motivations of your appeal, I have to point out that the terms of your message arc such as might leave the impression that we are responsible equally with Pakistan for the dangerous developments that have taken place. Unless your message is read in the context of the realities of the situation as they have developed, it tends to introduce a certain equation between India and Pakistan, which the facts of the situation do not bear out. Indeed, it seems to me that your message has to be read in conjunction with the report that you have sent to the members of the Security Council.

I would like to take this opportunity of apprising you of the salient facts of the situation. Since August 5, several thousands of infiltrators from Pakistan and from Pakistan-occupied Kashmir have crossed the ceasefire line. These men have come camouflaged as civilians and fully armed with modern weapons, signal equipment, large quantities of ammunition and supplies and explosives. From the interrogation of the prisoners captured by us from among the infiltrators, many of whom are regular officers of the Pakistan army, it is now known that a military headquarters was set up in Murree, in West Pakistan, in May, 1965, under General Akhtar Husain Malik, General Officer Commanding; 12th Division, of the Pakistan army. This organisation is known as Military Headquarters "Gibralter Force". Their instructions were to destroy bridges and vital roads, attack police stations, supply dumps, army headquarters and important installations, inflict casualties on Indian forces, and attack VIPs in Jammu and Kashmir. The

statements of the captured prisoners and the nature and type of weapons which the infiltrators carried, large quantities of which have been captured by us, bearing the markings of Pakistan ordnance factories, prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the infiltrators were armed and equippod by the Pakistan Government and have operated under their instructions.

Pakistan, however, has denied any knowledge of these armed infiltrations and persists in the theory that there is an internal revolt in Kashmir -a revolt which does not exist and has not been noticed by independent foreign observers. Since your message was sent the situation has been further aggravated by a massive attack launched by two regiments of tanks and air-craft supported by Pakistan troops in brigade strength, across the ceasefire line and the international frontier between the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir and West Pakistan. The attack which is in great strength is aimed at our key positions controlling our lines of communications. Even on its own admission, as indicated in President Ayub Khan's broadcast of September 1, the Pakistani forces have gone to the assistance of the infiltrators whom Pakistan chooses to call "Freedom Fighters". There is no pretence in it of any kind of defensive action and the Pakistani attack

185

clearly constitutes aggression The (Pakistani attack is accompanied by the usual tactics of the aggressor, namely, indiscriminate bombing of the civilian population. In a bombing raid on September 2, the Pakistan Air Force killed 50 civilians and injured an equal number in addition to the bombing of a mosque. We have to Meet the Situation created by this latest Pakistani aggression.

In your message, Mr. Secretary-General, you have yourself recognised that essential to the restoration of the ceasefire would be a cessation of the crossings of the ceasefire line by armed personnel. As I have indicated above, the root cause or the development of the present dangerous situation in Kashmir lies in the massive infiltrations of Pakistani armed personnel. Since the Pakistan government disown responsibility for the armed infirtrations, your appeal to Pakistan, so tar as armed infiltrators are concerned, can hardly be productive of results and the root cause of the trouble will remain.

India is a peace-loving country. We have neither the inclination nor is it in our interest to be deviated from the path of peace and economic progress to that of military conflict. Pakistan has, however, by sending armed infiltrators in large numbers across the ceasefire line, brought about a situation in which we have no choice but to defend ourselves and take such preventive action as may be deemed essential. In taking such preventive action we have, in certain sectors, had to cross the ceasefire line for the purpose of effectively preventing further infiltrations. This is a matter of great importance to us.

As to the ceasefire agreement, you are well aware that we have shown respect for the ceasefire line all these years though Pakistan has shown scant regard for it. Over the past two years, General Nimmo, Chief Military Observer, has made proposals for a meeting between the representatives of India and Pakistan with a view to ensuring the observance of the ceasefire agreement and to preventing its violation from the Pakistan side by armed civilians. We have always accepted these proposals but Pakistan has neither rejected them or not responded to them. In July, 1964, we offered to come to a gentlemen's agreement with Pakistan to ensure tranquillity along the ceasefire, line. Pakistan at first agreed to a meeting and the representatives of India and Pakistan were to meet in Karachi on the 2nd November, 1964. However. a day before the meeting was to be held, Pakistan postponed the meeting unilaterally and did not suggest any fresh date thereafter.

Pakistan's international behaviour is such as cannot be ignored in considering your appeal. It will be recalled that in 1947-48, Pakistan undertook action similar to the present one and persisted in denying its complicity for several months unto the truth could no longer be hidden and it had no way but to admit to the United Nations' Commission for India and Pakistan, in July 1948, that Pakistani forces had been fightmg in Kashmir for several months. That act of Pakistan's aggression the United Nations seems to have forgotten, but that aggression is still with us and Pakistan continues to be in forcible occupation of 2/5ths of our State of Jammu and Kashmir.

It is within your knowledge that in April this year, Pakistan launched a military attack in our territory in the Rann of Kutch-a clear case of use of force for the assertion of its claims, which is forbidden by the Charter of the United Nations, the Bandung Declaration, the Charter of the Organisation of African Unity States, the Cairo Declaration and many other international declarations. of our time. In spite of such provocation, we showed forbearance and reached an agreement with Pakistan on the 30th June, 1965, for the peaceful settlement of the border question. The hope was solemnly expressed by both sides in the agreement that it would result in better relations between India and Pakistan and in the easing of tensions between the two countries. It is now clear, however, that even when Pakistan was putting its signature to that agreement it was planning and organising the massive armed infiltrations across the ceasefire line in Jammu and Kashmir, and even before the ink was dry on that agreement, Pakistan launched thousands of its armed infiltrators across the ceasefire line. We cannot be expected to wait for Pakistan to violate the ceasefire line and to attack us at will, and we cannot go from one ceasefire to another without our being satisfied that Pakistan will not repeat its acts of violations and aggression in the future.

There is no other name for the massive Pakistani infiltrations across the ceasefire line and across the international frontier between Jammu and Kashmir and West Pakistan, and the military attack that Pakistan has launched into our territory, but aggression. That aggression throws on us, as a sovereign State, responsibilities for defence which it is our right and duty to discharge.

To sum up, I have taken this opportunity of acquainting you with all the aspects of the complex and dangerous situation that has been brought about by Pakistani actions. We owe it to you and to the high office you occupy with such distinction to leave you in no doubt as to our position. Mr. Secretary-General, you have appealed for peace and we greatly appreciate your anxiety and the sincerity of your efforts. India has always stood firmly for peace and our position needs no reiteration. What is essential, however today is that Pakistan should undertake

186

forthwith to stop infiltrations across the ceasefire line and to, withdraw the, infiltrators and its armed forces from the Indian side of the ceasefire line and the international frontier between Jammu and Kashmir and West Pakistan. Furthermore, we would have to be satisfied that there will be no recurrence of such a situation. These have to be the starting points of any steps towards the restoration of peace for which you, as Secretary-General of the United Nations, are bending your efforts. I trust that, in, the first instance, you will ascertain from Pakistan if it will accept the responsibility for withdrawing not only its armed forces but also the infiltrators and for preventing further infiltrations. This, in fact we take it, is the basic assumption underlying your appeal.

USA PAKISTAN INDIA MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA INDONESIA EGYPT

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Reply to U Thant's Letter of September 12.

The following is the text of Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's reply, dated September 14, 1965, to the U.N. Secretary-General's letter of September 12, 1965 :

Mr. Secretary-General,

I thank you for your letter of 12th September, 1965 and appreciate greatly the sincere concern which you have expressed about the likely repercussions of the existing situation on, the welfare of the peoples of India and Pakistan. Ever since India attained independence in 1947, we have concentrated attention on the economic development of our country with a view to eradicating poverty and providing a reasonable standard of living to our people. Such resources as we could mobilise have been devoted to this vital task. All these years, we have actively and purposefully pursued a policy of non-alignment and of peaceful co-existence. We have sought peace and friendship with our neighbours. Our faith in the forces of peace was so genuine and so strong that we did not pay the requisite attention to building up adequately the defence forces of the country. It was only after the Chinese invasion on our northern borders in 1962 that we realised how essential it was for us to be prepared for defending our territorial integrity.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, our effort has always been to promote good neighbourly relations. There has not been even a single occasion, during the last 18 years, when India has deviated from the path of peace in her relationship with Pakistan, let alone thinking of any aggressive action. In fact, on more than one occasion, both I and my distinguished predecessor have offered to enter into a no-war pact with Pakistan so that there is no possibility of a clash of arms between the two countries.

The response from Pakistan has been disappointing in the extreme. Our proposal for a no-war pact has been repeatedly turned down. An atmosphere of conflict and tension has been continuously maintained through a variety of ways, including firing across the cease-fire line, repeated border incidents elsewhere and a campaign of hate against India through the controlled press and radio of Pakistan. Important men, occupying responsible positions in that country, have openly and repeatedly declared their intention to use force against India in achieving their objectives. Not content with that, the rulers of Pakistan have launched naked aggression against India three times since 1947, twice in our State of Jammu and Kashmir and once in our State of Gujarat.

Mr. Secretary-General, we fully understand the concern of the Security Council over the present situation and we greatly appreciate its efforts towards the restoration of peace. I cannot, however, help expressing here that if the same concern had been shown immediately when Pakistan launched a massive attack on India on August 5, 1965, by sending thousands of armed infiltrators equipped with Pakistani arms and ammunition and officered by men of the regular forces of Pakistan, about which there is irrefutable evidence, for the purpose of capturing vital positions, such as airports, and police stations, cutting off lines of communication, destroying bridges, and other public property and creating disorder with a view to seizing power from the lawfully established Government, in accordance with a predetermined plan of invasion, the situation would not have assumed its present serious proportions. I would not go further into this aspect of the matter but must add that having been attacked by Pakistan. we had to take action to defend ourselves. I must also stress, and I hope it will be appreciated, that at every stage whatever action our armed forces took was dictated solely by the requirements of self-defence to meet the aggression of Pakistan.

Whatever may be the context, Mr: Secretary-General, we greatly welcome your visit and we recognise the importance of your mission from the point of view of peace, not only in the Indian sub-continent, but, indeed, in the world as a whole. India has always believed in peace and her adherence to peaceful methods stands un-

187

shaken. In deference to the wishes of the Security Council and to the appeals which we have received from many friendly countries, we accept your proposal for an immediate cease-fire. We would, therefore, be prepared to order a ceasefire effective from 6.30 a.m. IST on Thursday, 16 September 1965, provided you confirm to me by 9 a.m. tomorrow that Pakistan is also agreeable to do so.

In your letter, it has been suggested that the Governments of India and Pakistan should give the requisite orders to their field commanders with a view to ensuring an effective cease-fire from the appointed time and date. This will, however, be effective only in respect of the armed forces in uniform engaged in the present combat. The problem of thousands of armed infiltrators who have crossed over into our State of Jammu and Kashmir, from Pakistan side, will, I am afraid, continue to remain on our hands. Armed as they are with dangerous weapons of destruction, such as machine guns and hand-grenades, they do even now. as I write this letter. make sudden depredations in an effort to damage vital installations and other property and harass the people of the

State of Jammu and Kashmir. That this invasion by armed infiltrators in civilian disguise was conceived, planned and executed by Pakistan is now well-established. Your own report, Mr. Secretary-General, brings this out clearly. And yet, as we understand from you, Pakistan continues to disclaim all responsibility. We are not surprised at this denial. because even on an earlier occasion when Pakistan had committed aggression by adopting similar methods she had at first denied her complicity, although at a later date she had to admit her involvement. We must urge that Pakistan should be asked forthwith to withdraw these armed infiltrators. Until that is done, our security forces will have to deal with these raiders effectively.

Mr. Secretary-General, may I remind you that it was only the other day, in April this year, that Pakistan had launched an armed attack supported by tanks and other armour, in our State of Gujarat. Despite grave provocation, we had then acted with great self-restraint and had taken no counter-measures. Eventually, a cease-fire agreement was signed, in which among other things, both-sides had expressed the solemn hope that the tension between the two countries would get reduced. Subsequent events have shown that Pakistan never meant what she had agreed to expressly and specifically in that cease-fire. agreement. It has come to us as a great shock that even from the month of April, 1965, plans for invading India in another sector had been prepared and training was being imparted to the armed personnel for war-like operations on our territories. Within less than five weeks of the signing of the Indo-Pakistan Cease-fire Agreement relating to West Pakistan-Gujarat Border, Pakistan attacked India once again. In the light of our own experience during the last few months, we will have to insist that there must be no possibility of a recurrence of armed attacks on India, open or disguised. Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Secretary-General, that when consequent upon cease-fire becoming effective further details are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infiltrations that have taken place. I would also like to state categorically that no pressures or attacks will deflect us from our firm resolve to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of

Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part.

In conclusion, Mr. Secretary-General, I must point out that the menacing forces of aggression are unfortunately at large in Asia, endangering the peace of the world. If the Security Council does not identify the aggressor and equates it with the victims of aggression, the chances of peace 'will fade out. The situation which the Security Council is being called upon to handle has grave and vital implications in respect of peace and political stability in Asia. What is involved is the welfare of millions of human beings who have suffered for long and who are now entitled to relief and to a better standard of living. If the forces of aggression are not checked effectively, the world may find itself embroiled in conflict which may well annihilate mankind. We sincerely hope that the forces of peace will win and that humanity will go forward towards ever increasing Progress and prosperity. It is in this spirit that we are agreeing to your proposal for a ceasefire.

USA INDIA PAKISTAN

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on U Thant's Mission

The following is the text of the Prime Minister's statement in Parliament on September 16, 1965 on the visit to New Delhi of the U.N. Secretary-General, U Thant :

As the Hon'ble Members are aware, Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, arrived in New Delhi on September 12, 1965 and after staying here for three days he left yesterday for New York. I We welcomed him amongst ourselves not only as a high dignitary, but also as a representative or the world organisation on which lies the heavy responsibility of preserving international peace. The Secretary-General and I had free and frank discussions. He met the Foreign Minister and also saw the Defence Minister.

During the discussions, the Secretary-General drew attention to We grave implications of the present conflict, specially in relation to the welfare or the 600 million people belonging to India and Pakistan. He referred to the Security Council Resolutions of September 4 and 6 and appealed that a cease-lire should be ordered immediately by both countries.

I gave a factual narration of the events as they had taken place and pointed out that the present conflict was not of our seeking. It was stated by Pakistan when thousands of armed infiltrators invaded our State of Jammu and Kashmir commencing from August 5, 1965, with the objective of destroying or capturing vital positions, such as airports, police stations and bridges and ultimately of seizing power forcibly from the State Government at Srinagar. Finding that its initial invasion had largely failed, Pakistan had launched on 1st September, 1965, a massive armed attack not only across the cease-fire line but across the international frontier as well. Pakistan had thus not only started the conflict but had further escalated it in such a manner as to leave India with no choice except to take counter-measures in self-defence.

I explained all this to the Secretary-General and told him that the present conflict had been forced upon us by Pakistani aggression. We were determined, however, to preserve fully and completely the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country of which the State of Jammu and Kashmir formed an integral part; nor could we accept a situation in which Pakistan may continue its armed aggressions on India time and again.

The Secretary-General was particularly anxious that as a first step we should agree to the cease-fire and to the cessation of hostilities. I told him that a cease-fire in regard to the fighting between the troops was understandable but the question of raiders would still remain on our hands. I pointed out that we would have to continue to deal effectively with these raiders many of whom were still at large in the State of Jammu and Kashmir unless, of course, Pakistan undertook to withdraw them from our territory.

We went into the pros and cons of the ceasefire in some detail. Subsequently, I received a letter from the Secretary-General in which his appeal for a cease-fire was reiterated. After full consideration of all aspects we sent a reply to him. As the Hon'ble Members would see from a perusal of this letter, we raised no objection to the Secretary-Gnerals proposal for a cease-fire. However, in regard to certam matters of vital importance to India, we made our stand perfectly clear. For instance, as already stated we would have to deal with the raiders who were still sporadically attacking public property or harassing the people in the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Also, we could not possibly revert to a situation in which we may find ourselves once again unable to prevent infiltrations or to deal effectively with those who had already come in. In regard to the political aspect of the question, we made it clear that we were fully determined to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of India of which the State of Jammu and Kashmir was an integral part. From this resolve we could never be deflected, no matter what the pressure or the threat. These were not conditions attached to our acceptance of the cease-fire but were meant to be a clear and' unequivocal reiteration of our stand in regard to these vital matters.

Late in the evening, on the 14th September, I received a further letter from the Secretary-General saying that he could not give any undertaking to which 1 sent a reply yesterday morning pointing out that as a matter of fact, we had not asked him to give any undertaking to us. Our acceptance of the cease-fire proposal thus complied fully with the appeal of the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General told me, prior to his departure from New Delhi, that if by the evening of 15th September, 1965, Pakistan did not give a reply agreeing to cease-fire we should take it that an agreement on this question had not been possible. Since no such acceptance was received by the stipulated time, an announcement was made that our defence forces will have to continue the operations with unabated vigour.

Although the Secretary-General's present efforts to bring about a stoppage of hostilities in order to pave the way for peace has not been fruitful through no lack of cooperation from us, he intends, as he has announced publicly, to pursue his efforts further and just before leaving Delhi, he sent me a further letter.

As the Hon'ble Members would see, we have made every effort to extend all cooperation to the United Nations in its efforts to restore peace and we accepted the Secretary-General's proposal for an immediate cease-fire. Pakistan, on the other hand,, has given no such acceptance. In fact, the indications are that she is intent upon continuing the fight, unless her own plan involving withdrawal of the armed forces of India and Pakistan from the entire State of Jammu and

189

Kashmir, the induction of the United Nations Force. and a plebiscite within three months thereafter is agreed to. Let me state an the floor of this House that not one of these conditions is acceptable to India. It is obvious now that Pakistan launched an aggression on India by 5th August, 1965, with a view to making an attempt to revive the settled issue of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. She wants to force a decision by naked aggression. This we cannot possibly allow. We have no alternative, therefore, but to carry on our struggle. We fully realise that the present armed conflict between India and Pakistan will cause untold hardships and misery to people in both countries. However, I am confident that our countrymen would cheerfully undergo those hardships, but they would not allow an aggressor to endanger our freedom or to annex our territories.

I have seen some press reports of President Ayub Khan's press conference of yesterday. Among other things, he is reported to have observed that good sense required that India and Pakistan live together in peace. If this is a new and sincere thought, I would greatly welcome it, however belated it might be. But if past experience is any guide, thew remarks would appear to be part of a propaganda to beguile the world. Previously also, President Ayub has talked of the virtue of peace, and has followed it up by unprovoked aggressions on India in Kutch and subsequently in Kashmir. President Ayub has, I trust, by now seen the result of Pakistan's policy of hate and hostility against India.

As the circumstances exist today, the nation has to be continuously alert and be ready for any sacrifice to preserve our freedom and integrity. I am greatly beholden to the Parliament, to all the political parties and indeed to the entire nation for their united stand against the aggressor. I want also to express once again the gratitude of the nation to the valiant armed forces who have already demonstrated that they are capable not only of defending our frontiers but also of delivering crushing blows to the invader. Their deeds of heroism will make a glorious chapter in the annals of India. This Parliament and the whole country is proud of them. I am confident that we will continue to meet this challenge with-the same determination and courage.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Reply to the Debate in Parliament on the Security Council Resolution of September 20.

The following is the text of the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's speech in Parliament on September 24, 1965 :

I must express my gratitude to all the Hon'ble Members who have participated in the debate today. There have been several speakers, and they have expressed themselves in words of their choice. But I have heard from every side of the House only one voice-the voice of patriotism, of national will to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of India no matter who' the invader may be. This is the voice of the people of India expressed in unmistakable terms through their chosen representatives in Parliament; this is the voice of the sovereign will of the people. Hon'ble Members would permit me to recall that, while speaking in this House in April last, I had appealed for the unity of heart amongst our people. That unity has been achieved in the fullest measure and has been demonstrated effectively in these critical days. In fact, it is this unity which has been the biggest source of strength to all of us in these testing times.

The cease-fire has already come about in spite of Pakistan's intransigence. It is likely that when we consider the subsequent steps, further difficulties and complications might arise. It is by no means going to be an easy task, specially in view of the threats given even after the acceptance of the cease-fire, by President Ayub Khan and his Foreign Minister. I have made India's position absolutely clear in my letter of 14th September, addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Our understanding of the three resolutions of the Security Council is that they are applicable to both regular forces and the infiltrators from Pakistan. Pakistan must own and discharge the responsibility of withdrawing the infiltrators from our State of Jammu & Kashmir. However, they are continuing to disclaim all responsibility for the infiltration despite the report of the Secretary-General himself. If Pakistan persists in this attitude. India alone must deal with the infiltrators effectively and force them out. Moreover, we shall never allow any arrangement for the future in which there may be possibilities of further infiltrations.

About our State of Jammu and Kashmir, the House knows our stand which is firm and clear. This State is an integral part of India, a constituent unit of the federal union of India. There is hardly any case for the exercise of self-determination again. The people of Jammu and Kashmir have already exercised the right of

190

self-determination through three General. Elections held on the basis of universal adult franchise.

I feel grateful for and heartened by the unanimity of support for the, policy which the Government of India has followed in meeting the challenge of recent aggression. However, I would like to say that dangers still lie ahead even after a cease-fire has become effective. These dangers are very real indeed. We should surely be prepared to meet them and our preparations will not be relaxed.

Shri Peter Alvares had expressed the opinion that the Soviet Union had apparently agreed to "de-freezing" the Kashmir question. It would not be correct to say so. The Soviet Union is today an ardent champion of peace. They have known the horrors of war and they do want, in a friendly spirit, to endeavour to bring about an improvement in the relationship between India and Pakistan. Their intentions are pure and we have, therefore, welcomed their initiative. Discussion on the non-official resolution of Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad will be carried over to the next session. I would not, therefore, like to say anything just at present.

Some Hon'ble Members have referred to the work of our Diplomatic Missions abroad. I can tell the House with complete sincerity that on the present occasion each one of our Missions has been alert and vigilant. They have done a good job in keeping the Government to which they are accredited fully informed of the developments and of the justness of our cause. The attitude which some Governments take, is not in my, view dependent upon or even affected by, what our Ambassadors have to say. There are pre-conceived notions and prejudices which one has to contend with. It must, nevertheless, be our persistent effort to project our case in the best possible manner and to win friends for India in all parts of the world.

A few wards are necessary, Mr. Speaker, about the home front. The momentum which the nation has gained will have to be kept up, our defence preparedness will have to be improved continuously, we will have to remain vigilant all along our frontiers. For strengthening our defences, a good deal of sacrifice will be needed on the part of the country as a whole. We may all have to accept privations and even our economic development may have to be slowed down somewhat in order that our defences are not weakened.

To the tasks that lie ahead, we shall address

ourselves in a realistic manner and in full awareness of the fact that self-reliance must be our watchword. I am grateful to this august House for the magnificent support which it has given in these historic times. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would appeal to the House to authorise you to carry, through our Defence Minister, the admiration and gratitude of this House to our Armed Forces for the splendid job they have done. I would also, with your permission. like to suggest that the House should rise and observe a minute's silence to honour the memory of those soldiers, airmen, policemen and civilians who have become martyrs in the defence of their Motherland.

USA INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Letter to the U. N. Secretary-General on the Security Council Resolution of September 4.

The following is the text of a letter from Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, to the U.N. Secretary-General, on the Security Council Resolution of September 4, 1965 :

The Minister of External Affairs of the Government of India presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the text of Resolution 209 (1965) adopted by the Security Council at its 1237th meeting on September 4, 1965. The Government of India having given the most careful consideration to the Resolution of the Security Council would like to convey the following views to the Security Council :

The Government of India appreciate that the Security Council in their anxiety to stop the con-

tinuance of hostilities and bloodshed have urgently adopted a Resolution in the hone of bringing about an immediate cease-fire. This Resolution has evidently been adopted without taking into consideration the reply of the Prime Minister of India communicated to the Secretary-General on September 4 in response to the anneal addressed by the Secretary-General to the Government of India on September 2. The reply of the Prime Minister of India narrated the events leading to the present situation in Kashmir, and also urged the steps which should be taken to restore peace in the State of Jammu & Kashmir. It is also evident that the Resolution does not take into consideration certain important findings and recommendations of the Secretary-General contained in his Report (S/6651) dated September 3, 1965. Further, neither the Resolution nor the discussions which preceded the adoption of the Resolution took note of the fact that on

191

September 1, 1965; Pakistan violated the international border south of the CFL between the State of Jammu & Kashmir and West Pakistan in order to attack the Chhamb-Jaurian sector within the State of Jammu & Kashmir, thereby extending the area of conflict. While aggression across the international border in the Chhamb-Jaurian sector continues, this attack, directed as it was by regular forces of Pakistan army towards gaining territory and cutting the vital lines of communication between the rest of India and the Indian State of Jammu & Kashmir, has changed the entire character of the situation. The offensive action in the Chhamb area was being fed by bases in Pakistan along the border of Pakistan with the State of Jammu & Kashmir. There were strong concentrations of Pakistan forrces, on the western frontier between India and Pakistan. On September 5th, after the Resolution of the Security Council calling for a cease-fire, Pakistan aircraft bombed an Indian Air Force Unit in Amritsar in the Indian State of Punjab. Pakistan aircraft also bombed Ranbirshinghpura and other places in Jammu & Kashmir well away from the cease-fire line. It was obvious that Pakistan was preparing for an offensive against India in a big way and situation was created in which action restricted to Jammu & Kashmir could no longer meet the needs of the situation. Since the UN has throughout accepted that the security of Jammu & Kashmir is the responsibility of India,

the Government of India had no alternative but to give effective assistance to our forces by moving across the Wagah border to stop Pakistan at the bases from which the attacks in 'Jammu & Kashmir were being mounted and supported.

The Resolution 209(1965) "calls upon the Government of India and Pakistan to take forthwith all steps for an immediate cease-fire". "is cease-fire is posited on the condition mentioned in paragraph 2 of the Resolution which "calls upon the two Governments to respect the cease-fire line and have all armed personnel of each party withdrawn to its own side of the line". It is the view of the Government of India that, if ceasefire is to be brought about and peace restored the withdrawal of the "armed personnel of each party" referred to in this paragraph, must include all infiltrators from the Pakistan side of the CFL, whether armed or unarmed. because as stated by the Prime Minister of India in his reply to the Secretary-General, the present hostilities originated with large scale infiltration of armed and unarmed personnel from Pakistan, and until the activities of such personnel cease and until all such Personnel are withdrawn from the Indian side of the ceasefire line, peace cannot be restored for which Pakistan must accept full responsibility.

It has been stated by the Secretary-General in the concluding part of his Report that the restoration of the cease-fire and the return to normal conditions along the cease-fire line can be achieved Inter alia by "(a)- A willingness of both parties to respect the agreement they have entered into" and (6) A readiness on the part of the Government of Pakistan to take effective steps to prevent crossings of the CFL from the Pakistan side by armed men, whether or not in uniform.

These findings of the Secretary-General, based on the reports of the UNMOGIP, established beyond any doubt that Pakistan committed aggression against India across the CFL. This aggression began in its massive form soon after India agreed to withdraw and withdrew from the Kargil area, considered strategically vital to the security of the Srinagar-Leh road, on assurances given by Pakistan through the Secretary-General that the security of this road would not be endangered by Pakistan. But as stated by the Secretary-General in his Report to the Security Council, "subsequently there were some military attacks on the road by armed element from the- Pakistan side". Ibis establishes clearly that Pakistan had no intention of honouring solemn assurances given to India through the Secretary-General and was bent on renewed and further aggression. The facts leading to the present situation and narrated in Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's message of September 4 to the Secretary General are borne out by the Secretary General's Report wherein it is stated that "General Nimmo has indicated to me that the series of violations that began on 5th August have been to a considerable extent in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the CFL from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side. This is a conclusion reached by General Nirmno on the basis of investigations by the UN Observers, in the light of extensiveness and character of the raiding activities and their proximity to the CFL". It has been further stated by the Secretary-General that "as regards violations by artillery, there was heavy and prolonged artillery fire across the line from the Pakistan side in the Chhamb/ Bhimber area on 15-16 August, and on 19 and 26 August the town of Poonch was shelled from the Pakistan side. some of the shells hitting the building occupied by UN Military Observers. Pakistan artillery again shelled the town of Poonch on 28th August." It is also stated the "it is likewise confirmed that as of 24 August armed elements from Pakistan were still occupying Indian Positions (pickets) north of Mandi in the Poonch sector of the CFL." The Secretary-General's Report has also stated that UN Military Observers have confirmed that on September 1 Pakistan army supported by artillery and airforce attacked the Chhamb area of the Jammu-Jhangar sector: and on September 2 attacked Jaurian village across the international border between India and Pakistan.

192

Thus, aggression by Pakistan has been clearly estalished by the independent authority of the

United Nations and it is regretted that the Security Council have not taken this into consideration or asked Pakistan to withdraw from across the international border south of the CFL and to respect the international border between India and Pakistan.

While the Secretary-General in his recommendations to the Security Council referred to above has sought willingness of both parties to respect the agreement they have entered into, this appeal should more appropriately have been addressed to Pakistan alone because India has always respected the agreement in respect of the CFL. This is borne out by the Report of the, Secretary-General itself. In this Report he has stated that on the morning of 9th August, a cable was received from General Nirmo warning that the situation was deteriorating along the CFL. On the basis of this Report, the Secretary-General asked the representative of Pakistan to convey to his Government his "very serious concern about the situation that was developing in Kashmir, involving the crossing of the CFL from the Pakistan side by numbers of armed men and their attacks on Indian military positions on the Indian side of the line, and also my strong appeal that the CFL be observed". In response to this appeal, the Secretary-General has noted that "I have not obtained from the Government of Pakistan any assurance that the cease-fire and the CFL will be respected henceforth or that efforts would be exerted to restore conditions to normal along that line". The reason for Pakistan refusing to give such an assurance is also evident from the Report of the Secretary-General when, he described the considerations which led to his withholding the statement he wanted to make in consultation with the Governments of India and Pakistan. While India was agreeable to the statement proposed to be issued by the Secretary-General, according to the Secretary-General "The Government of Pakistan was strongly negative about the statement in general, on the ground that it favoured India in that it dealt only with the current cease-fire situation without presenting the political background of the broad issue and thus was lacking in balance, since a cease-fire alone supports the status quo to India's benefit. It is clear from this that Pakistan did not want and does not want to maintain the status quo in respect of cease-fire line and its only aim is to violate the CFL and by aggression to extend by force the forcible occupation of the 2/5th of the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the whole of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Thus, it is Pakistan alone who should be asked to express willingness to respect the agreement they have, entered into and to desist from altering status quo by force.

The Secretary-General in the second recommendation contained in his report to the Security Council has urged categorically that the Government of Pakistan is to be asked to express its readiness "to take effective steps to prevent crossings of the CFL from the Pakistan side by armed men, whether or not in uniform". It is obvious from this that as stated in the reply of the Prime Minister of India to the Secretary-General, the present situation has arisen not from any armed revolt in the State, of Jammu and Kashmir, as wrongly alleged by Pakistan, but as a result of massive armed infiltration organised and planned by Pakistan followed by attacks by Pakistan Army and Air Force. Until this aspect of the situation and the recommendation of the Secretary-General in this regard are taken into consideration, no progress can be made to restore peace in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Government of India is of the firm view that an immediate cease-fire and the implementation of paragraph 2 of Security Council Resolution No. 209(65) can he brought about only when Pakistan takes effective steps to stop further crossings of the CFL from Pakistan side by armed and unarmed personnel, civil and military, whether or not in uniform, and also immediately removes from the Indian side of the CFL all such personnel, who have already crossed the CFL. Pakistan must also vacate aggression in the Chhamb area forcibly occupied by Pakistan since 1st September from across the international border and undertakes to respect in future the international border between India and Pakistan. Furthermore. India would have to be satisfied that there will be no recurrence of such a situation before cease-fire can be effective and peace restored.

INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA PAKISTAN **Date :** Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speeches in the Security Council

Shri Mahomedali Currim Chagla, Union Minister of Education and the Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Security Council, made the following speech in the Security Council on September 17, 1965 :

We are meeting here this morning under very distressing and tragic circumstances. Fighting is going on between two neighbouring countries. I assure you that, as far as we are concerned, we have the friendliest and most cordial relations

193

with the people, of Pakistan. Although President Ayub has said that we are at war, our Prime Minister more than once, has stressed the fact that there is no war between the two countries and that we do not want to be at war with Pakistan.

This is a peculiar tragedy for our country. We have always stood for peace. We are wedded to the cause of peace. Our great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, gave the message of non-violence and peace to the whole world, and it is sad that we should be involved in this war. But Mahatma Gandhi also said that a country must defend itself against aggression, that a country must have selfrespect and dignity; if a country loses dignity and self-respect, that country ceases to exist. I assure you that this particular conflict that is going on is a conflict not of our making. If we have to resist with arms Pakistan's aggression, it is purely for me purpose of self-defence.

As I have said, war is opposed to our basic philosophy. We realize the horrors and devastation of a war. A war makes no distinction between combatants and non-combatants, between the innocent and the guilty. War means to us a threat to our economic progress. We are fighting a tremendous war against poverty and ignorance. As Minister of Education, I know what the war against ignorance means, and we do not want to be Stopped or deterred from carrying on that war. Therefore, we do not want to divert either our attention or our resources from our primary purpose, which is to raise the level of the standards of living of our people. Now I hope to satisfy you that even after Pakistan's aggression every step that we have taken has been in self-defence. Our reply to Pakistan has not been offensive; it has been purely defensive. I also want to point to the Council that we have done our best to prevent the escalation of this war. And may I now point out that it was Pakistan which for the first time used field artillery; it was Pakistan that used tanks with air cover; it was Pakistan that started the bombing of cities; it was Pakistan that started the dropping of paratroops; it was Pakistan that used its navy to bomb one of our seaports, while we have not used our navy at all.

The basic question which this Council faces and which it must answer and resolve is : Who is the aggressor ? Who has committed aggression ? I ask the Council not to shirk giving a reply to that question.

I think that on the records of this Council it has been established beyond any doubt that in this particular conflict aggression was committed by Pakistan upon our territory. May I first of all refer to the Secretary-General's report, in document S/6651 of 3 September 1965:

"General Nimmo has indicated to me that the series of violations that began on 5 August were to a considerable extent in subsequent days in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform. crossing the CFL from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side. This is a conclusion reached by General Nimmo on the basis of investigations by the United Nations Observers, in the light of the extensiveness and character of the raiding activities and their proximity to the CFL, even though in most cases the actual identity of those engaging in the armed attacks on the Indian side of the Line and their actual crossing of it could not be verified by direct observation or evidence". (S/6651, para. 6).

Therefore, we have here a finding of the Secretary-General, based upon first-hand information from General Nimmo, that this conflict started on 5 August with armed men from the Pakistan side invading our country. I cannot understand or imagine how there could be a clearer finding of aggression than we have here.

It is important to note that the resolution of the Security Council also mentions the date of 5 August. That, to our minds, is the crucial date, and the Council has to apply its mind to that date. What happened on that date. What happened on that date was that Pakistan invaded India. Kashmir is a part of India, and the invasion of Kashmir was an invasion of India and aggression on Kashmir was aggression on India. But we have other evidence of Pakistan's complicity and the support that Pakistan has been giving to these infiltrators. May I read out a few quotations.

President Ayub in a broadcast on I September 1965 said:

"How can she"-India, that is--"blame anyone from Azad Kashmir"-they call it Azad Kashmir, we call it the part of Kashmir unlawfully occupied by Pakistan--"or, for that matter, from any part of Pakistan, for going to the assistance of these brave people?"

I ask you to mark "any part of Pakistan". So that here is a statement from the Head of State asking how India can expect any part of Pakistan not to help these so-called brave people-and I shall deal with these brave people presently-who have invaded India.

Then Mr. Bhutto, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, said this on 13 July in the National Assembly

"Circumstances and conditions have been the most eloquent compulsion to action-what was valid, proper and realistic yesterday need not be valid, proper and realistic today."

So that the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan moulds his policy not according to law,

194

not according to international morality, but according to circumstances and conditions.

Then we have this from the Morning News of Karachi, 20 August:

"Mr. Bhutto told reporters that the Ceasefire Line, which India describes as an unshakable boundary, is a temporary arrangement. It could very well have been drawn further down inside occupied Kashmir."

This is his respect for the United Nations resolution which drew the Cease-fire Line. According to Mr. Bhutto, it is a temporary arrangement; it could be changed, it could be altered, it could be modified to suit Mr. Bhutto's pleasure.

Then something more. The Morning News of Karachi of 19 August quoted Central Home and Kashmir Affairs Minister Chaudhry Ali Akbar, under the headline "Kashmiris Free to Cross Line. Pakistan will Help Freedom "Fighters". To call these people "freedom fighters" causes me to say: What sins are committed in thy name, Freedom About Azad Kashmir, this Minister said: "Who can question their right to go to their help? They have to be there." And about Pakistan's help he said: "The freedom fighters will not find Pakistan wanting in the hour of need."

In this connexion I should have quoted one more Passage from the Secretary-General's report to which I referred earlier, where he gives his finding with regard to the Cease-fire Line :

"I have not obtained from the Government of Pakistan any assurance that the Cease-fire and the CFL will be respected henceforth or that efforts would be exerted to restore conditions to normal along that Line. I did receive assurance from the Government of India, conveyed orally by their Representative at the United Nations, that India would act with restraint with regard to any retaliatory acts and will respect the Cease-fire. Agreement and the CFL if Pakistan does likewise." (Ibid., para. 9).

While we were prepared to honour our international obligation to respect the Cease-fire Line, Pakistan informed the United Nations Representative that it was not prepared to do so.

As regards the support by Pakistan for what has been happening in this invasion mounted by it on our territory, I do not want to weary this Council with a great number of facts and details. I must respect the patience of this Council; I know how anxious it is to come to some conclusion. But there are certain facts to which I must refer.

On 8 June. 1965 the Pakistan Government issued an ordinance entitled "The Pakistan Mujahids Force Ordinance". The Mujahids are supposed to be freedom fighters. In this connexion the Pakistan Times of 12 June said

"Pakistan will now have a regularly constituted Mujahids force"--these are the people who have invaded India--"with a rank structure similar to that of the army, according to a Press release of the Inter-Service Public Relations Directorate. It will have commanding officers, junior commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers and other ranks. The Mujahids, for certain local purposes, will be deemed part of the Pakistan army and will be treated on a par with army personnel of the corresponding rank."

Thus there is no ambiguity as to the situation. These 4,000 to 5,000 people who invaded our country on 5 August were really part and parcel of the regular Pakistan army. They may have come in civilian garb or they may have come dressed in any manner they liked, but the fact remains that they were part of the regular Pakistan forces.

It is very interesting to note that the headquarters for the training of the infiltrators was located near Murree in West Pakistan, under the command of Lieutenant-General Akhtar Hussain Malik, General Officer Commanding, the Twelfth Infantry Division of Pakistan. This organization is known as Headquarters Gibraltar Forces. I do not know why they chose the name "Gibraltar", but, after all, a person is entitled to adopt any name he chooses. All commanders connected with Operation Gibraltar were summoned to Murree during the second week of July 1965. President Ayub Khan of Pakistan addressed them personally to explain to them their task of creating confusion and chaos in Jammu and Kashmir. Then these infiltrators were organized into eight forces. each of them composed of six companies of 110 men each. In most cases they am commanded by regular Pakistani army officers of the rank of major, while the platoon commanders are either junior commissioned officers or senior noncommissioned officers.

The Indian Security Forces have captured vast quantities of arms and ammunition seized from

these infiltrators. Some of the arms and ammunition captured from the infiltrators bear the marking POF. that is, Pakistan Ordnance Factories. Two of the captured officers held emergency commissions in the Pakistan army.

I have photographs here: I could also bring arms here to satisfy you that they were manufactured in Pakistan. These infiltrators carried radio sets so that they were in communication with Pakistan Headquarters. There cannot be the slightest doubt of this. No judge--and I appeal to you, Mr. President--can on this evidence fail to come to the conclusion that on 5 August a regular invasion of Win was mounted by Pakistan and that

195

these infiltrators were backed and supported by Pakistan'. they were armed by them, they were trained by them and they were supported by them.

What is the utility of this Council if it will not condemn aggression on these facts ? If you am satisfied-and I ask you to say that you are satisfied-to respect the Secretary-General's report and if you are satisfied that aggression was cornmitted by Pakistan on 5 August, I say that it is your duty to condemn this aggression. Otherwise, international law has no meaning and international society cannot exist. Not only must this aggression be condemned, but also Pakistan must be asked to vacate this aggression. An aggressor cannot get away with the fruits of his aggression. I beg you, Mr. President, and members of the Council : do not equate the aggressor and the victim, do not bracket them together. My one objection to the resolutions of 4 and 6 September, if I may say so with respect to the Security Council, is that you treat both India and Pakistan alike, that you call upon both of them to do something without distinguishing in any way' whatsoever the role played by Pakistan and the role played by India.

I hear certain nations talking of impartiality, that they must be impartial between India and Pakistan. Mr. President, you have been a judge, I have been a judge for seventeen years. When I have two parties before me, I am not impartial; I have to reveal my judgment; I have got to say who is right and who is wrong. A judge cannot afford to be impartial. When two parties appear before a judge, he has to decide. You are the judges, and I think that it is wrong for the Security Council to say that it is going to be impartial as between India and Pakistan. It is an entirely wrong attitude, a weak attitude; it is an attitude which will completely destroy the utility of this Council. If you have no evidence, you may withhold judgment or reserve it. But when you have this statement of the Secretary-General, when you have the evidence that I have produced, how can this Council say, "We will bracket the two countries together, we will be impartial, we will not pass judgment"? I think that the time has come when the Council must call a spade a spade. The Security Council has hesitated too often in doing this. But there are times in history-and this is one of them; as I develop my argument I will satisfy you that we have reached the watershed of history-when the Security Council must call a spade a spade.

What was the grand design of Pakistan? Let me explain it to you. When it sent these 4,000 or 5,000 infiltrators, or invaders or armed mencall them what you like-Pakistan expected that there would be an uprising in Kashmir. They thought that the large Muslim majority in Kashmir would support them and that Kashmir would fall into their mouth like a ripe plum. What happened? The, whole of Kashmir stood firmly behind the constituted Government of that State and behind the Government of India. Kashmir is proud of its traditions of a multi-racinl society, just as India is. In Kashmir we have Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists and Christians. All of them stood firm and resisted this aggression. They handed over the infiltrators to the Government and to the security forces, and this grand design of Pakistan failed. Having failed in that Pakistan started an attack in force with its regular army. That was the attack in the Chhamb sector. You are perhaps not familiar with the map of Kashmir, but may I explain that the Chhamb sector is a very crucial one in Kashmir; it contains our life-line, our lines of communication to our Army on the Cease-fire Line and also communication to the army that is facing China in Ladakh and trying to meet that menace. Their entry in this particular sector of Kashmir was for the purpose of destroying our life-line so that we should be crippled both with regard to our army on the Cease-fire Line and to our defence against China.

Pakistan's other objective was to make this a

religious war. We are living in the modern age. We have learned to understand that religion is something personal and intimate. It is, Your contacts with your Creator. It is your attempt to understand the inscrutable mystery of existence. We do not wear our religion on our sleeves now. We do not ostentatiously brandish it in the face of people. But I am sorry to say that Pakistan is still in the mediaeval age.

The idea was that not only the people of Kashmir but the 50 million Muslims in India would support Kashmir and that there would he communal trouble in India.

There are two million. Muslims in kashmir but there are fifty million Muslims in India. Indiasome of the members do not realize this is the third largest Muslim country in the world. These Muslim brothers of ours, fellow citizens of ours, live in perfect satisfaction with all the rights that the majority community enjoys under our Constitution. They have all the fundamental rights We are a secular State. But Pakistan does not like this because it is a theocratic State; it is a religious State. To Pakistan religion is the basis of citizenship. To us religion is not the basis of citizenship. This argument will appeal to my

friends from the Middle East and from other parts of the world where People of different religions live together as nationals.

There is one good thing about Mr. Bhutto : he lends himself to quotations. May I quote him again, on this question of religious war. This is what Mr. Bhutto said in his broadest of 3 September 1965 :

196

"Let India not be complacent in waging war in Kashmir. Let them not disregard the lawns of history. Lot them not forget that if Pakistanis have, hitherto shown the Patience of a Solomon, they are also the descendants of the heroic soldiers of Islam who have never showed any hesitation in laying down their lives in defence of their honour and the pursuit of justice."

Why "heroic soldiers of Islam"? Are they fighting a war of Islam? it is an insult to Islam to suggest that Islam is intolerant or that Islam believes in wars and conflicts. Then Mr. Bhutto said the following at an Independence Day civic reception at Lahore on 14 August:

"India is known as a country believing in threats alone I want to tell Mr. Shastri and India that after all justice is sure to prevail. We are not alone in this. Our religion is spreading all over the world."

Again the appeal is a religious appeal. The Council will realize the danger of this. There are fifty million Muslims living in India in peace and amity, in friendship and concord, with other communities. The whole attempt of Pakistan was to disrupt this unity, to bring about communal discord and then to appeal to this Council, or to the world, by saying: You see, Indians treat their minorities badly.

I told the Council that our action against Pakistan was purely defensive, and let me slightly elaborate this. What happened? They sent in these infiltrators on 5 August. How did we react? All that we did was to cross the cease-fire line in order to prevent more infiltrators from coming into India. It was a purely defensive action. Then when they attacked us at Chhamb with their regular forces, as I told the Council, we had to cross into the Punjab, into Pakistan, in order to prevent these forces from being further strengthened and our life-line from being destroyed. That again was a defensive action.

Now I want to draw the Council's attention to something which is very interesting. I think it was Max Beerbohm who said that history does not repeat itself; historians repeat themselves. But in this case history has repeated itself; I do not know whether historians are going to repeat themselves or not.

There is a close similarity between this invasion by Pakistan of Kashmir and of India and what happened in 1947 and 1948. If one looks at the record, one will find-and it is a matter of record; I am not speaking outside the record-that tribesmen invaded Kashmir and that Pakistan refused any complicity with these tribesmen. They said; We have nothing to do with it. Ultimately, Mohammad Zafrulla-no less a person than Mohammad Zafrulla, who is now a member of the International Court of Justiceagreed and admitted that Pakistan had armed these tribesmen to invade Kashmir.

This is exactly what is happening now. But the Similarity does not end there. We have a gruesome history of what the tribesmen did to Kashmir and the people of Kashmir in 1947 and 1948, and there is a repetition this time. People have been killed; they have been tortured, mosques have been desecrated; mosques have been bombed and cruelty has been practised of a sort which it is difficult to believe can be done in modern times. It almost goes back to the days of Hitler, when such things were possible. But I thought we had outlived the days of Hitler.

May I just quote from what happened in 1947, and it comes out of the mouth of Sheikh Abdullah, who came before the Security Council. This is what he said, and I am reading from the debate of the Security Council which I quoted in my speech of 7 May 1964:

"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." (1113th meeting, para. 21).

The other day the Times of London, which is not known for its pro-Indian opinion, published a protograph of a mosque in Kashmir bombed by these infiltrators. These are the protagonists of Islam; these are the brave soldiers of Islam who are going to the rescue of the majority of Muslims in Kashmir.

No country, under these circumstances, could have done more than India has done to come to a friendly settlement with Pakistan. We have extended the hand of friendship; it has been rejected. We have made overtures; we have been rebuffed. Now let me give the Council a short resume of what we have been trying to do.

First and foremost, as far back as 1950, our late Prime Minister asked Pakistan to enter into a no-war declaration. We said: "Look, before 1947 we were one country; we are brothers; ethnologically, racially and culturally we are one. It would be a horrible thing to contemplate a war between our two countries. Let us enter into a no-war declaration."

What was the response ? It was: No. From 1950 onwards we have repeated this offer. We have said: "We shall not go to war with you, and you must not go to war with us. If we have differences we shall settle them in a peaceful manner."

197

Why has Pakistan refused to enter into this no-War declaration? I shall give you the reason. It is because she had a guilty mind; because she knew that when the proper time came, she would not hesitate to attack India. Now we know for a fact the reason for her not entering into this no-war declaration.

But this is not the only thing we have done. After the last meeting of the Security Council last year, we agreed to have talks with Pakistan. We had a meeting of the Home Ministers of the two countries in April 1964. That meeting was adjourned. We continued to remind Pakistan of the need to have another meeting. After continuous pressure from India, the Government of Pakistan agreed to hold a conference on 23 November 1964 in Karachi. However, about ten days before the meeting was due to take place, the Governmeat of Pakistan unilaterally postponed the conference indefinitely.

In October 1963, the United Nations Chief Military Observer decided to give awards even against civilians if they committed breaches of the cease-fire agreement. The Government of India accepted this decision. The Government of Pakistan rejected it.

In 1964, the Chief Military Observer proposed a meeting between the military representatives of India and Pakistan to consider the problems arising out of the violations of the cease-fire line by armed civilians. India accepted the proposal, but Pakistan rejected it.

In early 1965, the United Nations Military Observer renewed his proposal. India accepted it, but Pakistan rejected it again.

In July 1964, India proposed a gentleman's

agreement to restore tranquillity along the ceasefire line. When Pakistan failed to respond, India repeated this offer-this is found in the letter of the Permanent Representative of India dated 24 August 1964, addressed to the Security Council, which is part of the records of this Council. At this stage, Pakistan accepted the proposal, and a meeting was fixed for 2 November in Karachi. Two days before the Indian delegation was due to leave for Karachi, the Pakistan Government unilaterally postponed the meeting for an indefinite period, and the meeting has never taken place.

What happened about Kutch ? I should like to say that this is the third invasion by Pakistan of India. The first was in 1947-48 when they attacked Kashmir, which legally and constitutionally is part of India; the second was when they committed aggression in Kutch; and this is the third invasion. With regard to Kutch, thanks to the intervention of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, we agreed to a truce and to certain cease-fire terms. I would like to draw the attention of members to the preamble of that agreement.

"In the confidence that this will contribute to a reduction of the present tension along the entire India-Pakistan border. . .."

While this agreement was being negotiated and before the ink was dry, Pakistan was plotting and planning to invade India.

I would like to come now to our response to the mission of the Secretary-General. May I in the first place express my appreciation of the very strenuous and difficult task that he has undertaken. I remember that I came here on the day the Secretary-General was leaving. I saw him, wished him godspeed and told him that he would be most welcome in my country. I hope the Secretary-General will not misunderstand me, but there is a passage in his report with which I must quarrel; I do not think it is fair to my country, nor does it correctly represent what really happened in India and in Pakistan. I quote the following statement from the report :

"The replies from both Governments to my message of 12 September have shown clearly the desire of both for a cease-fire, but both pose conditions which make the acceptance of a cease-fire very difficult for the other side. For this reason, to my profound regret, it has so far been impossible to obtain a cease-fire as required by the Security Council Resolutions of 4 and 6 September." (S/6683, para. 13)

I wish to state that whereas President Ayub posed conditions with regard to the cease-fire, we posed no conditions whatever. We accepted the cease-fire unconditionally. I have the greatest respect for the Secretary-General and for his objectivity and impartiality, but I am really surprised at how he came to make a statement like this in the face of the letters which appear in his report. Let me read them out.

Let me first quote from the letter of my Prime Minister of 14 September :

"In deference to the wishes of the Security Council and to the appeals which we have received from many friendly countries, we accept your proposal for an immediate cease-fire. We would, therefore, be prepared to order a ceasefire effective from 6-30 a.m., Indian standard time, on Thursday, 16 September 1965, provided you confirm to me by 9 a.m. tomorrow that Pakistan is also agreeable to do so." (S/6683, para. 8)

In his letter of 15 September, this is what my Prime Minister stated :

"I reaffirm my willingness, as communicated, to order a simple cease-fire and cessation of hostilities as proposed by you, as soon as you are able to confirm to me that the Government

198

of Pakistan has agreed to do so I as well. The actual time when the cease-fire would become effective would depend upon the time when You are able to convey to me the agreement of the Government of Pakistan to a cease-fire." (Ibid., para. 11)

Does this mean that we were imposing conditions ? What is the meaning of a simple ceasefire ? I do not want to weary the members of the Council on this point, because it would take up too much time. It is quite clear from the whole tenor of my Prime Minister's letters that he was prepared to accept an unconditional cease-fire. This is what the Security Council wanted, and we complied with the request of the Security Council. Now let us see the reply of President Ayub. He stated :

"I am fully conscious of the gravity of the present situation and also of the dangers implicit in the catastrophe that threatens to engulf the Sub-Continent particularly because of the certainty that as time goes on the present conflict would be bound to assume grave and wider dimensions.

"However a cease-fire can be meaningful only if it is followed by such steps as would lead to a durable and honourable settlement in order to preclude the recurrence of a catastrophe such as now threatens the Sub-Continent. To bring about such a settlement, it would be necessary to evolve an effective machinery and procedure that would lead to a final settlement of the Kashmir dispute." (Ibid., para. 14)

President Ayub is posing a precondition that there must be machinery in the cease-fire agreement or a cease-fire itself, which would lead to a final settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

There is another point. The Secretary-General suggested-and he has made the point here also --that President Ayub Khan and our Prime Minister should meet and discuss their differences. It requires two to constitute a meeting. There cannot be a meeting with one person. What is-President Ayub's reply to this ? It is very revealing:

"While we are agreeable to stop fighting in principle I should like to point out that despite over most earnest efforts. the Ministerial level talks that followed the 1962 agreement proved barren and abortive in face of a firm refusal by India to arrive at an honourable settlement of the Kashmir dispute. On the other hand, India let loose a reign of terror and repression in the State and Proceeded to adopt measures to 'integrate' the State of Jammu and Kashmir in the Indian Union. In adopting these measures India showed once again that she has no regard for her own solemn agreements and treats them merely as scraps of paper whenever it suits her." (s/6683, para 14). I am not dealing with that now. Therefore, there is a clear refusal on the part of President Ayub to meet our Prime Minister. He says that the last effort was "barren" and "abortive'. Again, I am not going into that history. We had seven rounds of talks, and the meeting was broken up by Pakistan. But this is the response of President Ayub to the Secretary-General's suggestion that the two leaders should meet and bring about a settlement.

The date of this reply of President Ayub is very significant. Whereas our Prime Minister replied immediately, President Ayub took some timeand that was deliberate. Members of the Security Council are aware of the news that was released in this country yesterday, namely, that China has given us an ultimatum, which expires within three days, that if we do not carry out China's demands serious consequences will follow. It was only when President Ayub was assured of this that this reply was sent. This intractable and intransigent attitude is due to the fact that he is expecting support from China. He wants India to fight on two fronts. While we are facing Pakistan in the direction of the Punjab, he wants China to stab us in the back. If ever a complicity was established between those two countries, it is this. The timing of the ultimatum and the timing of the reply of President Ayub is not merely a coincidence. It has grave and serious implication. We are now threatened by an invasion from China.

It is sad that Pakistan should be taking this attitude with the help of the arms supplied to Pakistan by the United States not for the purpose of fighting India but for the purpose of meeting the Chinese menace. I have three statements here. The first is from no less a Person than President Eisenhower; it is dated 24 February 1954 :

"What we are proposing to do and what Pakistan is agreeing to is not directed in any way against India. And I am confirming publicly that if our aid to any country including Pakistan is misused and directed against either in aggression. I will undertake immediately in accordance with my constitutional authority, appropriate action, both within and without the United Nations to thwart such aggression." This is what Mr. Bunker, who was then the Ambassador to India, said in November 1957 :

"If Pakistan uses American arms against India for aggressive Purposes, she will forfeit our assistance and we will be on the side of India."

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who was as you know not very friendly to us in those days. said in 1956:

199

"I think there can be every confidence on the part of India that there will be no use of these arms in any aggressive way against India, and certainly Pakistan knows that if that should happen there will be a quick ending of its good relations with the United States, and that on the contrary under the prinicples of the United Nations Charter the United States would be supporting India, if it became the victim of any armed aggression."

I ask the United States : Is the United States going to permit Pakistan to commit a breach of faith with it, and also make it possible for a breach of faith to be committed by the United States with India? These are not ordinary people giving us assurances. These are assurances by the President of the United States, by the Ambassador of the United States and by the Secretary of State of the United States. Today we have this extraordinary situation that Pakistan is fighting us with Patton tanks, with arms which Pakistan received from the United States, and Pakistan is going to fight us in collaboration with a country which the United States considers to be its number one enemy. Therefore, American arms are going to be used to destroy a country which is friendly to the United States.

Therefore, my short submission is that whereas our response to the Secretary-General's mission and the resolution of the Security Council calling for a cease-fire has been positive, constructive and unequivocal, the response of Pakistan has been obstructive and non-cooperative.

Let us look at the conditions that Pakistan has laid down for the cease-fire. There are four conditions. The first is, a cease-fire--of course, it wants a cease fire. The second is withdrawal of all troops from Kashmir. This is an extraordinary condition. I am not going into the Kashmir question. If I may say so, the Security Council should confine itself to the simple question of the cessation of the conflict and not mix up the political issue with this issue at this juncture. We have time enough for that when the fighting ha-, stopped. But I want to say this about the withdrawal of all troops from Kashmir. Under the United Nations resolution, we are entitled to have troops in Kashmir, and Pakistan had agreed to withdraw all its troops from that part of Pakistan which it occupies. The following is from the resolution of 13 August 1948 :

" 1. As the presence of troops of Pakistan in the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir constitutes a material change in the situation since it was represented by the Government of Pakistan before the Security Council, the Government of Pakistan agrees to withdraw its troops from the State." (S/1430, page 22, part II. A 1)

This was in 1948 and we are in 1965. The troops still remain. Not only do they remain, but they are used to invade us, to attack us, to commit inhuman cruelties upon the citizens of Kashmir.

The following paragraph of the resolution relates to India :

"2. Pending the acceptance of the conditions for a final settlement of the situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the Indian Government will maintain within the lines existing at the moment of the cease-fire those forces of its Army which in agreement with the Commission are considered necessary to assist local authorities in the observance of law and order." (Ibid., page 23, part 11, B 2)

Therefore, we are responsible for law, order, security and defence of Kashmir.

Kashmir is an integral part of India. It is a member of the Indian Federation, and it is as much our duty, our responsibility and our privilege to defend Kashmir and look after its law and order as it would be if it was Calcutta, or Bombay, or Delhi, or any other part of India. And what is this demand? When analysed, it means this. All troops should be withdrawn. That means that we have got the legal right, the constitutional right to have troops in Kashmir for its defence and security, but we must withdraw them before the great country of Pakistan will condescend to talk with us or to accept a cease-fire. The third condition is induction of an Afro-Asian force. We are entirely opposed to this proposal. We do not want any foreign troops in our country, on our soil. We can look after the interests of our people ourselves. We know how to defend ourselves, and we will never agree to any foreign troops being inducted into our country.

Finally-and this is the most extraordinary condition of all-a plebiscite within three months. I have said that these conditions are impossible and preposterous. But let me deal with this last one : a plebiscite within three months. Again, I am not going into the political history of Kashmir. I said on the last occasion-and I stand by that that under no circumstances will India bold a plebiscite. Kashmir is an integral part of India and we do not hold plebiscites in every part of the country. You, Mr. President. would not agree to hold a plebiscite in New Mexico, or Texas, or Alaska, and this would apply to many other countries that I could mention. But, apart from that, it is for the Security Council ultimately to decide whether a plebiscite should be held or not. But Pakistan desides, and it wants a plebiscite at the point of the gun, at the point of the bayonet. The argument is this : we have invaded Kashmir; now hold a plebiscite within three months.

200

I could understand Pakistan's coming to this Council-after all, Kashmir is still on the agenda of the Council-and pleading its case. But no, Pakistan does not believe in going to international forums. I think that Bhutto said that he had lost his patience and that he was prepared to fight for a thousand years in order to get Kashmir. But this shows now impossible a condition has beta laid down by President Ayub Khan before we can have a cease-fire.

Now may I say this. This is not merely a conflict between India and Pakistan it has a much wider significance. The first significance is that The threat and menace of China looms large behind this war. it is much more than merely looming now; it has almost come to a concrete shape after yesterday's ultimatum. And I charge Pakistan with having launched upon this fight with India in the hope and expectation that China will be behind it and support it.

Then, this is a war between two ideologies. Let us face it. On the one hand, there is the religious State; and on the other, the secular State. This is the conflict; it is not Kashmir. Kashmir is merely the symptom: it is not the disease. The disease is that Pakistan believes in a religious State; it believes in religion as the nexus between citizens. We believe in. a secular State, in a multiracial society. And it is also a fight between a tree society and democratic institutions, on the one hand, and dictatorship and regimentation on the other. These are the issues involved in this war. And I think, if I may say so, that it is in the interests of Asia and the world that our free society, our multi-communal federation should survive.

The attack on Kashmir is an attack for the purpose of breaking up our federation, of breaking up our way of life, of preventing us from carrying on our great experiment of men of different religions and different languages living peacefully together. You in this country are trying the same experiment. Other countries are trying it. But Pakistan does not want it; it does not believe in it and wants to break it up.

What we are defending today is not merely the territorial integrity of our country-which is important enough. What we are defending today is the existence of a free, democratic nation. We want to function as a free, democratic nation. It is the threat to our institutions that we are resisting.

Finally, I charge Pakistan with aggression. Aggression began in 1947 against Kashmir and continues today. It is a continuing aggression. The Secretary-General's report shows that Pakistan does not wish to renounce aggression as an instrument of its policy, and Pakistan has been allowed to enjoy the fruits of aggression and even permitted to make common cause with China. And I charge Pakistan with refusing to comply with the United Nations resolution. Thirdly, I ask that in the resolution which the Council ultimately will be pleased to adopt it will note that whereas we have unconditionally accepted a cease-fire, Pakistan has refused to do so. The action which I suggest that the Security Council should take is that it must brand Pakistan as an aggressor, and it must insist on Pakistan's compliance with the resolution.

May I deal now with the report of the Secretary-General which he has read out and which I have had a short time to read. The Secretary-General says

> ".....it could order the two Governments concerned, pursuant to Article 40 of the Charter of the United Nations, to desist from further hostile military action and to this end to issue cease-fire orders to their military forces."

Why two Governments ? Why again bracket India and Pakistan together? We have not said no. Why do you say you should call upon India and Pakistan to desist from taking hostile action ? I have read out the letter of our Prime Minister. Why this constant attempt at bracketing India and Pakistan together, coupling them together, putting them on the same footing ?

Then the Secretary-General says:

"The Council might also declare that failure by the Governments concerned to comply with this order would demonstrate the existence of a breach of the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter."

I say that the Council must call upon Pakistan to desist from carrying out hostilities, and I ask it, under Article 39 of the Charter, to which the Secretary-General referred, not to declare that there is a breach of the peace, but to determine -and the Security Council has the authority to "determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression" -the existence of an act of aggression on the part of Pakistan.

With regard to the second suggestion reading as follows :

"The Security Council may wish to consider what assistance it might provide in ensuring the observance of the cease-fire", after the cease-fire has taken place, and if we wish for any assistance from the Security Council, we will certainly ask for it.

The third point reads as follows :

"The Security Council resolution of 6 September also calls for a prompt withdrawal of

201

all Armed personnel back to the positions held by them before 5 August 1965, and the Council may wish to study means of assisting in the carrying out of this requirement."

This deals with the modility of the cease-fire. I do not want to deal with this in detail, but may I say this. All the invaders who have entered Kashmir must leave. They must be withdrawn. They must be called back. Just as they were sent by Pakistan, they must be called back by Pakistan. Secondly, it must be made impossible for such infiltration to take place again. Thirdly, Pakistan must own up to its responsibility for these infiltrations.

The fourth point is: "The Council could request the two Heads of Government to meet together at the earliest possible time," I have already dealt with that. As I have said, it requires two to constitute a meeting. We are always prepared to talk with anyone. Debate and discussion are the lifeblood of democracy. We have never said no to talks with anybody, but talks must have a purpose. There must be a basis for a talk. While this conflict is going on it is impossible to suggest that the two leaders can meet, Once there is a basis for talks, I hope the Head of the Pakistan State will agree to meet with our Prime Minister, and I am sure that the response of our Prime Minister will not be uncooperative.

The last point is this :

"I may again assure the Council of my availability and of my desire to continue to be of assistance in this matter in any way which may commend itself to the Council and to the two Governments." (S/6686, page 4)

The Secretary-General is always welcome in our

country. As I have said before, we have great respect and great regard for him personally and as the executive of this great Organization. Today he is the greatest international servant in the world. I know his desire for bringing about peace, and whenever he wants to come to our country he will be welcome. Whatever assistance we can give him for restoring peace will always be available.

Sir, I am very grateful to you and the members of the Council for the patient hearing I have been given. I am afraid I have been longer than I expected, but the cause for which we are fighting is so important that I had to present India's case in full detail.

I agree with the Secretary-General that a great responsibility is placed upon the Security Council. I think this is the test of the Security Council. Is it going to meet the challenge ? If international society is to function, the Security Council, must answer the challenge. I say: come to a decision, come to a conclusion, arrive, at a judgment, and do not hesitate to denver the judgment.

The following is the text of Shri Chagla's speech dated September 18:

Mr. President, I shall try to be as brief as possible in view of the lateness of the hour and your laudable desire to bring this meeting of the Security Council to a close by coming to a conclusion which will help the cause of peace.

May I point out that this war has now taken on a new dimension. The latest reports we have had are most disturbing. Chinese troops are maw mg on our border. At tour points they nave already indulged in probing actions and they are poised for an invasion or a serious attack as soon as the ultimatum to which I referred yesterday expires. And the ultimatum expires tomorrow. But the Council will be making a Serious Mistake, it I might say so with the greatest respect to the members of the Council, if it looks upon this new trouble on our frontiers as something having to do merely with India and China. I want to satisfy the Council that what is happening now is an extension of the India-Pakistan conflict. The Law Minister of Pakistan blandly rejected what I said yesterday about the complicity between China and Pakistan; but unfortunately the record is much too clear for such bland dismissal of the change I made yesterday.

May I refer to two or three quotations from responsible officials of the Government of Pakistan, in a telecast of the American Broadcasting Company in July 1961, President Ayub, the Head of a member country of SEATO and CENTO, and a recipient of United States military aid, felt no hesitation in advocating China's system to other countries of South and South-East Asia. Ouestioning the view that the relations between certain countries of South and South-East Asia and India were friendly, he asked whether those countries were going to feel more secure. "In fact, they would be looking for protection elsewhere, and my belief is they will find it under China's system." He argued that if India's economic and military potential was developed, the rest of Asia, far from taking it as a comfortable example, would be apprehensive of India's growing might and, out of fear, might seek protection which China would be willing to extend.

In a statement to the Associated Press of Pakistan made on 10 April 1963, Premier Chou En-lai disclosed that the leaders of Pakistan had assured him in 1954-mark the year 1954-that Pakistan had joined the Western military alliances only to gain political and military ascendancy over India and that "Pakistan had no other motivation in joining the pacts".

Initiating a foreign policy debate in the Pakistan National Assembly in 1963, the Foreign

202

Mimister of Pakistan, Mr. Bhutto, said that in the event of a war with India, Pakistan would not be alone; Pakistan would be helped by the most powerful nation in Asia.

In December 1963 the Chinese Vice-Minister for Foreign Trade, Mr. Nan Han Chen, then on a visit to Pakistan, said :

"We have to build ourselves militarily, economically and financially to beat the aggressors."

And he added:

"If ever there is war between India and

Pakistan, China will surely support Pakistan and not India."

Apart from this, we have been reading in the Press about the visit of Mr. Chou En-lai and the Vice-President of the Chinese Republic to Pakistan in recent times-and you will have noticed that the one country in the world which is opposed to the cessation of these hostilities between India and Pakistan is China. It has condemned the action of the Security Council; it has called it an imperialist body. It has condemned the peace mission of the Secretary-General. calling him a stooge of the imperialists. And this is for obvious reasons. China is fighting India through Pakistan. The whole Policy of China is to disrupt the economy of India, to break up the country, because China realizes that India is the only country in Asia which can withstand the menace of Chinese aggressiveness. Therefore, there is no point in saving, as the representative of Pakistan has said: "We have nothing to do with China; there is no complicity between ourselves and China: we are fighting this war with India singlehanded".

I come now to the question of Kashmir. I do not want to delve into history. I studied history at Oxford and I am very fond of history, but history must be reserved for a proper occasion. Therefore, all that I have to gay about Kashmir I said at great length when I intervened in the debate last year. But I want to make my Position clear on Kashmir. I do not want this Council to be under any misapprehension as to the attitude of my Government with regard to Kashmir; nor do I want the representative of Pakistan to he under any misapprehension. Kashmir is an integral part of India. Kashmir is a unit of the Indian Federation: and we will lot Permit our Federation to be broken up. The separation of Kashmir from India means the break-up of our Federation of India. It would mean as much a break-up as if any other part of India were separated from India. Therefore, as far as the Position of Kashmir is concerned, it has been stated by the representatives of the Government of India on more than one occasion, and, as I said, I myself stated it clearly and categorically at our last meeting.

The representative of Pakistan, surprisingly enough, referred to the people of Kashmir as the "kith and kin" of Pakistanis. It is a surprising statement. Why are they kith and kin of Pakistanis ? Is it merely because the majority of the people in Kashmir happen to be Muslims"? There are 50 million Muslims in India; I suppose that the next suggestion of Pakistan will be that they have got 50 million people in India who are their kith and kin and, therefore, they have a right to invade India to liberate these people who are groaning under the tyranny of India-as he has suggested that the people of Kashmir are groaning under the tyranny of India.

I have here a broadcast which was made by Mr. Bhutto on 15 September, and it is very significant. I quote:

"Pakistan can never be complete without self-determination in Kashmir. This is the demand of the Muslims of the sub-continent."

Let me make two comments on this statement. Even before a plebiscite, which the representative of Pakistan demands, has taken place, and even before the people of Kashmir have expressed their determination. as he wants them to do, Mr. Bhutto has made up his mind that Kashmir shall belong to Pakistan because, according to him, Pakistan Will never be complete without the self-determination of Kashmir. Therefore, according to him. the self-determination of Kashmir means Kashmir belonging to Pakistan.

The second extraordinary statement is that this is the demand of the Muslims of the sub-continent. Now, with all respect to Mr. Bhutto, who made him the representative of the Muslims of the sub-continent? According to him, this is not merely the demand of the people of Pakistan, but also the demand of the Muslims of India. If I had the time, I would satisfy the Council that hundreds and thousands of meetings of Muslims have been held in India, in all parts of the country. entirely supporting the Government of India on this issue. India is one in fighting this aggression by Pakistan and in taking up the attitude that Kashmir is an integral part of India. There is no Hindu-Muslim problem about Kashmir in India. Every Indian. whether he be Hindu or Muslim or Christian or Jew or Buddhist, is agreed on one thing: that Kashmir is an integral part of India and is. as I said, part of the Federation which constitutes our

country.

The representative of Pakistan has also talked about disputed territory and he has tried somehow to exonerate himself from the charge of aggression which has been levelled against him by suggesting that the Pakistani troops entered into disputed territory of Kashmir. I do not understand this expression. How is Kashmir disputed territory? If one looks at the resolutions of the Security

203

Council, it is absolutely clear that India was made responsible for the defence and security of Kashmir. that our troops are there with the consent and sanction of the Security Council. If there is a dispute at all it is as to the question of a plebiscite. But as far is the territory is concerned today, the sovereignty is legally and constitutionally vested in India. If I had the time I would satisfy the Council, from the records of this august body. that that is the position; but I do not want to go into it. However, I want to make it clear that Kashmir is not a disputed territory. It is an integral part of India not only because we say so; it is an integral part in law and in constitution, in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council.

The representative of Pakistan has charged us with violation of international agreement with regard to a plebiscite. I think that the shoe is on the other foot. It seems to be forgotten that it was we who came to the Security Council as complainants against the aggression of Pakistan against Kashmir. We were the complainants. The Pakistanis were the accused. And this Security Council called upon Pakistan to vacate its aggression, to withdraw its troops. Until today, that has not been done.

If there has been a violation of international agreements, it has been by Pakistan, and that violation started in 1948 and has continued until today.

I do not want to go into the question of aggression by Pakistan. It is borne out by the report of the Secretary-General and the very able statement which has been made by the representative of Malaysia. But there is something more. Pakistan admittedly has violated the cease-fire line. According to the report of the Secretary-General, Pakistan has admitted that it does not respect the cease-fire line. According to Pakistan, the ceasefire line has ceased to exist. If you look at the resolutions to which reference has been made, resolutions passed as far back as 1948 or 1949, it will be seen that all the arrangements that were arrived at with Pakistan through the instrumentality of the Security Council were based on the integrity and inviolability of the cease-fire line. If Pakistan says the cease-fire line does not exist. then the resolutions of the Security Council which I termed as obsolete in my statement last year not only have become obsolete but are dead,

The representative of Pakistan has shown a great solicitude for the minorities in India. I do not think he need be so solicitous about them. They are perfectly happy, enjoying all the rights of free Citizens, with all the fundamental rights guaranteed to them. He quarrelled with me for calling Pakistan a religious State. He has forgotten his Constitution. Under the Pakistan Constitution, no one but a Muslim can be President of Pakistan. Under our Constitution, we make no distinction as to caste or community. He has forgotten that there are no real parliamentary institutions, there are no direct elections, and democracy functions, if at all, in a very diluted and modified form.

As regards the cease-fire, I think that by now it should be clear to the members of the Council from the statements made by all members that we have accepted the cease-fire unconditionally. The letter of our Prime Minister is clear, categorical and unequivocal. We have refused to link the problem of Kashmir with the cease-fire. On the other hand. President Ayub Khan insists on linking this problem with the cessation of hostilities, and that position has been repeated emphatically by the representative of Pakistan. I challenge the representative of Pakistan even now, at this table, to state categorically whether he is prepared unconditionally to accept a cease-fire. I say here what my Prime Minister has said : I am prepared to accept a cease-fire here and now at this very moment, unconditionally. Is the representative of Pakistan prepared to do so? If he is not, I beg you, Mr. President, and I beg the members of the Security Council when they draft a resolution to make a distinction. between these two positions, not to equate us, not to bracket us and not to put us on the same footing.

The representative of Pakistan said he was opposed to the issuing of any order against him under Article 40 of the Charter. Why ? Does be not want a cease-fire ? Is he not so sure of himself because China is coming to his rescue ? It again discloses an attitude which is not favourable to peace. which is not favourable to the cessation of hostilities.

We are living in serious times. The situation is becoming graver. War is extending and escalating. 'However, as far as we are concerned, we are prepared to give every assistance to the Security Council for the cessation of hostilities.

I do not wish to tax your patience by rebutting every statement made by the representative of Pakistan. for it would take much too long a time, but it should not be understood that I have accepted the various statements he has made. I could rebut each one of them if I were given the opportunity. However, there is one statement which I must rebut. I must nail the lie to the counter.

The representative of Pakistan said that we had bombed the civilians at a place called Batamalu. The position is this. About the time the fire started, the Azad Kashmir radio blared forth a call to so-called freedom fighters asking them to set fire to all areas with important government offices--the State Secretariat building, the State Armed Police headquarters, the supply godowns and the agency office adjoining the place. Later

204

the Same evening and again the next morning, the Pakistan radio gleefully announced that freedomfighters had set fire to an area at Batamalu with important government buildings. Next morning The Pakistan Times announced the same, as follows :

"Government buildings in Srinagar on fire. Mujahids"--these are the people Pakistan sent across the cease-fire line-"active in heart of city. field State capital cut off from outside. Hundreds of Indians killed in skirmishes."

It specifically mention the arson committed in this particular case :

"The freedom-fighters set many government

buildings on fire at Batamalu about three miles from Srinagar yesterday and entrenched themselves in the heart of the city. The blaze continued for seven hours, according to the All India Radio."

The representative of Pakistan, sitting before a responsible body like this, has charged us with setting fire to that place. What I have read is from Pakistan's own newspaper, their own radio, their own responsible officers.

Now, there is one thing more I should like to say. Every time we come here, Pakistan talks about the "revolt" in Kashmir. In this morning's Guardian, a leading newspaper in Enland, this is what appears in an article by the correspondent Donald Chesworth:

"An offer to stay in a Srinagar house-boat took me on a recent holiday to Kashmir. I was in the Kashmir Valley during much of the present trouble, arriving back in New Delhi on Sunday.

"Pakistan has alleged a popular uprising, nothing whatever to do with Pakistan, was the basis of the present armed conflict. At no time did I come across any evidence that there was a Kashmiri revolt, spontaneous or otherwise."

But that is not all. The London Times, one of the most responsible newspapers of the world, on I I August, in a dispatch from its correspondent in India :

"There is no indication of any armed revolt by the people from the Indian side"--of Kashmir--"as announced by Pakistan Radio."

And the Baltimore Sun, a very responsible newspaper in the United States-as the President would know--on 12 August 1965, in a report from its correspondent describing a tour around Srinagar, said :

"There is no evidence visible in or near this city to support reports from Pakistan of a popular uprising against India, nor of repressive measures against the population...

The Sydney Daily Telegraph, on 13 August 1905, stated; in a write-up by its columnist Emery Barcs :

"Whatever the basic rights or wrongs of the chronic Kashmir problem may be, Pakistan's claim that we present armed conflict there is a purely internal rebellion against India stretches credunty a time far."

The BBC television on 16 August 1965 stated : "Undoubtedly they hoped for much local support" --that is, we Pakistans--"perhaps a popular uprising, out there has not been one...."

This establishes what I said in my opening statement, that the grand design of Pakistan was that the people of Kashmir would rise in revolt and they Would be able to take kashmir in that way. But may I say this-and here I am echoing what my friend we representative of Malaysia said-that this would be a very serious thing- for the Security Council, it would be a very serious thing for international relations, it would be a very serious thing for international peace, if Pakistan could get a settlement of the Kashmir problem, could get a plebiscite, at the point of a gun or a bayonet. I call this blackmail. You invade a country, you spread terror in the country, you bomb civilians, you do everything that is in your power, and then you turn around and say. I agree to a cease-fire. provided you settle the problem of Kashmir and hold a plebiscite in Kashmir.

That is not the way to settle international problems; there are other ways of settling them.

In conclusion, I once again wish to express the anxiety of my Government to put an end to this war. An end can be put to this war on honourable terms. But I do not understand the expression cease-fire in principle". What does that mean? Either there is a cease-fire or there is not. Does Pakistan mean that we should stop fighting and they will go on fighting until they get the Kashmir problem solved ? What is the meaning of a "ceaselire in principle" ? A cease-fire is a factual thing. It means that the troops of both sides put down their arms and stop shooting at each other. But according to Pakistan, we should put down our arms and stop shooting while they continue shooting until their principle is conceded. That is not my understanding of a cease-fire, nor is it the understanding of my Prime Minister. When we said without reservation that we accept a simple cease-fire unconditionally, we meant it. But

when President Ayub replied to the Secretary-General, He talked of a "cease-fire in principle", something that has been re-echoed by the representative of Pakistan.

I say that these are two differing attitudes of the two countries, and when you deliberate on the resolution, I beg of you to bear in mind these two absolutely differing attitudes.

205

The following is the text of Shri Chagla's speech on September 20 :

It is already Monday morning and I do not think anyone of us wants to see the sun rise; therefore, I will try to be as brief as possible. Mr. President, may I first compliment you and your colleagues on your strenuous and heroic attempts to produce a resolution which has so much support and which, I take it, has been adopted in the interest of securing peace and the cessation of the hostilities in the sub-continent of India which are going on at present.

The main concern of the Security Council the cessation of hostilities. You have sat here from day-to-day; you have sat here until almost 2 o clock this morning because you realize what is happening. Men are being killed, there are widows and orphans, devastation rages in all directions, and all men of peace and good-will naturally desire that this terrible bloodshed should come to an end.

As far as my Government is concerned, as I have pointed out before, we accepted an unconditional cease-fire as far back as 15 September and, as I again pointed out, Pakistan did not. Yesterday I threw out a challenge to the Law Minister of Pakistan as to whether he was prepared to accept an unconditional cease-fire; no answer has as yet been given to that challenge. Not only that, he has repeated today the conditions for a ceasefire on which President Ayub has been insisting in his correspondence with the Secretary-General. But what is worse-and I have taken down his words-if the Kashmir problem is not solved the representative of Pakistan says that "another and wider conflagration is bound to ensue". The threat is already there. This aggression is not enough. The representative of Pakistan wants the members of the Security Council to know--and

I do ask you to make a note of this-that if the Kashmir problem is not solved according to his liking and to his country's liking, another and wider conflagration will ensue,

This is not the, attitude or the conduct of a peace-loving country. In the first place, he refuses to accept an unconditional cease-fire; in the second place, even before these hostilities have come to an end he threatens this great international body with a future conflagration which will break out if the Kashmir problem is not solved. That is the love that Pakistan has for peace and international understanding.

As I read it, this resolution is not directed against my country. We have already accepted an unconditional cease-fire and we certainly will carry it out if Pakistan will carry it out. To the extent that this resolution deals with a cease-fire, it can only be directed against Pakistan, which has not accepted an unconditional cease-fire.

With regard to the rest of the resolution, all that I am going to say now is that I adhere to everything I said in the two statements I made in this Council on Friday and Saturday. Various matters are dealt with in this resolution and I have taken those matters up in those statements. My Government adheres to every one of those statements, and my Government also adheres to the explanations given by the Prime Minister of India in his letter dated 14 September which is included in the Secretary-General's preliminary report (S/6683). Therefore, my position is perfectly clear and the position of my Government is also perfectly clear. We have come here before you to help you to stop the hostilities. We give you full co-operation. To the extent that this resolution deals with other matters. I do not wish to comment on them because I have already done so in my two statements, and the Prime Minister has commented on them in his letter of 14 September.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI GIBRALTAR RUSSIA CHINA UNITED KINGDOM MEXICO MALAYSIA AUSTRALIA

Date : Sep 01, 1965

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speech in the Debate in Parliament on the Security Council Resolution of September 20.

Intervening in the debate in the Lok Sabha on September 24, 1965 on the U.N. Security Council resolution of September 20, 1965, calling for a cease-fire between India and Pakistan, Shri M. C. Chagla, Union Minister of Education and the Leader of the Indian delegation to the, Security Council, made the following speech :

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in my opinion, the resolution of the Security Council of the 20th September which we are discussing constitutes a major diplomatic reverse for Pakistan. I cannot say, and I would not be fair to this House if I said, that it is wholly favourable to India. But I can say this : I will put it negatively-it is not unfavourable to India, If the drafting of this resolution was in our hands, we would certainly have drafted a better resolution, but the resolution was drafted by the Security Council, not by our representatives there.

But I should analyse this resolution and satisfy this House that it constitutes, as I said, a serious diplomatic reverse for Pakistan. Let us look at the resolution :

206

"The Security Council, having considered the reports of the Secretary-General on his consultations with the Governments of India and Pakistan,-

I am reading the preamble to the resolution-

"Commending the Secretary-General for his unrelenting efforts in furtherance of the objectives of the Security Council's resolutions of 4th and 6th September,

Having heard the statements of the representa-

tives of India and Pakistan,

Noting the differing replies by the parties to an appeal for a ceasefire as set out in the report of the Secretary-General, but noting further with concern. that no ceasefire has yet come into being, "

Then, this is a very important operative partwhat we urged before the Security Council, Look at the difference between the attitudes of India and Pakistan. Our Prime Minister, by his letter of the 15th September, accepted an unconditional cease--: fire. Contrast it with the reply of President Ayub of the 17th and record the fact that whereas India had accepted the ceasefire without conditions, Pakistan had not done so.

The Security Council could not go to that length, but I ask the House to see that by implication this preamble makes clear the position which I have just stated, because it says : ".... differing replies by the parties to an appeal for ceasefire as set out in the report of the Secretary-General." Anybody who looks at the report of the Secretary-General and looks at the letter of our Prime Minister of the 15th, and the letter of President Ayub of the 17th, will see the thing. I ask you to note the difference between the two, English expressions : it is not "different" replies but it is "differing" replies, which means that one reply is quite different in quality and character from the other. Therefore, in this preamble, it is clear that the Security Council has accepted the different attitudes taken up by India and Pakistan on the question of ceasefire.

Then, coming to the next paragraph

"Convinced that an early cessation of hostilities is essential as a first step towards a peaceful settlement of the outstanding differences between the two countries on Kashmir and other related matters."

Frankly, I am not very happy at the expression in question and the word "Kashmir' in this part of the preamble. But may I point out to this House that this expression "Kashmir and other related matters" appears in the joint declaration of the then Prime Minister, and Presiden Ayub in 1962 ? May I also point out to this House that nowhere in this resolution is the word "plebiscite' used ? Nowhere in this resolution is the old resolution of the Security Council referred to. When we talk of Kashmir, as I said, we must not merely think of Pakistan's claim for a plebiscite. Let us not forget that we were the complainants before the United Nations : that we went to the United Nations complaining of Pakistan's aggression. That aggression still continues, and we have every right to say that if there is a Kashmir dispute, the only dispute is about Pakistan's aggression and continuing aggression. So, there is no reason why we should look upon this part of the preamble as prejudicial to us.

I then come to the operative part

"Demands that a ceasefire should take effect on Wednesday, 22nd September, 1965, and calls upon both Governments to issue orders for a ceasefire at that moment and a subsequent withdrawal of all armed personnel back to the positions held by them before 5th August, 1965;"

Now, our argument before the Security Council was that the only issue, as my hon. friend Shri U. M. Trivedi just now said, that the Security Council should consider was, who committed aggression, and if it was satisfied that Pakistan had committed aggression, condemn Pakistan as an aggressor. As I said, the time has come when the Security Council should call a spade a spade. It should not hesitate to do so. I said, take the evidence; look at the record and be satisfied. If you are satisfied that Pakistan has committed aggression, that is the only issue and you decide that issue. But the Security Council did not say so.

PAKISTAN CONDEMNED

I will satisfy the House how in this operative part is implicit the condemnation of Pakistan. I also pointed out that really we are concerned with cessation of hostilities and the resolution should be confined to the question of cessation of hostilities; and, all extraneous matters should not be brought in at this stage. The resolution says :

".... and calls upon both Governments to issue orders for a cease-fire at that moment and a subsequent withdrawal of armed personnel back to the position held by them before 5th August, 1965."

The most crucial date in this resolution is the 5th August, 1965, because that is the date on which Pakistan committed aggression on our country. I do not merely say that infiltrators entered into our country, because I think this was a naked aggression and unabashed invasion of India. The fact that they entered Kashmir makes no difference, because invasion of Kashmir is invasion of India. 5th August is the date which is to be

207

found in the Secretary-General's report. This is what the Secretary-General says in his report :

"Gen. Nimmo has indicated to me that the series of violations that began on the 5th August were to a considerable extent in subsequent days in the form of armed men generally not in uniform crossing the cease-fire line from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side."

This is not our allegation, not our view of the situation, but the report of the most powerful, most impartial international civil servant in the world today, the Secretary-General of the United Nations. This is his finding. If ever there was a clear and explicit unequivocal finding about an aggression, here it is. His finding is that aggression was committed by Pakistan on the 5th August, 1965.

Therefore, when you look at this resolution and see the date 5th August, as I said, implicit in that is the condemnation of Pakistan for this aggression, because you cannot read the date devoid of the report of the Secretary-General. The date is taken from his report and we have to ask ourselves the question, what happened on the 5th August? Why is that date mentioned in this resolution ? The only answer is that on 5th August took place aggression by Pakistan upon our country, invasion by Pakistan of our country. So, although there is no explicit condemnation of Pakistan as an aggressor, which this country and this House would have liked, implicit in this operative part is the condemnation of Pakistan.

I hope my hon, friend appreciates that in view of that fact that the Secretary-General's report mentions the date 5th August and says from that date a large number of armed people crossed over from Pakistan into Indian side, and this date having been mentioned in the resolution, there is implied condemnation of Pakistan.

As I pointed out. Pakistan has invaded India on three occasions, First was in 1947-48 when she invaded Kashmir. Then there was the Kutch invasion. This is the third invasion which is very similar to the first one into Kashmir, when Pakistan sent armed raiders, first denied any responsibility and then Sir Mohammad Zafrullah Khan admitted that Pakistan was behind it. But I will not deal with that now. I am dealing with this resolution.

WITHDRAWAL OF FORCES

Let me deal with the question of the withdrawal of the armed forces. I have made the position perfectly clear before the Security Council as to wheat we mean by withdrawal of the armed forces back to the positions hold by them before the 5th August. May I read out the passage ? it is in the debate held in the Security Council on the 17th September-page 49. I do not know whether the official text has come yet. This is what I said before the Security Council on that day : "This deals with the modality of the cease-fire.

I do not want to deal with this in detail, but may I say this ? All the invaders who have invaded Kashmir must leave. They must be withdrawan. They must be called back. As they were sent by Pakistan, they must be called back by Pakistan, Secondly, it must be made, impossible for such infiltration to take place again. Thirdly, Pakistan must own its responsibility for this infiltration."

Therefore, I made it clear that by withdrawal of the armed forces back to the positions held by them on 5th August, what I understood is, firstly, acknowledgment by Pakistan that she had sent these infiltrators, secondly, withdrawal of these infiltrators and thirdly, a situation to be created when such recurrence in future would be made impossible. I have not spelt out what the situation would be. But I would presently point out how the Prime Minister has taken up the same position in the correspondence, namely, that we do not want to go on from one cease-fire to another. We want to be satisfied that such a situation will not arise in future. We do not want to be put back in a position where thousands of infiltrators can enter our country and do what they have been doing there, create havoc, devastation, practise brutalities and cruelties, everything which I thought belonged to the past or the Hitler regime and not to modem civilised times. That is the position with regard to the 5th August.

Then, the resolution says :

"Calls on all the States to refrain from any action which might aggravate the situation there."

Sir, this is a plea to all the States, and I take it that China is included, although it is not a member of the United Nations, not to intervene and aggravate this conflict. Then comes this :

"Decides to consider as soon as operative paragraph I of the Council's resolution 210 of September 6 has been implemented, what steps could be taken to assist towards a settlement of the political problem underlying the present conflict, and in the meantime calls on the two Governments to utilise all peaceful means, including those listed in Article 33 of the Charter, to this end:"

Now, you will notice here that the steps which the Security Council could take are many. But here again there is no reference to Kashmir, there

208

is no reference to plebiscite, and what we are called upon to do is to utilise all peaceful means including those listed in Article 33 of the Charter to this end. This country has always believed in peaceful means. It has always believed in debate and discussion. We are prepared to talk with anyone, including the devil, if necessary (Interruptions). Well, I do not know in whose, favour the comparison is. But, Sir, you will notice that no time limit is fixed. It is left to us. This is purely recommendatory part of the resolution. We are asked to enter into discussions in order to bring about peaceful settlement, and there is mention of Article 33 of the Charter. Article 33 of the Charter, if you look at it, contains a large number of methods by which a peaceful settlement could be arrived at. Here also there is no prejudice as far as we are concerned.

Finally, it says :

"Requests the Secretary-General to exert every possible effort to give effect to this resolution, to seek a peaceful solution, and to report to the Security Council thereon."

Now, the best way to judge how seriously Pakistan considered this to be a diplomatic defeat is the response that was given by the Pakistan representative of the Security Council. I twice challenged him there to answer unequivocally whether he accepts a cease-fire unconditionally as our Prime Minister had done, and on both the occasions he refused to accept the challenge. This is what he says on the last day-this is very important, On the 20th September, when the resolution was about to be passed, this is the statement that he made. He said-this is page 23statement by Mr. Zafar, Law Minister of Pakistan :

"On the other hand, should the Security Council adopt this draft resolution, we feel bound to warn and to put it on the record that unless the basic cause of the present conflict is removed, another and. wider conflagration is bound to ensue."

I told the Security Council that one aggression is not over, and here is a threat of a new and wider conflagration. You will notice the note of utter dissatisfaction in this particular statement, because you will remember what the four conditions were which President Ayub was insisting on. The four conditions were : (i) cease-fire--on which we are agreed; (ii) withdrawal of all troops not only from the part of Kashmir of which they are in unlawful occupation but we should even withdraw from our own Kashmir where we are there now; (iii) induction of Afro-Asian force; and, (iv) plebiscite within three months. In this statement Mr. Zafar said that as these conditions were not satisfied the resolution was unsatisfactory and another and wider conflagration was bound to ensue. You will notice that even President Avub when he accepted the cease-fire said the resolution was unsatisfactory and mentioned that unless the Kashmir problem was solved, the continent will be submerged in a conflagration.

GOLDBERG AWAKENED AT DEAD OF NIGHT

it is surprising that although at this meeting, notwithstanding the challenge thrown out by me on two occasions, the Pakistan representative was not prepared to answer that Pakistan was prepared to accept a cease-fire unconditionally as our Prime Minister had done. It was only after a lapse of two or three days that President Ayub sent post haste Mr. Bhutto to the Security Council-poor Goldberg was awakened at dead of night, I do not know why, only for the purpose of permitting Mr. Bhutto making a speech to abuse our country. The acceptance could have been sent by a telegram, as we did, to the Secretary-General.

But the Security Council was convened solely for the purpose of enabling Mr. Bhutto to appear and abuse our country. I have a shrewd suspicion--I may be wrong-that the reason for this delay, why the challenge was not accepted at the meeting of the Security Council and why some time lapsed before President Ayub accepted cease-fire, is that during that interval, a crucial interval, a vital interval, Pakistan was satisfied that China was not coming to her assistance. If Pakistan had felt that China was going to press home her ultimatum and attack us or invade us, I have a feeling that the answer of Pakistan would have been very different. Because Pakistan felt that not only she was militarily defeated but she could not even count on the perfidious alliance of China, that is why she was driven, however much she disliked it, to accept this cease-fire.

KASHMIR AN INTEGRAL PART OF INDIA

Now, Sir, I was telling you with regard to Kashmir. May I draw your attention to the fact that there also I took up an entirely unequivocal attitude. On the 18th September, speaking to the Security Council about Kashmir I said this :

"I come now to the question of Kashmir. I do not want to delve into history. I studied history at Oxford and I am very fond of history, but history must be reserved for a proper occasion. Therefore, all that I had to say about Kashmir I said at great length when I intervened in the debate last year. But I want to make my position clear about Kashmir. I do not want this Council to be under any misapprehension as to the attitude of my Government with regard to Kashmir, nor do I want the representative of Pakistan to be under any misapprehension. Kashmir is an integral

209

part of India. Kashmir is a unit of the, Indian, Federation, and we will not permit, our Federation to be broken up. The separation of Kashmir from India means the break-up of our Federation of India. It would mean as much a break-up as it any other part of India were separated from India. Therefore, as far as the position of Kashmir is concerned, it has been stated by the representative of the Government of India on more than one occasion and, as I said, I myself stated it clearly and categorically at our last meeting.

Some apprehension was felt by some of the members as to the effect of withdrawing our troops to the, 5th of August positions. At the very last meeting when the resolution was passed, I made a statement on this resolution and I made, the position of the, Government perfectly clear so that there will be no doubt as to what the position was. This is what I said :

"As I read it, this resolution is not directed against my country. We have already accepted the unconditional cease-fire and we certainly will carry it out it Pakistan will carry it out. To the extent this resolution deals with the cease-fire, it could only be directed against Pakistan, which has not accepted the unconditional cease-fire."

This is the important part.

"With regard to the rest of the resolution all that I am going to say now is that I adhere to everything that I said in the two statements I made in the Council on Friday and Sunday. Various matters are dealt with in this resolution and I have taken up those matters in those statements. My Government adheres to every one of those statements and my Government also adheres to the explanations given by the Prime Minister of India in his letter, dated 14th September, which is included in the Secretary-General's preliminary report. Therefore, my position is perfectly clear and the position of my Government is also perfectly clear. We have come here before you to help you to stop the hostilities. We give you our full co-operation. To the extent this resolution deals with other matters, I do not wish to comment on them because I have already done so in my two statements and the Prime Minister has commented on them in his letter of 14th September."

Now it is very necessary to see what the Prime Minister says in his letter of 14th September because it clinches the matter both on the question of the withdrawal to the 5th August position and the question of Kashmir. This is the letter which the Prime Minister wrote to the Secretary-General, dated 14th. I will read the relevant passage :

"in the light of our own experience during the last few months, we will have to insist that there must be no possibility of a recurrence of armed attacks on India, open or disguised. Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Secretary-General, that when consequent upon cease-fire becoming effective, further details are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infiltrations that have taken place."

The next is about Kashmir.

"I would also like, to state categorically that no pressures or attacks will defect us from our firm resolve to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of Jammu and Kashmir is. an integral part."

Nothing can be clearer, more unequivocal, more categoric than this statement of the, Prime Minister. I pointed out to the Security Council that this was the attitude of the Government and I had reiterated it.

INDIA PREPARED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

So, the House need have no misunderstanding as to what is the modality of the cease-fire agree-

ment. We have agreed to the cease-fire. The modalities have to be worked out and in working out these modalities we will adhere to the position that we have taken. We will discuss with President Ayub. As I said, we are prepared to discuss with anybody. But in discussing with President Avub we will remember what the Prime Minister has said, that Kashmir is a closed chapter, as far as the territorial integrity of our country is concerned. I said this last year in the Security Council. We are not going to vacillate or wobble. I think our position should be absolutely clearly and emphatically stated to the world that we are not prepared to discuss under any circumstances the holding of plebiscite or ... (interruption).

I hope I have satisfied the House. The resolution that the Security Council has passed is not unfavourable to India, for our stand has been made perfectly clear and there is no doubt, no ambiguity, as to what we stand for and what we will stand for in the future.

Before I sit down may I make one or two general observations on what happened in the Security Council ? I think the time has come when we should do some re-thinking on our foreign policy. The world is moving and there is a regrouping of forces, regrouping of powers

210

and we cannot possibly take up a rigid attitude or-stand whom we stood some. years ago. We have to move with the world. I think we should give a serious thought to what the position is in the world today.

STAND TAKEN BY OTHER COUNTRIES

In this connection, I would be less than doing my duty if I do not express publicly on the floor of the House my deep appreciation for the stand taken up by Malaysia in the Security Council. As I said the other day, it was a speech which a member of the Indian delegation could have delivered. And I must also express my appreciation of the great help we received from the USSR while the resolution was being drafted. If the House only knew that the resolution was passed at quarter to three in the morning and the meeting had been going on the whole of Sunday, every comma, every semicolon, every sentence was considered and re-considered, it is only then that you realise how the assistance of a country like USSR in getting the resolution in this shape was invaluable.

And let me say this about USA. There was much more understanding of our position this year than I found last year. I am satisfied that on certain matters the world opinion is entirely in our favour, whatever some papers or some people may say. There is no doubt that the world is satisfied that Pakistan was the aggressor. There is no doubt that this myth of an uprising in, Kashmir has been completely exploded.

I should also say with regret that I could not understand the position taken up by Jordan. We have stood by the Arab world. We have shown friendship to the Arab world ever since we became free. We were among those countries which stood with the Arab world during the Suez trouble. As against Pakistan, we supported Jordan in the Jordan water issue. So, it came to me as a great disappointment that Jordan practically, if I may use a colloquial expression, toed the line of Pakistan.

There is one lesson which I learnt and which I have been learning since I joined public life, and that is this, that what ultimately matters is power; what ultimately matters is the strength of your country. We may have all the idealism in the world, we may have all the justice on our side, but it we are weak, nobody is going to listen. If we want our influence to be felt in the Councils of the world, we must be strong and must develop all the strength and power that we have. Then we would be listened to with respect.

There is one thing that I must say. I was proud when I was arguing India's case before the Security Council. I could hold my head up and felt proud of being an Indian and what India stands for. The first thing was the heroism displayed by our jawans. I could tell the Americans that notwithstanding your Patton tanks and all the modem equipment that you have given to Pakistan, our men are brave enough to fight them. Secondly, I was proud of the fact that not only Kashmir--Hindus, Muslim and Sikhs--had stood by Government and resisted the aggression, but the whole of India was united on this issue.

Please do not forget that Pakistan counted on one thing. The grand design was that when the infiltration took place Kashmir would give trouble. It was exactly like the story of the Bay of Pigs in Kennedy's regime. You remember, Sir, the Bay of Pigs. President Kennedy's one great mistake soon after he assumed power was that he relied on his Intelligence. He was told that if he sent a few Americans, the people of Cuba would rise I and when the people landed in the Bay of Pigs, they did not rise. And President Ayub--I do not know who was his informant; perhaps, Mr. Bhutto-was informed : Send 4,000 infiltrators to Kashmir and the whole of Kashmir will rise and will fall in your mouth like a ripe plum. That did not happen. He said, send these people to Kashmir and there will be trouble in India. Hindus, Muslims, Christians-India remains solid. And, there again he failed.

Sir, I have taken longer than I expected; but, in conclusion, I think, we did wisely in accepting the cease-fire because I assure you, the whole world realised that we were dedicated to peace and did not want bloodshed even for a moment if hostilities could be stopped. I think, on the whole we have secured a Resolution which is not unfavourable to India and, I think, we can look upon this whole incident with pride. We should be grateful to our Prime Minister for taking up this strong line.

DISCUSSION IN RAJYA SABHA

Later, intervening in the discussion on the same subject in the Rajya Sabha, the Minister of Education and Leader of the House, said :

Sir, I will try and make my intervention as brief as possible. If I might deal with the last point raised by Mr. Jairamdas about the Commonwealth, I know how strongly we are feeling and we are entitled to feel strongly about the attitude taken by the United Kingdom on this question of Pakistani aggression. Before we take a decision fraught with serious consequences, whether we should remain in the Commonwealth or not, we must give it careful thought. I would only throw out the suggestion for the consideration of the House. Our quarrel is with the United Kingdom, our grievance is against the United Kingdom, not against the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth is not the property of the United

211

Kingdom. The United Kingdom is only a member of the Commonwealth. In the other House, I just heard somebody saying, "We might ask the United Kingdom to leave the Commonwealth" rather than that we should leave the Commonwealth. Therefore, I would beg of this House, never take a political decision of far-reaching consequences when one is in a mood of indignation or anger. I think, as I said in London, our indignation and anger are perfectly justified but one must permit one's passion to cool down before one can come to a conclusion on so important a matter.

Dealing with the Resolution of the Security Council, an hon. Member said that it was not wholly satisfactory. I agree with him. As I was just telling the other House, this is not our draft. We did not approve of it. It was passed by the Security Council but I think, on the whole, it is a Resolution with which we might well be satisfied and it constitutes a serious and important diplomatic defeat for Pakistan. Just consider this. What did Pakistan want? She laid down four conditions, cease-fire, withdrawal of our troops from Kashmir and her troops from that part of Kashmir of which she is in unlawful occupation, induction of an Afro-Asian force and the holding of a plebiscite within three months. These were the conditions on which she was prepared to accept a cease-fire. Now, look at this Resolution. You do not find even a trace of any of these four conditions. There is no mention of a plebiscite, there is no mention of an induction of any foreign troops, there is no mention of evacuation of our troops from Kashmir and yet this Resolution, after a great deal of hesitation, Pakistan accepted. When I was arguing the case, the representative of Pakistan refused to give an unequivocal reply whether Pakistan was prepared to accept an unconditional cease-fire as our Prime Minister wants. It was only after the Security Council session was finished that President Ayub had second thoughts and sent Mr. Bhutto post haste to call a meeting at midnight to offer his acceptance.

I now come to the other point raised about the 5th of August by the hon. Member. He said this gives an advantage to the aggressor. Now, if you look at the Prime Minister's letter to the Secretary-General, it is perfectly clear as to what we mean by going back to the positions which were occupied by both the countries on the 5th August and I made Government's position perfectly clear to the Security Council that three conditions, are implicit in this date, 5th August, one, that all the infiltrators who entered Kashmir and who commenced Pakistan's aggression must withdraw, second. Pakistan must admit responsibility for these infiltrators, and third-and the most important-that we must create such a situation that infiltration in future would become impossible. We have had enough of these ceasefires, we have trusted Pakistan sufficiently and we are not prepared to trust her any more. Therefore, in the interests of our country, in the interests of our defence, we must have a cease-fire line of such a character that in future no infiltration would be possible. The cease-fire line is five hundred miles long. You may increase the number of U.N. Observers from forty to four hundred or four thousand but unless the cease-fire line is so constituted that infiltration becomes almost impossible, there is no guarantee as to what is going to happen in the future.

And this is all the more important when we realise the statement made by Mr. Bhutto recently, the statement by Pakistan's representative in the Security Council and what President Ayub said in accepting the cease-fire. What did they say? They said that unless the Kashmir problem is solved and solved according to their pleasure, there will be a greater conflagration in this country. Therefore, my submission to this House is, let us not forget that the cease-fire is only a truce; it is not peace. Therefore, we have got to be watchful; we have got to be vigilant. I think the cease-fire is not the end of our trouble; it is the beginning of many things which will have to be worked out over a long period of time and we must not be caught napping again. Now we have got full notice that Pakistan does not accept this cease-fire as leading to peace.

Pakistan's contention is that peace will only come when there is a plebiscite in Kashmir. No, I should not say that because what has been said in the Security Council and by Mr. Bhutto is that peace will only come when Kashmir goes to Pakistan. They have already anticipated a plebiscite, they are not worried about the plebiscite. What they want is that Kashmir should belong to Pakistan. The Law Minister of Pakistan when he was arguing his case talked of Kashmiris as being the kith and kin of Pakistan and I asked since when the Kashmiris had become the kith and kin of Paksitan. The only bond which he could find was the fact that the majority of people in Kashmir were Muslims and Pakistan is a theocratic State. And I said that on that basis they might as well say that the 50 million Muslims in India are the kith and kin of Pakistan and the next demand they will make is they will invade India in order to bring these 50 million Muslims under their domination. That shows the absurdity of the claim. When you make religion the basis of citizenship. you are really living in medieval times, not modem times. That is the whole trouble.

I think my friend. Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, said that something much more was at stake in this fight between us and Pakistan. not merely the question of Kashmir. I entirely agree with him

212

and may I quote from what I mid in the Security council on this very matter ? This is what I said :

"This is not merely a conflict between India and Pakistan. It has a much wider significance. The first significance is that the threat and menace of China looms large behind this war. It is much more than a mere looming now. It has almost come to a concrete shape after yesterday's ultimatum."

I was speaking the day after the ultimatum and I charged Pakistan with having committed this aggression on India with the hope and expectation that China will be behind it and support it.

"Then there is the war between the two ideo-logies."

That is what Mr. Akbar Ali Khan was referring to.

"Let us face it. On the one hand, there is the religious State and on the other hand the secular State. This is the conflict. It is not Kashmir. Kashmir is merely the symptom; it is not the disease. The disease is that Pakistan believes in a religious State; it believes in religion as the nexus between citizens. We believe in a secular State, in a multi-racial society. It is also a fight between a free society and democratic institutions on the one hand and dictatorship and regimentation on the other. These are the issues involved in this war and I think, if I may say so, that it is in the interests of Asia and the world that our free society, our multi-communal federation should survive. The attack on Kashmir is an attack for the purpose of breaking up our federation, of breaking up our way of life and preventing us from carrying on our great experiment of men of different religions and different languages living peacefully together. You in this country are trying the same experiment. Other countries are trying it but Pakistan does not want it. It does not believe in it and wants to break it up. What we are defending today is not merely the territorial integrity of our country which is important; what we are defending today is the existence of a free democratic nation. We want to function as a free democratic nation. It is the threat to our institutions that we resist."

So this really is the conflict. It is not merely Kashmir, Of course, Kashmir is important enough; every inch of our country is important to us but something much more is involved in this fight and it is really a fight between two ideologies.

Now I think an hon. Member said : Why should India be pressurized into entering into talks with Pakistan? Now, the Resolution, if you look at it, does not pressurize us. All that it says is :

"decides to consider as soon as operative paragraph 1 of the Council's resolution 210 of 6th September has been implemented, what steps could be taken to assist towards a settlement of the political problem underlying the present conflict....

That is, as far as the Security Council is concerned what steps it could take.

".....and in the mean time calls upon the two Governments to utilise ail peaceful means, including those listed in Article 33 of the Charter......"

No time limit is fixed. We are called upon to talk and I think in India we should be the last to say that we will not talk with anyone, not even the devil. Therefore, if our Prime Minister has said that he is prepared to accept the invitation of USSR that he and President Ayub should meet in that country under propitious circumstances, there is nothing to be frightened about it. I think the fear we have is that we will allow the Kashmir question to be reopened. Let us face it. We have done that in the past. The fear in this House which I fully appreciate is that we might be weak, we might vacillate, we might wobble over Kashmir but I wish to give this assurance to this House-the Prime Minister has said it in his letter to the Secretary-General and I have reiterated it in the Security Council-that as far as our basic stand is concerned, that Kashmir is an integral part of India, it remains unaltered. As I said, we will talk with President Ayub, we will talk with anybody else. After all this is another important issue about Kashmir that we can talk about and that is we went to the United Nations as complainants. Pakistan committed aggression on Kashmir in 1947 and that aggression still continues till today. Let that aggression be vacated. But as I said, it is perfectly clear on the record that out basic stand on Kashmir remains unaltered.

And may I say this ? I think an hon. Member said something about the USSR. As far as the USSR is concerned uptil today, she has given us every assistance; she has made it perfectly clear and she has always said that she recognised that Kashmir was an integral part of India. And let me say this. This Resolution was passed on Sunday at quarter to three early in the morning. The Security Council sat the whole of Sunday and we were there. There were discussions over every comma, every semi-colon, every phrase and throughout those discussions we had every help

213

and assistance from the USSR and I can assure this House that this Resolution would never have been passed in the terms in which it has been passed but for the considerable assistance and help which we got from the U.S.S.R. Of Course, Malaysia also helped us but do not forget that what counts most in the Security Council is the five Big Powers which have the right of veto, Of course, Formosa does not count much but Russia, the United States, France and the United Kingdom do count because if one of them is opposed to a Resolution it makes no difference if everybody else supports it because that country can veto it. We succeeded in the Security Council to bring about unanimity among the Big Powers and even the non-permanent Powers and I repeat that but for the great assistance and help we had from the U.S.S.R. this Resolution would not have been carried and I say that this Resolution favours our country. It is a diplomatic defeat for Pakistan; it does not accept any of its conditions and I think we might look upon it as something which does not go against our interests at all.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CHINA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALAYSIA JORDAN CUBA UNITED KINGDOM RUSSIA

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Syed Mir Qasim's Speech in the General Assembly

Syed Mir Qasim, Minister without Portfolio, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, and Member of the Indian Delegation to the U.N.; made the following speech in the U.N. General Assembly on September 29, 1965 :

I am grateful for the opportunity to address this august Assembly on some of the points which were raised by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan yesterday. I am afraid he has filled the records of this Assembly with a mass of untruths and misrepresentations of fact and history, more especially about the people of Kashmir, and I cannot possibly leave the Assembly to rely upon abuse and invective as substitutes for reason and the hard facts of history.

At the outset, let me say a word or two about

my own humble title to speak on the issues which have been raised. I come here from that part of my country which is known as the Kashmir Valley. Perhaps I should mention that I belong to the majority community of Muslims in my home State of Kashmir, although in our countryunlike Pakistan-we do not believe that religious distinctions should impinge upon political life. I have had some little part to play in the political life of our State from the days of princely rule. It is for these reasons that it is my duty, on behalf of our delegation, to set the record of the Assembly right on the many statements made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan.

I would like to confine myself mainly to the task of establishing, with reference to what I have just called the hard facts of history, that the people of Kashmir made their choice as between the Indian and Pakistani ideologies long before the events of Indian independence and the partition of the country.

I propose, furthermore, to expose the hollowness and the real nature of Pakistan's false solicitude for the Muslims of Kashmir--a deadly solicitude of which we have had repeated and bitter experience in the past. I propose to indicate Pakistan's real designs on Kashmir and the people of Kashmir, of which too we have had repeated evidence. I propose finally to draw the attention of the Assembly to the basic problem underlying the conflict between India and Pakistan which the United Nations seems anxious to resolve.

It was way back in the year 1938, some ten years before the formal accession to India, that we, the people of Kashmir, decided by our own free and well-considered choice to adopt the secular and democratic way of life, rejecting the two-nation theory advocated by Mr. Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan. Early in the course of our struggle against the autocracy of the then princely ruler, we received inspiration, sympathy and support from the great leaders of the Indian National Congress. Our people felt that it would be opposed to our cultural heritage and upbringing, out traditions and history, to confine our movement to the platform of a single religious community. Such a narrow approach was also contrary to the message of secularism and communal harmony preached by our great Kashmiri poets, our revered Kashmiri sheikhs, such as Nooruddin, the Wali of Kashmir, and our great philosophers. As a result, in the year 1938, led by Sheikh Abdullah, we took the decision to form the National Conference at a historic session presided over by Mr. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq, who today is the Chief Minister of the State. Thenceforward, we carried on our struggle for democratic rights on a common platform, on behalf of all the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, irrespective of religion, province or community. We have all these years fought the bigotry and narrowmindedness of those who exploited religion for political purposes. We routed them every time with the overwhelming backing and support of the Kashmiri people-much to the dislike and discomfiture of Mr. Jinnah and other leaders of

214

the Pakistan movement. The next year-and I am still talking of the thirties-we held an important convention known as the Sopore Convention, at which we had as our honoured guests the great Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and other stalwarts of the Indian National Congress.

It is understandable that, having played no part in the independence struggle of the sub-continent, the Pakistan Foreign Minister should be ignorant of these facts of history. The stalwarts in the political life of the sub-continent who inspired us in the thirties' and the forties' were these and other leaders of the Indian National Congress, and not Mr. Jinnah or any of the past or present leaders of Pakistan. We aid have the misfortune of being exposed to the overtures of Mr. Jinnah and his Muslim League. Mr. Jinnah did his best to woo us and failed; he tried to bully us into submission and failed; we rejected his offers and blandishments on the strength of our experience of the part played by the protagonists of Pakistan in our popular movement.

What did the leaders of the Pakistan movement do to us ? When we launched our popular movement in 1946, asking for abrogation of the autocratic rule of the Maharaja-and many of us, including myself, went to jail in defence of our democratic rights-it was Jawaharlal Nehru, not Jinnah, who came to Kashmir and courted imprisonment for our sake. The great Gandhi followed and asked the Maharaja to give us our rights. What did the leaders of Pakistan do ? Mr. Jinnah expressed his "Islamic sympathy" with the Muslims of the State by characterising their popular movement as an agitation by a few malcontents; Maulvi Yousuf Shah, whom Pakistan has of late paraded abroad as the Grand Mufti of Kashmir, opposed our movement by hailing the "Hindu" Maharaja as the shadow of God on earth, as Sultan Zeil-el-Allah. Mr. President, as a Muslim and one who claims some little knowledge of our Holy Koran. I can presume to say that this was a self-seeking, opportunistic and gross misinterpretation of the Holy Koran by the supporters of Pakistan.

When the founders of Pakistan had failed to win over the Muslims of Kashmir politically to their retrograde, reactionary way of thinking, Pakistan tried to take Kashmir by the force of arm". In 1947, in the same way as on this occasion. they sent thousands of armed Pakistani raiders to subjugate the innocent, peaceloving Kashmiri people, The raiders committed murder. argon and pillage directed against Muslims and others alike. It is often forgotten that they did all this even before our State joined One Union of India. The people of Kashmir. Muslims. Hindus and all unitedly, gave the invaders from Pakistan a determined and fitting reply even before-I repeat, even before-the arrival of Indian troops whose help we freely sought out of our old kinship and bonds with the Indian people. Year after year, all these years, Pakistani intruders have sneaked into our territory, killed people, looted property, indulged in head-hunting and sabotage. Bombs were placed in mosques, as well as in cinema halls, and innocent people were killed in such outrages year after year by Pakistan's trained saboteurs.

For us, 1965 was merely a repetition of an old and familiar experience at the hands of Pakistan. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan should know that we Kashmiris are fully aware of Pakistan's real designs on Kashmir. We realize that the reason why Pakistan wants our beautiful land has nothing to do with the welfare of Muslims in the State, or with securing for them any imaginary rights which they do not already enjoy, but rather with what the President of Pakistan called its "vital interests". If Pakistan were really interested in the people of Kashmir, Mr. Bhutto and his Government would not have bartered a way large chunks of our territory to the Chinese or imposed repressive rule on our brethren in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir, whom Pakistan holds in bondage to this day and whom we cannot forsake.

Let me now turn to some of the other considerations urged by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in support of his main theme. We are glad that Pakistan has now recognized that the remaining vestiges of colonial rule, wherever they might still exist, must be removed. Pakistan's earlier record on this question has hardly been any different from that of the colonial Powers themselves. This neo-crusader of the rights of dependent peoples, had preferred to subserve, as an instrument of national policy, the interests of colonial Powers. It has maintained close and friendly relations with Portugal, a Power with the worst colonial record. when India stamped out the vestiges of Portugal's colonial domination in Goa, the President of Pakistan described it as "an eve-opener for the entire world about India's evil intentions towards her peaceful neighbour". For years, after the adoption of resolution 1761 (XVI) by the General Assembly. Pakistan continued to trade with Smith Africa in the face of the united stand of Asians and Africans against commercial and other intercourse with that country.

Pakistan's pro-imperialist role in the Suez and Yemen crises is well-known. When Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal, in the exercise of its right of self-determination, the then Pakistan Prime Minister justified the Anglo-French attack on Egypt on the ground that it was intended "to restore international morility". Sir Olaf Caroe, once Secretary of the Foreign Department in the British regime in undivided India, describes in his book

215

"Wells of Power" how Pakistan alone could serve as a British base for the protection of British interests in West Asia and Africa. Thus from its very birth, Pakistan has been subserving the policies of colonial Powers, rejecting with contempt the right of self-determination of the Asian and African people over whom those Powers ruled.

Now the Foreign Minister of Pakistan is contemptuous of the claim of Portugal that its colonies are part of the metropolitan territory. Only the other day in the Security Council he himself accused India of committing aggression in Goa. Pakistan is the only Afro-Asian country to have supported Portuguese colonialism. This Assembly itself has recognized that Goa, along with Sao Joao da Batista, had been nationally united with India and Dahomey respectively.

Speaking about Afro-Asia, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan said :

"The physical and human realities of Asia and Africa make it imperative that unity should be sought through diversity. The need for tranquillity is para mount for the countries of Asia and Africa to enable them to secure for themselves an orderly transition." (1339th meeting, page 46).

This is exactly what India has been trying for the last eighteen years of independence and this is exactly what Pakistan has done its utmost to prevent.

India desires nothing but to be left alone to decide its own destiny in peace and tranquillity and to maintain a society in which all Indians, regardless of their race or religion, may be able to pursue their programmes of economic and social betterment. Pakistan, however, will not leave us alone. Thrice within eighteen years it, has committed aggression on India. Firstly, in October 1947 Pakistan took this deliberate step in violation of the United Nations Charter within a month of its becoming a Member of this Organization and of pledging to abide by its purposes and principles. The second aggression took place in April this year when Pakistani forces backed by armour invaded the Indian State of Gujarat. Even while the Kutch Agreement was being signed on 30th June 1965, Pakistan was already preparing for the third aggression on India. On 5 August this year, Pakistani armed personnel crossed the cease--fire line in Jammu and Kashmir in thousands. And yet yesterday the Foreign Minister of Pakistan talked of the need for unity through diversity and the need for tranquillity in Afro-Asia.

The Foreign Minister of 'Pakistan stated :

"The war with India is not of our seeking. It is a war of self-defence against an armed attack launched on our borders without warning on the morning of 6 September and aimed at the seizure of Lahore, our second largest city and the very heart of Pakistan." (Ibid., page 48-50).

But, even according to the facts recognized by the Secretary-General, it is established that the war was forced upon India by Pakistan. The truth is that on 5 August 1965 thousands of Pakistani armed personnel crossed the cease-fire line. Their purpose was to destroy military installlations, disrupt vital communications, create terror among the local population, assassinate popular leaders, and set up a so-called "revolutionary council" to give the false impression that the people of Jammu and Kashmir were in revolt, Let me quote from the Secretary-General's report :

"General Nimmo has indicated to me that the series of violations that began on 5 August were to a considerable extent in subsequent days in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the CFL"--that is, the cease-fire line - "from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side. This is a conclusion reached by General Nimmo on the basis of investigations by be United Nations Observers, in the light of the extensiveness and character of the raiding activities and their proximity to the CFL, even though in most cases the actual identity of these engaging in the armed attacks, on the Indian side of the Line and their actual crossing of it could not be verified by direct observation or evidence." (S/6651), para. 6).

This is what the Secretary-General of the United Nations said. How dare the Foreign Minister of Pakistan talk of the war not being of Pakistan's seeking ? Is there no limit to misrepresentation ? By now the world is so fully aware of Pakistan's direct complicity in despatching armed troops in civilian disguise across the cease-fire line that I do not propose to burden the members of the Assembly with hundreds of quotations from foreign correspondents and others who have written about the conflict which began on 5 August. But let me quote just a few.

Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts, the Staff Writer of the Washington Post, wrote in that newspaper only day before yesterday : "Perhaps the best way to tell the story of what happened is to tell it in chronology. On 5 August, the first of 4,000 to 5.000 Pakistani infiltrators were sent into the Indian-held Part of Kashmir. They crossed the 1949 cease-fire line in that State. . . . The Moslem Pakistanis, led by President Ayub Khan, had expected the infiltrators to be able to produce a general uprising of the predominantly Moslem

216

Kashmiris, it is believed here. But there was no uprising and this is Ayub's first disappointment. By the end of August, when the Indiana were sufficiently alarmed by the infiltration, however, they countered with infantry offensives across the cease-tire line."

The well-known columnist, Walter Lippman, writing in the New York Herald Tribune of 28 September, has this to say :

"The hostilities in Kashmir began with an infiltration of guerilla troops (recruited as a matter of fact from the Pakistani army though they wore different uniforms). The purpose of the guerillas was to arouse the population and to liberate Moslem Kashmir from Hindu rule."

The nationalist Arabic daily of Beirut, Al-Anwar, says.:

"The infiltration operations carried out by the Pakistanis at the present time in Kashmir are fruitless, and the infiltrators will not succeed in taking Kashmir from India. What they are doing is to widen the conflict between the two countries and make the possibility of settling the Kashmir problem more, difficult than at any time before."

The Daily Sun of Ceylon in its edition of 18 August 1965, stated :

"In spite of conflicting reports from the Indian and Pakistani sides and the so-called Voice of Kashmir Radio, it seems fairly clear that the present disorder in Kashmir, now fortunately under control, had been planned six or seven months in advance and was caused by armed Pakistani infiltrators variously admitted as between two to three thousand."

The Swatantra Samachar of Nepal wrote in its edition of 22 August 1965

"It has been quite clear that this Pakistani infiltration is wholesale aggression presenting a great challenge to world peace. Pakistan should realize that she will not be saved from the flames of this challenge."

The Gazette de Lausanne of Switzerland wrote :

"It appears evident that the responsibility for the present crisis lies with Pakistan. Pakistan defends herself by saying that she has no hand in the acts of sabotage committed by guerilla fighters who have infiltrated into the Indian part of the Kashmir. But the arms used by raiders could come only from Pakistan."

The Frankfurter Allgeimine Zeitung of 26 August 1965, said :

"Kashmir would have been torn open by rebellion apparently directed and started Pakistan. Pakistan infiltrations of the freedom fighters, who, she says, have risen in the Indian part of Kashmir can no longer be maintained, since New Delhi has shown to the world Pakistani officers who have been taken Prisoner".

Le Monde of Paris had this to say about the so-called revolt in Jammu and Kashmir :

"Everything leads one to think that Pakistani infiltrations in the Valley were probably aimed at starting a revolt by throwing the suburbs of Srinagar into trouble, which in reality is the scene of political activity. For the moment, it seems that this undertaking which recalls a great deal the American adventure in Bay of Pigs has not had an immediate success."

I hope it is clear by now that the Pakistani troops in civilian disguise who crossed the ceasetire line beginning on 5 August 1965 failed miserably in achieving their objective. Not only was there no revolt of the local population, but on the contrary there were hundred of instances in which the local population participated actively in tracing and rounding up the infiltrators. And what was Pakistan doing while these Pakistan armed troops in civilian disguise were perpetrating acts of sabotage and terror on the people of Jammu and Kashmir, for whose, "liberation" they had crossed the cease-fire line? Pakistani forces were engaged in giving these troops in civilian disguise heavy artillery or other fire cover all along the cease-fire line from east to west and north to south. The intention obviously was to keep the Indian army engaged along the cease-fire line while the clandestine operations went unchecked. But even this failed. Then, on I September 1965, Pakistan took the ultimate step of invading the south-western part of the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir across the cease-fire line and the international border. The invasion was supported by two regiments of Patton tanks and was provided with air cover. Pakistan's purpose was now crystal clear to the whole world: having failed in its clandestine operations it came out into the Open.

When at last the United Nations Security Council met on 4 September to consider the situation, and the Government of India was considering the appeal of the Council for a cease-fire, pakistani aircraft flew across the international borders to bomb the town of Ranbirsinghpura. What is more on the same day, that is 5 September, the city of Amritsar was bombed by Pakistani war planes. It was obvious that Pakistan was preparing a full-scale invasion of the Indian State of the Punjab in order to cut off all land communications with the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. In that situation, there was no course

217

left for India but to exercise its inherent right of self-defence, a right which is not only upheld by international law but is specifically recognized in the United Nations Charter. And yet the Foreign Minister of Pakistan would have this Assembly believe that : "The war with India is not of our seeking." (1339th meeting, p. 48-50).

It is extraordinary that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan supports the lofty principles of Bandung. May I refer to some of the principles enshrined in the Bandung Declaration. The first is': "Respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations." I have already indicated to this body that within thirty days of Pakistan's joining this Organization and pleading itself to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, Pakistan invaded Jammu and Kashmir.

The second principle is : "Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations." I have already stated that Pakistan has committed aggression against India three times in the last eighteen years.

The sixth principle of the Bandung Declaration is in two parts. Part (a) reads : "Abstention from the use of arrangements of collective defence to serve the particular interests of any of the big Powers." Need I refer to Pakistan's membership in the military alliances known as the South East Asia Treaty Organization and the Central Treaty Organization ? The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has himself stated that in any military conflict with India, the integrity and the sovereignty of the largest State in Asia would be involved because now Pakistan has joined hands with China, whose support it loudly proclaims. Part (b) of the sixth principle is : "Abstention by any country from exerting pressure on other countries." If membership in military alliances and the collusion with China against India is not a violation of this principle, what is ? Mr. Bhutto has gone even further. He has now threatened to take his country out of the United Nations if the membership of this Organization does not facilitate the annexation by Pakistan of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has claimed that impartial world opinion supports Pakistan in its aggression against India. He has named Turkey, Iran and Indonesia. The two former are members of the same military alliances to which Pakistan belongs. Indonesia today has chosen to stand outside this world body and is perhaps the only country, apart from the People's Republic of China, which has applauded and supported Pakistan's aggression against India. Pakistan keeps the company of adventurist nations-those who covet the territory of others-and in that company Pakistan feels at home.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated yesterday :

"Since the whole world has been concerned with the failure thus far to resolve the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, I must refer to at least two or three basic issues involved in it. The first and the foremost is the right of selfdetermination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The second issue is the sanctity of international agreements, especially those brought about by the United Nations itself. The third is the effectiveness of the United Nations in securing pacific settlement of international disputes." (1339th meeting, page 51).

First of all, I must categorically state, and with all the emphasis at my command, that there is no dispute about Kashmir, that the conflict between India and Pakistan has arisen as a result of repeated attempts by Pakistan to commit aggression against India in violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, and more so as a result of the refusal by Pakistan to vacate aggression to this day.

But let us examine the three points which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan calls basic to the whole problem. The first is ... "the right of selfdetermination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir" (Ibid). The Foreign Minister of Pakistan waxed eloquent on the peoples' right of selfdetermination, or, if I may say so, other peoples' right of self-determination. How about the right of self-determination of those people whose territory Pakistan has annexed ? Does Pakistan practise what is preaches to others? What is its record in recognizing and honouring the right of self-determination of the people of Baluchistan, Pakhtunistan, Gwadar, and that area of the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir forcibly occupied by it in 1947-48? Let me lift the veil on the subject.

Pakistan's administration in Baluchistan was described by the newspaper Guardian of 21 April 1962, ..."typical of food colonial rule" in which "there is a wide gulf between it and the people."

Baluchistan, lying to the south-west of Pakistan, despite its predominantly Muslim population, did not automatically become part of Pakistan, as the neighbouring province of Sind did. In view of the well-known opposition of the Baluchi people to their integration with Pakistan, the British Government's declaration of 3 June 1947, concerning the transfer of power and partition of British India, provided that : "This province will also be given an opportunity to reconsider its position". But the referendum that took place in Baluchistan was boycotted by the most powerful and well-organized Baluchi party. Since then, the Baluchis have been struggling for their freedom, 218

despite the most brutal suppression. In independent Pakistan, the Baluchis have lost even the tribal freedom which they enjoyed under British rule.

The repression in Baluchistan was so severc that the Sangbad of Dacca, in its issue of 15 April 1964, warned the people of Pakistan that the country was "crossing the limits of even a police state". The paper wrote

"We have more than once heard about heartless repression in Baluchistan. Only the other day, Mr. Abdul Haq, a member of the National Assembly, disclosed that an Id gathering there had been bombarded surely an astonishing occurrence But the manner in which repression in Baluchistan is going on. and the countrywide arrests, the lathi charges, the firings and bombings ... do they not prove that we might be crossing the limits even of a police state

The Baluchi demand is similar to the demand of the Pakhtuns in the North West Frontier area. Pakistan's repression of the Pakhtuns is exemplified by the suffering of their seventy-five-yearold leader, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Badshah Khan, as he is affectionately called by his people, was the founder of the Khudai Khidmatgar, or the Servants of God, which. like the Anjuman-e-Watan of Baluchistan, had boycotted the referendum of 1947. For this, be has since suffered almost seventeen years of incarceration and is now in Afghanistan in shattered health.

Even more illuminating is the manner in which Pakistan has purchased-let me repeat, purchased --the people and territory of Gwadar from the Sultan of Muscat and Oman. Not unexpectedly, news of this mediaeval cash-for-territory deal was hidden from the people of both Gwadar and Pakistan and the whole transaction was camouflaged as a gesture of goodwill. However, the then West Pakistan Chief Minister, Mr. Qizilbash, disclosed on 23 September 1958-that is, almost a fortnight after the deal-that Pakistan had purchased Gwadar. As for the people of Gwadar. Pakistan never asked them if they acquiesced in being bought like chattel in the twentieth century.

Since October 1947. the Pakistan Government has been systematically enslaving our brethren and fellow citizens in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. How pitiful the conditions of these enslaved Kashmiri brethren in this area ire has been described from time to time by their leaders who submitted a memorandum on their plight to the Pakistan Constituent Assembly and who have denounced Pakistan's despotic rule in the Pakistan Press. They have no independent legislature, no independent indiciary and they have been robbed of all civil liberties..

The sanction of Pakistan's Kashmir Affairs Ministry is required for legislation and enactment of statutory rules, all appointments, all questions of general policy, budget, internal security, all matters involving financial commitments, alienation of State property, public debts and loans, all forest schemes, all important matters relating to civil supplies and rehabilitation and a wide range of other activities. This is stated clearly in the so-called Azad Kashmir Government Gazette Extraordinary, dated 28 October 1952. If this is not colonization of our territory, what is ?

In an editorial entitled "Azad Kashmir Prospect", the Khyber Mail of Pakistan, dated 27th August 1964, stated

"But what has come to be witnessed in Azad Kashmir in recent days looks like a complete swing of the pendulum to the other extreme. From the available reports, it seems that the future presidents of Azad Kashmir would be put in place not by the people but by officials sitting in Rawalpindi."

No amount of propaganda or Up service to the principle of self-determination by Pakistan can hide these facts. Essentially a camp-follower of colonial Powers, it is hardly surprising that the Pakistan Government is not prepared to trust its own people. President Ayub's classic statements, describing the people of Pakistan as unworthy of democracy, are too well known to need any repetition. The no less categorical assertion by the Pakistan Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto, on the same subject is, however, worth repeating. "The slogan of democratization of the constitution was an old note", he said, according to Dawn of 29 October 1962. "We must not dance to an old tune-, we must have a new song". This "new song" was based on suppressing the people's democratic rights. I must admit that Pakistan has achieved signal success in this direction.

India yields to no one in its support of the principle of self-determination. For many years, India has been fighting for this principle in the United Nations. But to abuse it by seeking to apply this principle and to apply it to parts of sovereign independent States would be disastrous. Such abuse could lead to political chaos in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world; for example, the Sudan, Kenya, Ethiopia, Cameroon, Thailand, Iran and Iraq, among others.

Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India. Its people are free nationals of India, who have made their choice of union with India and ratified the union through their representatives elected on the basis of adult franchise. Jammu and Kashmir has an elected legislature a Government responsible to the electorate through this legislature which exercises control

219

over government policies. Their judiciary is independent and they enjoy justifiable fundamental rights, like their fellow citizens in the rest of India. None of these rights and freedoms is to be found in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir, or even in Pakistan itself.

Pakistan, therefore, should be the last country to advocate the right of self-determination. Its attitude is based on the mediaeval concept of religion being the basis of nationality and its contradictory conduct on the principle of self-determination cannot be described except as obscurantist and betraying a desire for territorial aggrandisement-an attitude completely divorced from the principles and ideals of non-aligned and Afro-Asian countries.

India has been and still is in the vanguard of the struggle against racialism and colonialism and is dedicated to the task of extending the frontiers of peace, coexistence and international co-operation. No other country in the world with a comparable population has given a fuller expression to popular rights and freedom or greater opportunity to its people to exercise their democratic rights.

Pakistan preaches the principles of self-determination and anti-colonialism to India. On this score, we have no need for lessons from Pakistan. We stand on our record, a record which has been recognized in the very resolutions of this Assembly throughout the last twenty years of its existence. We stand on our record of anti-colonialism in Asia and Africa and the Caribbean and other parts of the New World.

Another issue to which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan referred as basic is the sanctity of international agreements, especially those brought about by the United Nations. Pakistan's attitude to the Security Council resolutions has been extraordinary. As Sir Mohammad Zafrullah Khan told the United Nations Commission, his Government has never accepted any international obligations with regard to non-interference in Kashmir. One of the Foreign Ministers of Pakistan stated on the floor of the Security Council on 16th January 1957 :

"I want to make it clear that Pakistan recognizes no international obligations with regard to the State of Jammu and Kashmir except those it has voluntarily accepted together with the Government of India in the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949." (S/PV. 761, para. 115)

He conveniently forgot that India and Pakistan had also accepted the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948, which Pakistan promptly violated by inducting regular Pakistan forces into the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, deliberately withholding this vital information from the Security Council though required to communicate any material changes in the situation, as provided for under the resolution.

Thus Pakistan has always claimed that it is not bound by any resolution which it has not voluntarily accepted, and yet, by some curious twist of irrational logic, Pakistan has been holding the view that India is committed to all resolutions of the Security Council whether India voluntarily accepted them or rejected them. In other words, Pakistan claims special dispensation where the implementation of resolutions affecting its own obligations are concerned.

It is a matter of record that even the United Nations Commission resolutions which Pakistan accepted have been violated by it. There- is a mass of evidence in support of this charge in the records of the United Nations Commission and the Security Council. There is also the inescapable fact that, although an unqualified obligation was placed on Pakistan, under the United Nations Commission resolution of 13 August 1948, to vacate its aggression against the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan has not done so for the past seventeen years. Though solely responsible for the non-implementation of this resolution, Pakistan claims that the resolution must be implemented by India. Anyone who has taken the trouble to study the United Nations Commission resolution of 13 August 1948 will find that any action by India was not to arise until and unless Pakistani regulars and irregulars, as well as Pakistani nations, were completely withdrawn from the State.

Faced by Pakistan's non-implementation of the resolutions, and with the passage of time leading to changed circumstances which rendered the resolutions obsolete, India implemented them in keeping with their spirit. Accordingly, the people of Kashmir convened a Constituent Assembly to which they elected representative on the basis of adult franchise. These representatives duly ratified the State's accession to India.

In brief, Pakistan tried to grab Jammu and Kashmir first by imposing an economic blockade against the State, then by organizing raids by its irregulars, then by sending regular Pakistan troops into the State, and, when all these failed, it retained and extended its unlawful presence in the territory of the State by holding up implementation of the United Nations Commission resolutions.

A country Member of the United Nations such as Pakistan, which creates a problem by committing aggression, which conceals that aggression from the United Nations until its concealment

220

becomes impossible, which undertakes to end the situation created by its aggression but refuses to implement the undertaking and in fact commits further acts of aggression, has no right to talk about the implementation of United Nations resolutions which, by its own conduct, it has treated with contempt.

The third issue mentioned by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan as basic is "the effectiveness of the United Nations for the pacific settlement of international disputes". (1339th meeting, page 63).

How does the Foreign Minister of Pakistan intend to prove whether the United Nations is take his country out of the United Nations if the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir is not handed over on a silver platter to Pakistan by the United Nations-and that, too, here and now. On the one hand, he relies on the resolutions of the Security Council to prove his case that there is a binding commitment on the part of India to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir-and may I reiterate there is no such binding commitment on the part of India-and, on the other hand, be says that the Security Council has been manoeuvred into a position of helplessness. On the one hand, he waxes eloquent over the testimonies given to Pakistan by United Nations Representatives appointed by the Security Council, and, on the other hand, be says : "It is a painful story, this story of the Security Council's inaction" (1339th meeting, page 64). On the one hand, he says that his country warned the Security Council of an impending explosion, and, on the other hand, his country sets about deliberately to infiltrate armed troops in civilian disguise across the casefire line to create a "revolt". On the one hand, he points the gun at India and asks for a plebiscite, and, on the other hand, be runs to this august Assembly and wants to force it, under the threat of leaving the United Nations, to put pressure on India to do what his country has failed to achieve at the point of the gun. This is' the manner in which he wants the United Nations to be effective. One begins to wonder whether he has really understood the purposes and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Where does he get the idea that the United Nations was created in order to put pressure on Member States to satisfy the insatiable lust of countries like Pakistan for territorial aggrandize ment?

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has presented

a proposal to this Assembly. The first point in his proposal is that India and Pakistan both should withdraw their forces from the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. This is preposterous. Only a little earlier he was accusing India of treating the resolutions of the Security Council as obso lete. Let me make it clear to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that not only does India consider the resolutions to be obsolete but, in view of the massive Pakistani assault on the cease-fire line and its open repudiation of the cease-fire agreement of 1949, India considers the resolutions to be also dead.

However, to return to the inconsistencies of the Pakistan Foreign Minister, he stated categorically that the resolutions on which he relies for his case could not be, to quote him "changed or modified even by the Security Council, far less repudiated by one of the parties." (1339th meeting, page 62). The first point of his proposal is in fact a repudiation of the earlier resolutions. One basic thread running through the resolutions of the Security Council is their unquestioned recognition of India's sovereignty over Jammu and Kashmir. Now one of the attributes of sovereignty is the right, indeed the duty, of a State to defend its territory against external aggression. It was due to this fact that while the resolutions called for the withdrawal of all Pakistani forces from Pakistan-occupied Kashmir, they recognized the right of India to retain forces necessary for the defence and security of the State. How does the Foreign Minister of Pakistan propose to reconcile these two contradictory positions? May I in passing also remark that he has not referred at all to withdrawal of Chinese troops from that area of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir which is currently under this illegal and forcible occupation.

The second point of the proposal submitted by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan is the induction into the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir of a United Nations force. We are entirely opposed to this proposal. We do not want any foreign troops on our soil. We know how to defend ourselves. We will never agree to any foreign troops being inducted into our country. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan referred to India's contribution to United Natious peacekeeping forces in some parts of the world. Let it be clear beyond any doubt that nowhere have Indian troops been sent without the consent of the Government concerned.

The third point of his proposal is a familiar one, concerning self-determination, plebiscite-call it what you will-and I have already dealt with it. However, in connexion with this third point the Foreign Minister of Pakistan made a curious statement. He said : "If we had made the demand that Kashmir be given to us, the United Nations would have every right to look askance at our suggestion" (Ibid., p. 71). Has the Foreign Minister of Pakistan the statements of his own President? Has he forgotten his own statement ? Let me refresh his memory.

221

In December 1959, the Pakistan President said : "Kashmir is vital for Pakistan, hot only politically but militarily as well. Kashmir is a matter of life and death."

Again, on 19 July 1961, President Ayub said "Kashmir is important to us for our physical as well as economic security."

Now to quote the Foreign Minister of Pakistan himself. According to the Pakistan newspaper Dawn in its issue of 20 August 1965, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan said : "As a matter of fact, the State of Jammu and Kashmir was Pakistani territory which India has usurped."

Let me make one thing clear. Despite two aggressions against the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan has not been able to annex the State by force of arms. Having failed to do so, having failed to compel India to discuss this so-called question of Kashmir at the point of the gun, Pakistan now seeks to put international pressure-on India to enter into discussion. Let there be no misunderstanding or doubt about India's attitude on this subject. As the Prime Minister of India has already stated hi his letter dated 14 September 1965 to the Secretary-General, "I would also like to state categorically that no pressures or attacks will deflect us from our firm resolve to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part" (S/6683, para. 8).

Yesterday, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan

quoted one of our leaders, Mr. Jay Prakash Narayan, in support of Pakistani contentions regarding the plebiscite. I can do no better than to quote the same leader, Mr. Narayan, giving his opinion about the latest aggression committed by Pakistan against India. I quote from The Hindustan Times of 19 September 1965 :

"Mr. J. P. Narayan yesterday declared that Pakistani conditions for a and withdrawal of forces implied that Pakistan considered it within her right to wage war against India, if New Delhi did not agree to a plebiscite in Kashmir.

"This indeed is an extraordinary claim and needs to be looked at closely," Mr. Narayan said in a press statement here.

"He had not thought it necessary to add anything to his initial statement expressing full support to the Government's action in dealing with Pakistani aggression in Jammu and Kashmir, 'But now a moment has come when I feet I must speak not to ray country and my people, but to the people and Governments of the world.'

"Mr. Narayan said : the world takes it for granted that Pakistan has a fight to interfere in Kashmir, because she. is a party to the dispute. This is not so. At any rate it is not so any longer.'

"Originally neither India nor Pakistan had any rights in Kashmir, though both had their undoubted interest in the future of the State. But, according to law, the future of the State, was in the hands of Maharaja Hari Singh and his people.

" 'Pakistan, however, lost her patience and attacked the defenceless State with no other intent than to annex the territory. The Maharaja, with the full support of Sheikh Abdullah and the people of Kashmir, acceded to the Indian Union,' Mr. Narayan said.

" 'Since that day', Mr. Narayan said, 'India became a party to the issue in Kashmir. Pakistan had yet nothing to do with Kashmir in terms of the settlement between the British Government, the National Congress, and the Muslim League. "In fact, it was India that made her a party in the naive hope that the Security Council will name the aggressor and discipline him. But let it be clear that even then the only sense in which Pakistan was made a party was in the capacity of an aggressor with no other responsibility in the matter than to vacate the aggression.'"

"Mr. Narayan said not only was the original aggression not vacated for one reason or another, but Pakistan had now committed another and still more massive aggression in Kashmir with the same intent as before, namely, to occupy the State by force. By this deliberate and blatant action, Pakistan had forfeited whatever place it had in the Kashmir issue."

It is necessary for me to draw the attention of this world body to the concluding passage for the speech of the Foreign Minister. Under the guise of spurring the United Nations to activity, he attacks what he calls the philosophy of Status quo. And what other progressive philosophy does he advocate in its place ? Here is a passage from his speech which is worth noting :

"It is no use to have the Security Council congratulate itself on the accomplishment of the cease-fire. Will it be any consolation to anyone that the United Nations has an observer corps merely to observe and report violations of the cease-fire? A cease-fire and its observation do not amount to peace. What is needed is firm action to eradicate the incentives to violence and fighting. What is needed is action to remove the seeds of war." (1339th meeting, p. 69-70).

222

It is legitimate to ask which- country has resorted to violence and fighting and which country has been constantly engaged in sowing the seeds of war. It is Pakistan and not India. Another passage in the Foreign Minister's statewent is also to be pondered over :

"The forcible annexation of Jammu and Kashmir by India is not a guarantee of Indian secularism, democracy or territorial integrity. On the contrary, it keeps alive those very fears and suspicions which made it impossible for the Muslim minority to accept a united Indian State. If the Nagas, the Sikhs and other communities have grievances against the Government of India, then the fate of Jammu and Kashmir can only act as a spur to their fears and suspicions. The Nagas and the Sikhs call be specified not by the example of forcible occupation of Jammu and Kashmir but by a just redress of their grievances." (Ibid., p. 57).

Here again is another expression of Pakistan's evil intentions towards India, which are to try to disrupt the Indian Union, no doubt based on the major premise of the Foreign Minister's philosophy that the status quo should be disturbed and disrupted. I submit that the philosophy, enunciated by the Foreign Minister is the philosophy of adventurism and disruption, which is ail outlook and mode of strategy which Pakistan shares with its new-found friends in Peking.

Some concern has been expressed in regard to resolving the underlying cause of the conflict between India and Pakistan. What is the underlying cause of the conflict'? It is not Kashmir. The underlying cause is Pakistan's intolerance of India's secular and democratic way of life. It is a conflict of two ways of life and arises out of Pakistan's unrelenting and ceaseless efforts to undermine the unity of our country, strike at the roots of our democracy, and destroy the secular structure of our society. The problem is that Pakistan's rulers have all these years worked up a deliberate campaign of hate against India add tried to mislead the people of Pakistan into imagining that India wants to destroy Pakistan. Nothing, is farther from the truth. India wishes the people of Pakistan well; India is a party to Pakistan's creation and is interested in the prosperity and welfare of its people, who, until Partition, formed one nation, sharing a long and glorious history. Some speakers have talked of the need for peaceful relations between our two countries. All these eighteen years of our independence, we have repeatedly extended our hand of friendship to Pakistan; it is Pakistan which has consistently refused to accept it. We have repeatedly offered a no-war pact; it is Pakistan which has always spurned the offer and secretly prepared for this massive aggression against us. It is this attitude which has made it difficult for Pakistan to live as a friend and good neighbour of India.

The sooner Pakistan can be persuaded by this world body to see the reasonableness and the supreme need for living as a good neighbour with India, the greater will be the prospects of lasting peace in the sub-continent. And when that is brought about, we in India fervently hope that further steps could then be considered to promote deeper understanding through easier international movement, freer movement, of trade and commerce, economic co-operation and positive constructive measures of that type. We have more than once given evidence of our keen desire to establish such good and peaceful relations between our two countries : on the occasion of Kutch, on the occasion of the Canal Waters Treaty and on so many other occasions. If even now Pakistan is prepared to grasp our hand of friendship, we will warmly welcome such a gesture.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TUNISIA PORTUGAL EGYPT YEMEN LEBANON NEPAL SWITZERLAND FRANCE ANGUILLA INDONESIA CHINA IRAN TURKEY AFGHANISTAN OMAN CAMEROON ETHIOPIA KENYA SUDAN THAILAND IRAQ

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Speech in the Security Council

Shri C. S. Jha, Foreign Secretary of India, delivered the following speech in the Security Council on September 6, 1965 :

I am most grateful to you, Mr. President, for your welcoming words, and I am grateful to the Council for giving me the opportunity of expounding the position of my Government.

I have just heard the statement of the representative of Pakistan. He spoke with emotion and with a great deal of rhetoric. But rhetoric is no substitute for facts, and what the Council and what the whole world have, to apply themselves to are the facts of the situation. I will briefly answer some of the points that he made, later, but to begin with, may I have your permission to read out the text of the message, from the Minister of External Affairs of India to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in answer to the communication by the Secretary-General forwarding the resolution of the Council on 4 September. I incidentally note that there is no response from Pakistan. This is the reply of the Minister of External Affairs to the Secretary-General-and here may I crave the indulgence of the Secretary-General; he has just

223

received the, communication and I hope he will permit we to read it out for the record of the Council:

"The Minister of External Affairs of the Government of India presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the text of the resolution 209 (1965) adopted by tire security Council at its 123/meeting on 4 September 1965). The Government of india, having given the most careful consideration to the resolution of the Security Council, would like to Convey the following views to the Security Council. "The Government of India appreciate that the Security Council, in Weir anxiety to stop the continuance of hostiliues and bloodshed, have urgently adopted a resolution in tire hope of bringing about an immediate ceasefire. This resolution has evidently been adopted without taking into consideration the reply of the Prime Minister of India communicated to the Secretary-General on 4 September,"-

Here I might say that this reply perhaps reached the Secretary-General a bit too late for circulation, but it was read out by our representative on that date. Now, continuing with the message

"in response to the appeal addressed by the Secretary-General to the Government of India on 2 September. The reply of the Prime Minister of India narrated the events leading to the present situation in Kashmir, and also urged the steps which should be taken to restore peace in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It is also evident that the resolution does not take into consideration certain important findings and recommendations of the Secretary-General contained in his report, S/6651, dated 3 September 1965. Further, neither the resolution nor the discussions which preceded the adoption of the resolution took note of the fact that on 1 September 1965 Pakistan violated the international border south of the Cease-fire Line between the State of Jammu and Kashmir and West Pakistan in order to attack the Chhamb-Jaurian sector within the State of Jammu and Kashmir, thereby extending the area of conflict. While aggression across the international border in the Chhamb-Jaurian sector continues, this attack, directed as it was by regular forces of the Pakistan Army towards gaining territory and cutting the vital lines of communication between the rest of India and the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, has changed the entire character of the situation. The offensive action in the Chhamb area was being fed by bases in Pakistan along the border of Pakistan with the State of Jammu and Kashmir. There were strong concentrations of Pakistan forces on the western frontier between India and Pakistan. On 5 September, after the resolution of the Security Council calling for a cease-fire, Pakistan aircraft bombed an Indian Air Force unit in Amritsar in the Indian State of Punjab. Pakistan aircrafts also bombed Ranbirsinghpura and other places in Jammu and Kashmir well away from the cease-fire line. It was obvious that Pakistan was preparing for an offensive against India in a big way and a situation was created in which action restricted to Jammu and Kashmir could no longer meet the needs of the situation. Since the United Nations has throughout accepted that the security of Jammu and Kashmir is the responsibility of India, the Government of India had no alternative but to give effective assistance to our forces by moving across the Wagah border to stop Pakistan at the bases from which the attacks in Jammu and Kashmir were being mounted and supported.

"The resolution 209 (1965) 'Calls upon the Government of India and Pakistan to take forthwith all steps for an immediate cease-fire'. This cease-fire is posited on the condition mentioned in paragraph 2 of the resolution which 'Calls upon the two Governments to respect the cease-tire line and have all armed personnel of each party withdrawn to its own side of the line', it is the view of the Government of India that, if a cease-fire is to be brought about and peace restored, the withdrawal of the 'armed personnel of each party', referred to in this paragraph, must include all infiltrators from the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line, whether armed or unarmed, because, as stated by the Prime Minister of India in his reply to the Secretary-General, the present hostilities originated with large-scale infiltrations of armed and unarmed personnel from Pakistan, and until the activities of such personnel cease and until such personnel are withdrawn from the Indian side of the cease-fire line, peace cannot be restored, for which Pakistan must accept full responsibility.

"It has been stated by the Secretary-General in the concluding part of his report that the restoration of the cease-fire and a return to normal conditions along the cease-fire line can be achieved inter alia by :

'(a) A willingness of both parties to respect the Agreement they have entered into.

'(b) A readiness on the part of the Government of Pakistan to take effective steps to prevent crossing of the CFL from

224

the Pakistan side by armed men, whether or not in uniform.' (S/6651, para. 15).

"These findings of the Secretary-General, based on the reports of the UNMOGIP. established beyond any doubt that Pakistan committed aggression against India across the cease-fire line. This aggression began in its massive form soon after India agreed to withdraw and withdrew from the Kargil area, considered strategically vital to the security, of the Srinagar-Leh road, on the assurances given by Pakistan through the Secretary-General that the security of this road would not be endangered by Pakistan. But as stated by the Secretary-General in his report to the Security Council, 'subsequently there were some military attacks on the road by armed elements from the Pakistan side'. This establishes clearly that Pakistan had no intention of honouring solemn assurances given to India through the Secretary-General and was bent on renewed and further aggression.

"The facts leading to the present situation and narrated in Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's message of September 4 to the Secretary-General are borne out by the Secretary-General's report, wherein it is stated that :

'General Nimmo has indicated to me that the series of violations that began on 5 August were to a considerable extent ... in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the CFL from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side. This is a conclusion reached by General Nimmo on the basis of investigations by the United Nations Observers, in the light of the extensiveness and character of the raiding activities and their proximity to the CFL. . . (Ibid., para. 6)

"It has been further stated by the Secretary-General that : 'As regards violations by artillery, there was heavy and prolonged artillery fire across the line from the Pakistan side in 'the Chhamb/Bhimber area on 15-16 August, and on 19 and 26 August the town of Poonch was shelled from the Pakistani side, some of the shells hitting the building occupied by the United Nations Military Observers. Pakistan artillery again shelled the town of Poonch on 28 August.' It is also stated that : 'It is likewise confirmed that as of 24 August armed elements from Pakistan were still occupying Indian positions (pickets) north of Mandi in the Poonch sector of the CFL.' The Secretary-General's report has also stated that United Nations Military Observers have confirmed that on 1 September. the Pakistan army supported by artillery and air force attacked the Chhamb area of the Jammu-Jhangar sector; and on 2 September attacked Jaurian village across the international border between India and Pakistan.

"Thus, aggression by Pakistan has been clearly established by the independent authority of the United Nations and it is to be regretted that the Security Council has not taken this into consideration or asked Pakistan to withdraw from across the international border south of the cease-fire line and to respect the international border between India and Pakistan.

" While the Secretary-General in his recommendations to the Security Council referred to above has sought willingness of both parties to respect the agreement they have entered into, this appeal should more appropriately have been addressed to Pakistan alone because India has always respected the agreement in respect of the cease-fire line. This is borne out by the report of the Secretary-General itself. In this report he has stated that on the morning of 9 August, a cable was received from General Nimmo warning that the situation was deteriorating along the cease-fire line. On the basis of this report, the Secretary-General asked the representative of Pakistan to convey to his Government his 'very serious concern about the situation that was developing in Kashmir, involving the crossing of the cease-fire line from the Pakistan side by numbers of armed men and their attacks on Indian military positions on the Indian side of the line, and also my strong appeal that the cease-fire line be observed'.

"In response to this appeal, the Secretary-General has noted that : I have not obtained from the Government of Pakistan any assurance that the cease-fire and the cease-fire line will be respected henceforth or that efforts would be exerted to restore conditions to normal along that line'. The reason for Pakistan refusing to give such an assurance is also evident from the resort of the Secretary-General when he described the considerations which led to his withholding the statement he wanted to make in consultations with the Governments of India and Pakistan. While India was agreeable to the statement proposed to be issued by the Secretary-General, according to the Secretary-General : The Government of Pakistan was strongly negative about

the statement in general on the grounds that it favoured India in that it dealt only with the current cease-fire situation without presenting the Political background of the broad issue and thus was lacking in balance. since a ceasefire alone suports the status quo to India's benefit'. It is clear from this that Pakistan

225

did not want and does not want to maintain the status quo in respect of the cease-fire line and its only aim is to violate the cease-fire line and by aggression to extend by force the forcible occupation of the two-fifths of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the whole of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Thus, it is Pakistan alone who should be asked to express willingness to respect the agreement the), have entered into and to desist from altering the status quo by force.

"The Secretary-General in the second recommendation contained in his report to the Security Council has urged categorically that the Government of Pakistan is to be asked to express its readiness 'to take effective steps to prevent crossings of the Cease-fire Line from the Pakistan side by armed men, whether or not in uniform'. It is obvious from this that, as stated in the reply of the Prime Minister of India to the Secretary-General, the present situation has arisen not from any 'armed revolt' in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, a; wrongly alleged by Pakistan, but as a result of massive armed infiltration organised and planned by Pakistan, followed by attacks by the Pakistan Army and Air Force. Until this aspect of the situation and the recommendations of the Secretary-General in this regard are taken into consideration, no progress can be made to restore peace in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

"The Government of India is of the firm view that an immediate cease-fire and the implementation of paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 209 (1965) can be brought about only when Pakistan takes effective steps to stop further crossings of the Cease-Fire Line from the Pakistan side by armed and unarmed personnel, civil and military, whether or not in uniform, and also immediately removes from the Indian side of the Cease-Fire Line all such personnel who have already crossed the Cease-Fire Line. Pakistan must also vacate aggression in the Chhamb area, forcibly occupied by Pakistan since 1 September from across the international border, and undertake to respect in future the international border between India and Pakistan. Furthermore, India would have to be satisfied that there will be no recurrence of such a situation before a cease-fire can be effective and peace restored."

I have taken the liberty of reading into the record this message from the Minister of External Affairs to the Secretary-General. This message gives the position of my Government with regard to the matter that is before the Security Council. It is, of course, an elaboration, but substantively it contains the same points that were made by the Prime Minister of India in the reply to the Secretary-General contained in his communication of 4 September. Our position therefore has been made clear before the Council, and I would leave this communication at that.

Now, with the permission of the President, I should like to say a few words about the rhetorical, highly coloured and, in many instances, false statements made by the representatives of Pakistan. He talked about Pakistan's being one-fifth the size of India. I think that perhaps that is arithmetically a little wrong, but nevertheless it is correct that Pakistan is smaller in size than India. But what do we see today? We certainly do not judge a country by its size. A large country and a small country are both Members of the United Nations and enjoy sovereign equality; they are equals before the international community. But today we find that Pakistan has mounted an aggression against India with the help-and I have to mention this regretfully---of weapons obtained from its ally by deceitful means throughout these years. These weapons were obtained for other purposes, but today they are being used against the sons of India, against the friends of the United States. in an action which is a patent example of egression.

The representative of Pakistan has also referred to what he calls India's aggressive actions. In his statement, he has turned a blind eye to many things. He has not mentioned the report of the Secretary-General, which is a Council document and which indeed forms the basis of the consideration of this matter by the Council. 'Mat report has been ignored. He has ignored the fact of the massive infiltrations commencing on 5 August, which again is a matter of history, which is testified to in the report of the Secretary-General in no uncertain terms, and which is again based on the observations of United Nations Observers who have been specifically entrusted with the task of observance of the cease-fire. All these, according to Pakistan, do not exist. The incidents of 5 August and thereafter-the massive infiltration of hundreds. and in fact thousands, of men armed to the teeth with modem weapons, well organized and coming into our territory to commit sabotage and arson -those facts have been completely ignored.

The representative of Pakistan has also ignored and forgotten, although the world has not forgotten-and certainly we have not forgottenthe invasion of Jammu and Kashmir by Pakistan in 1947-48. The Council will recall-or certainly the permanent members of the Councilthat in that year the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which is an independent State, an integral part of the Indian Union juridically and in fact, was invaded by Pakistan, and that for months Pakistan refused to admit any hand in that invasion. Before the Security Council, its

226

representatives solemnly and on several occasions denied any complicity in the invasion of Kashmir, any complicity in the activities of the raiders who had come across the boundary between Jammu and Kashmir, on the one hand, and Pakistan, on the other. But truth cannot be hidden for ever. Seven months later, in July 1948 when they realized that it was no longer possible to hide the fact of their complicity, they admitted before the United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan that the Pakistan Army had been in Kashmir in the strength of one or two brigades-I cannot recall now which it was; that they had been there, and had been there for several months.

That, of course, happened several years ago. But the consequences are still with us. Today, Pakistan occupies two-fifths of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, without the slightest shadow of legal right, and its occupation is based solely and entirely on force. That is aggression, which we shall not forget. The Council may have forgotten that-there have been tendencies sometimes to forget it-but we cannot forget. That is aggression, and that aggression is continuing today.

Not content with that aggression, Pakistan has engineered egression in the form of massive infiltrations of armed personnel, the fact of which can no longer be doubted in the context of the report of the Secretary-General and the report of the United Nations Observers.

I would request the Council to pause for a moment and consider the enormity of this action. India is a peaceful State. It does not want to get into any trouble with its neighbours; it has no designs on its neighbours; it does not covet any territory. Its record of peace, and its contribution to 'Peace, is inscribed in the archives of the United Nations. Here we are, a peaceful State-and suddenly thousands of armed personnel, most of them belonging to the regular forces in the camouflaged garb of civilians, descend on our territory. They descend in the midst of our population, with instructions from the Pakistan Government-as has been shown and abundantly proved by statements of captured prisoners, by photographs of weapons and of men who have been captured-to commit sabotage, arson, murder and pillage, to disrupt the lines of communication, to harass the Indian Army and to create an internal uprising. These were the motives with which these people came into our territory.

I said a moment ago that this is a matter to be paused over and pondered. Is it permissible for a State, a neighbouring State, to send thousands of armed personnel into another State to commit illegal acts ? Does that not amount to aggression? Does that not amount to a fiagrant violation of the Charter ? Is it not against all principles of peaceful coexistence ? Is it not contrary to the numerous international declarations-the Bandung Declaration, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, the Cairo Declaration, and numerous other declarationswhich have been adopted by nations and which today embody the ethos, the ethics of international life ? Surely, that sort of action cannot be permitted. If it does occur, a sovereign State is obliged-it has not only the right, but the dutyto defend itself against this kind of aggression.

That is all we did. The infiltrators who came into our territory were dealt with in accordance with the normal way of dealing with law-breakers, which is the right of every State. But then these people kept on coming. We made it quite clear the representative of Pakistan has even quoted some statements by my Prime Minister and others-that this was a most worrisome situation for us, a situation of patent and naked aggression-a situation which is not permitted to a neighbouring State under the Charter of the United Nations, or under any code of international behaviour. Therefore, we had to take action to meet this. We were faced with an endless chain of men being sent over the frontier. We would push them back, and they would continue to come over again. Therefore, we had to take military action; we had to take defensive measures which would not only enable us to deal with these people in our territory but, even more important, which would enable us to stop these infiltrations. We made no secret of this; as a matter of fact, our representatives here informed the Secretary-General of this development.

The most curious feature of this whole business is the fact that Pakistan denies completely any knowledge of these armed infiltrations or of despatching these infiltrators. According to Pakistan, they do not exist; according to them there is a mythical revolt in Kashmir.

Today, the whole world knows, however, as has been testified to by foreign and independent observers that there is no revolt in Kashmir : the people are with the Government--contrary to what Pakistan has tried to lead or mislead, the world to believe-and therefore co-operate with the Government. They are angry that their homes and herds have been raided by these armed men from across the cease-fire line, and they have helped the Government in tracking down these infiltrators. There is no revolt of the people in Kashmir. In fact, the people are suffering-they have suffered and are suffering at the hands of Pakistani armed personnel, both regular personnel and this camouflaged body of infiltrators.

227

While the Secretary-General of the United

Nations was making earnest efforts, in consultation with the representatives of India and Pakistan, to find a way out of this difficult situation-even while these efforts were being made-Pakistan, on I September, mounted a terrific attack : two regiments of tanks, to begin withagain, extremely lethal weapons-which they had deceitfully obtained from their allies for other purposes-a most severe onslaught, partly across the cease-fire line, partly across the international frontier between Jammu and Kashmir, and today, they have penetrated something like twenty miles, or even more, and are threatening our lines of communication with our armed forces in Kashmir, and also the lines of communication in general between Jammu and Kashmir and India. This they call defensive action.

These words-"defensive action"-are in current use. Yet, if there is one thing history has taught, it is that aggressors, when they use those words, use them for a different purpose to camouflage their aggression.

In the broadcast on I September, President Ayub Khan, while reiterating the denial of any knowledge of infiltrators, or of any responsibility for these armed infiltrators, and in announcing the invasion of the Chhamb area, into Jammu went on to say that Pakistan forces were obliged to go into Jammu and Kashmir to help the socalled freedom fighters.

Mark these words. This is not defensive action; he does not state he went there to defend Pakistan. He went there to help others who he thought were freedom fighters. This is not defensive action. By the very words of the President of Pakistan, the action that Pakistan has takenthe great military thrust supported by tanks, heavy artillery, aircraft, etc., as a result of which Pakistani forces have. penetrated many miles into our territory---could not be called defensive action. It was offensive action. Tanks are usually used for offensive purposes in such a manner. It was offensive action, whatever may be the reason or justification in their own eyes for that action.

The representative of Pakistan has also denied that there is an international frontier between Jammu and Kashmir and Pakistan. The State of Jammu and Kashmir is a part of the Indian Union; and I repeated this, as it has been repeated dozens of time before this Council. And if we have to repeat it again, we do so because it is our sacred right and our sacred duty to defend the integrity of any part of India. That right and duty cannot be taken away from us, even by the United Nations, because the very basis of the Charter of the United Nations is the recognition of the sovereignty of a country. We have the right to defend our territory, and Jammu and kashmir is a part of India; no emotional outburst on the part of Pakistan can change that fact. I want to make that clear. All consideration by this Council has to take account of that very basic fact. It it is ignored then the very basis of this consideration disappears.

India has the right to defend itself. As Prime Minister Nehru stated, several years ago, an attack on Jammu and Kashmir is an attack on ladia. He was stating an obvious fact, but Wanted to emphasize it because the eyes of our predatory neighbour have always been cast on Jammu and Kashmir. There is no international border, he said, between Jammu and Kashmir and India.

As you know, there is a cease-fire line, which of course is not an international frontier : it is a line arising out of the Cease-Fire Agreement of 1949. But below the cease-fire line there is a very long frontier between Jammu and Kashmir and Pakistan; and the fact that it is an international frontier cannot disappear merely because Pakistan has advanced a spurious claim to the State of Jammu and Kashmir; there can be no other frontier but an international frontier between Jammu and Kashmir and Pakistan. Therefore, even taking the worst view-which I do not for a moment admit-that it is a disputed frontier, does that justify a State marching its armies across a frontier it regards as disputed ? As I said, no dispute exists; but if the theory put forward by the representative of Pakistan were adopted, then the whole of international society would lose the very basis for its co-existence.

I am sorry to take the Council's time, but I wish to put the record straight. The representative of Pakistan has talked of colonialism; he accuses India of colonialism in Jammu and Kashmir. The people of Jammu and Kashmir are the people of India. They are our kith and kin; they are blood of our blood, and they are as much Indian citizens as anyone else in any part of India. That is not colonialism. They enjoy the same rights and privileges, the same guarantees under the Constitution of India, as any other citizen of India. The representative of Pakistan would be well advised to look nearer home, to look within himself. Some introspective examination is always useful for the soul. If there is colonialism, it is the colonialism that is being practised in Pakistan. A ruling group, divorced from contact with public opinion, is ruling over large sections of the people of Pakistan. If there is colonialism, it exists in Pakistan. The Pakhtoons, the Baluchis, the East Pakistanis, are being ruled without any regard to their civil rights, to their fundamental human

228

rights and freedoms. That is colonialism as the world understands it.

The representative of Pakistan continued to repeat that all the action undertaken by Pakistan has been defensive action. I have already said that the action taken by Pakistan, first and foremost-and I repeat "first and foremost"-has been the planned and Government-directed infiltration, massive infiltration, of thousands of people into our territory. That is aggression. That is something which international society cannot tolerate; it is not open to any neighbour to behave in that fashion, and if it does behave in that fashion, retribution must come.

Every nation has the inherent right to exercise self-defence, and that is what we have done against these armed infiltrators. The action undertaken by Pakistan is surely not defensive action. Its massive attack with tanks, heavy artillery and aircraft deep inside Jammu and Kashmir-accounts of which members of the Security Council must have read-cannot be defensive action, as I have already indicated. I should like to read out what appeared in today's New York Times, both in the news report and under the caption "Quotation of the Day". This is what General Mohammad Musa, Commanderin-Chief of the Pakistani Army, said to his troops on their success against Indian forces on the Indian side of the Cease-fire Line :

"You have got your teeth into him. Bite deeper and deeper until he is destroyed. And

destroy him you will, God willing." Even God is brought into this. These are not the words of a Commander who is engaged in defensive action. This is cold-blooded aggression. They want to destroy us. They want to defeat our armies. They want to annex our territory. And surely it is up to us, it is our duty, it is our right, to defend our territory by all means at our disposal.

Pakistan has, by its actions, converted and transformed this whole business into the realm of military action. What we have had to exercise is defensive military action because we have got to strike at the bases from where this attack has been launched and from where they expect to wreak destruction on us.

I shall content myself with these observations. I am most grateful to you, Mr. President, for having given me this time, and I hope that you will permit me to speak again if circumstances should necessitate it.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA INDONESIA EGYPT

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthsarthi's Speeches in the Security Council

Shri G. Parthasarthi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following speech in the Security Council on September 4, 1965 :

Mr. President, as one newcomer to another, may I at the outset take this opportunity to convey to you the warmest congratulaions of my Government and also my own on your appoinment as your country's chief representative to the United Nations. My delegation looks forward to close and friendly collaboration and co-operation with you and the United States delegation. You bring to your present post a record of high and distinguished services to your country and to your people, and my delegation is indeed very happy to see you here. Now, to follow the advice of your very distinguished and famous predecessor, the late Governor Stevenson, let us get on with the work that lies ahead of us.

First of all, I must express the gratitude of my delegation to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council for inviting us to take part in the proceedings of the Council on the. serious situation that has arisen as a result of Pakistani aggression on the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. This meeting has not been called at our instance. but since it has been called I owe it to the members of the Council to present the related facts to the Council in as brief and concise manner as possible. It shall be my endeavour to assist the Council in arriving at correct conclusions and taking correct steps in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the generally accepted principles of international law.

As the representatives are aware, the India-Pakistan question, as it is euphemistically called, has been on the agenda of the Council for over eighteen years. It was in January 1948 that India first brought the question to the Council on the issue of Pakistani aggression on the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, Incidentally, it may interest the members of the Council to know that it was my father who brought the issue here. Now it has fallen to me to bring to your attention the second massive aggression against Kashmir.

Since 1948 the issue has remained on the agenda without a satisfactory solution. Why has there been no satisfactory solution? It is primarily because the Council refuses to face the simple fact of aggression by Pakistan. It was

229

deliberately sidetracked, confused and befuddled by Pakistan's claims, which have no justification in law or even political exigency. Be that as it may, the council has once again the opportunity to do justice to itself and to India. It is the hope of the 475 million people of India that this time the Council will refuse to be sidetracked, confused or befuddled. As the representatives are aware, after the Pakistani aggression on the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir in 1947-48, a cease-fire was arranged between India and Pakistan and it became effective on 1 January 1949. The cease-fire agreement imposed the clear and unambiguous obligation on the two countries to respect the cease-fire line established by the agreement.

What has been the conduct of the two parties in relation to the Agreement and the Line? The Cease-Fire Agreement did not lead to the vacation of Pakistan's aggression on the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. In fact it allowed Pakistan to remain in occupation of two-fifth of the State. Despite this continuing aggression, the Government of India has always endeavoured to respect the Cease-Fire Agreement. It has spared no efforts to maintain peace and tranquillity all, along the Cease-Fire Line. It has co-operated with the United Nations Chief Military Observer and accepted every reasonable proposal made by General Nitnmo and, what is more, the Government of India itself prepared a gentleman's agreement to ensure respect for the Cease-Fire Line for discussion with Pakistan. What has been Pakistan's attitude towards the Cease-Fire Agreement ? I could quote to you innumerable extracts from statements by the leaders of Pakistan and the leaders of the so-called Azad Kashmir, which is a euphemism for that part of the State which is under the illegal occupation of Pakistan, and thousands of inflammatory newspaper reports from Pakistan to prove that Pakistan did not wish to respect the sanctity of the Line. All this I could quote to you, but I shall not do so at this time in extenso. It will suffice to give you a few samples.

Here is an extract from the Pakistani news paper Down of 29 August 1961, which states :

"President Ayub Khan emphasized that the people of Pakistan could not forget Kashmir because the present Cease-Fire Line was a constant source of danger to Pakistan rail, river and road system, and provided innumerable defence problems."

The same newspaper in its edition of 23 March 1962 had the following:

"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 T'

Mr. Bhutto, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, told a news conference on 19 May, 1962 at Dacca.

"Pakistan now realized that the Kashmir problem would have to be settled by our intrinsic strength, and ... the Kashmiris may rise to the same heights as the Algerians." The Dawn of Karachi in its edition of 21 October, 1963 had a story tinder the headline, "Force will be met with force : Habibullah Khan warns India". Mr. Habibullah Khan was then the Home Minister of Pakistan. Mr. Habibullah Khan's statement had, among other things, the following :

"Pakistan would give all possible assistance to the Azad Government of Jammu and Kashmir to meet Indian aggression against Azad territory. The Cease-Fire Agreement is a truce between the two armies of Pakistan and India and is no bar against the exercise of basic human rights by the people of Kashmir."

The Morning News of Dacca in its edition of 23 October, 1963 had a story headlined : "Cease-Fire Line not binding on Kashmiris-Agreement was a truce". The newspaper quoted Mr. Khurshid, the erstwhile President of so-called Azad Kashmir, as saying :

"that the Cease-Fire Line in Kashmir was not binding on the people of Kashmir and that his Government did no! recognize the Cease-Fire Line of 1949 as a dividing line between Azad Kashmir and Indian occupied Kashmir".

Mr. Kurshid went on to say that the freedom fighters in Kashmir State had nothing to do with this Agreement.

In the very Council. the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, speaking on 7 February, 1964 at the 1089th meeting, said :

"For India, the situation is simple. It is in

possession of the major part of the State of Jammu and Kashmir and would like nothing better than to be left alone. But we, seeing our kith and kin, our flesh and blood, suffer tyranny and oppression, shall we remain silent spectators ?" (1089th meeting, paragraph 80).

"That it is the restraining hand of the Pakistan Government alone which preserves peace in Kashmir-all the charges against us levelled by the Indian representative notwithstandingis apparent from the repeated demands made by the Azad Kashmir Government, and the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference

230

for the abrogation of the cease-fire agreement. These demands are not lightly made." (ibid. paragraph 114).

Not only by their statements but also by their action, the Government and the leaders of Pakistan have shown scant regard for the Cease-Fire Agreement and the Cease-Fire Line. Thousands of violations of the Line have been brought to the notice of the United Nations Chief Military Observer, and he has given a sufficient number of awards against Pakistan to establish clearly that, that country felt no compunction in violating the Line. What is more, on at least three occasions, the Chief Military Observer made some suggestions to the Government of Pakistan for improving conditions on the Cease-Fire Line.

In October 1963 the Chief Military Observer proposed to treat the activities of armed civilians and armed police within 500 yards on either side of the Cease-Fire Line as a breach of the Cease-Fire Agreement. India agreed; Pakistan rejected the suggestion. On 24 June, 1964, the Chief Military Observer proposed a meeting between the military representatives of India and Pakistan to work out agreed principles for the control of civilians in the area of the Cease-Fire Line. While India accepted the suggestion, so far Pakistan has not done so. On 8 March, 1965, the Chief Military Observer again proposed a meeting between military representatives of India and Pakistan in order to work out agreed principles for controlling the activities of the civilians in the area. On 26 March, 1965, India agreed to the proposal. On 5 April, India was informed by the Chief Military Observer that a meeting would

not be possible, since Pakistan was not agreeable to it.

Last year the Government of India itself proposed an official-level conference with Pakistan for the purpose of restoring tranquillity along the Cease-Fire Line and along India's international borders with Pakistan. The Government of Pakistan agreed to India's request for the conference and fixed a date for it. The Indian delegation was ready to leave for Karachi when suddenly Pakistan called off the talks at the last moment.

Over the years, Pakistan has perfected the technique of sending armed troops across the Cease-Fire Line in civilian disguise. These armed civilans were in most cases part of Pakistan's regular or irregular troops. Even the socalled Mujahids-the so-called freedom fighterswere formed in June this year into a regularly constituted Pakistan Mujahid Force with commissioned officers, JCOs, NCOs and other ranks. According to the decision of the Government of Pakistan, units were to he raised on the order of the Commander-in-Chief and were normally to serve in districts in which, they were raised. For certain legal purposes, they were to be deemed part of the Pakistan Army.

So much for the so-called freedom fighters. Now there is another category of armed troops in Pakistan, which is called the Azad Kashmir Reserve Force. That this Force is in no manner separate from the regular Pakistan Army is proved by the following extracts from the United Nations Commission's first interim report (S/1100) :

(i) The Commission "was repeatedly informed by you (the Foreign Minister of Pakistan) and by representatives of the Pakistan Army that the Azad Kashmir Force were under the overall control of the Pakistan High Command". (Para. 108),

(ii) The Foreign Minister of Pakistan's reply "to the Commission's questionnaire that all foxes fighting on the Azad Forces side were under the overall command and tactical direction of the Pakistan Army".

(iii) In answer to the questionnaire placed

by the Commission before the Government of Pakistan on 4 August, 1948, the Minister of Foreign Affairs stated that "the Pakistan Army is at present responsible for the overall command of Azad Kashmir Forces". [Annexure 27, para. 1(b)],

(iv) "During the exposition made by the High Command of the Pakistan Army on 9 August, 1948, it was stated that the Azad Kashmir forces were operationally controlled by the Pakistan Army". [Annexure 27 para. 1(c)].

An additional point in this connexion may be emphasized : the Cease-Fire Agreement of 27 July, 1949, is between the Government of India and Pakistan and the United Nations Commission. United Nations Observers will bear out the fact that posts on the Pakistan side of the south-east line in the west and in the north have been manned by "Azad Kashmir" battalions and Northern Scouts, all under the overall control of GHQ 12 Infantry Division of the Pakistan Army, Rawalpindi.

Let no member of this Council be under any illusion that whatever happens in Pakistan-Occupied Kashmir, be it in the military or in the civilian sphere, is not strictly under the control and direction and inspiration of the Government of Pakistan. The administration of Pakistan-occupied Kashmir is run by the Kashmir Affairs Joint Secretary and other Pakistani officials seconded to the so-called Azad Kashmir Administration. The periodical changes in the presidency of the so-called Azad Kashmir take place at the command of Rawalpindi.

231

This is the background of the invasion of Kashmir on 5 August, of the year. On that day large bodies of Pakistani troops in civilian disguise fully armed with automatic weapons, supplied with rations and huge amounts of Indian currency, carrying transistors and propaganda literature, began to infiltrate across the cease-fire line and the international border into the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The infiltration took place across the Cease-Fire Line in several carefully selected sectors : up in the north, near Chaknar, Keran and Tithwal; on the western sector of the Line, at Uri, Poonch, Mendhar, Rajaori and Naushera. The infiltrators also crossed into the Chhamb and Samba sectors of the international border. The strength of the Pakistani troops who infiltrated across the Cease-Fire Line in civilian disguise is estimated at about 5,000. They came in parties varying in number, some of them in groups consisting of 100 or 200 men. Their immediate objects, according to the documents captured from them and statements made by prisoners, were to destroy bridges, police stations, petrol pumps and other important installations, and also to cut roads: Further, they were to capture the summer capital of the State, Srinagar, especially the adjacent airfield. Among their other objectives was the assassination of political and other leaders, as also the general terrorizing of the population by setting fire to schools, hospitals, etc., and attacking places of worship. They sought to conceal themselves in the forests and mountainous terrain, and some of the parties managed to reach the outskirts of the capital, Srinagar. There were attempts to cut the Srinagar-Leh road, which is India's vital line of communication with north-eastern portion of the State. Larger groups of these armed troops clashed with Indian Security Forces within a depth of five to ten miles of the Cease-Fire Line from Poonch to Naushera on the Western sector of the Line. Heavy casualties were inflicted on these men and large numbers of them surrendered themselves to the authorities. Mopping-up operations are in progress and the Indian Security Forces have tried to seal the main passes, cutting the Cease-Fire Line through which they came, and there is fear of others coming. Large quantities of arms and equipment have been captured. There should be no doubt about the organized and deliberate manner in which the Pakistan Government participated in this armed infiltration. The evidence of the complete involvement of the Pakistan Government-if such evidence is required-is illustrated by the presence of the president of Pakistan at the dinner in Murree, in West Pakistan, in the second week of July, in honour of the Force Commanders and Company Coin manders who were to take part in the infiltration operations. The capture of large quantities o arms and ammunition the nature and type of weapons carried by the men, the statements made by the officers and other ranks who were captured by the Indian Security Forces, the markings on some of the weapons seized, the messages transmitted by men on the mobile transmitters

which they carried, and above all, the very document before you-I refer to the report of he Secretary-General contained in document S/6651 of 3 September, 1965-all this should convince anyone who is willing to be convinced of Pakistan's direct complicity in this whole affair.

The weapons seized from the infiltrators consist of light machine-guns, rifles, Sten-guns grenades, rockets, rocket-launchers, and large quantities of ammunition and explosives. The weapons, considering their range and the quantities of ammunition, could be supplied only by the Government of Pakistan. While some of the weapons carry markings to indicate their Pakistani origin, markings on others have been erased, clearly in order to conceal their origin. The Indian Security Forces have captured infiltrators with uniforms uncontestably belonging to the socalled Azad kashmir battalions, which, as I have stated earlier, are part of the Pakistan Army. Some of these armed troops in civilian disguise have been captured with badges showing their ranks and battalion badges marked "AKRF", that is, Azad Kashmir Reserved Force. From the accounts given by the captured prisoners, it is confirmed that the majority of the raiders belong to the regular Azad Kashmir battalions of the Pakistan Army.

The first interrogation of prisoners has revealed that the planned training for the armed infiltration began in May of this year. Two of the officers who have been captured hold emergency commissions in the Pakistan Army. The prisoners have disclosed that a military headquarters was set up in Murree, in West Pakistan, under the command of General Akhtar Husain Malik, General Officer commanding the Twelfth Division of Pakistan. The headquarters was known as the military headquarters of the "Gibraltar Forces" -what the word "Gibraltar" is supposed to indicate is anybody's guess. The prisoners also disclosed during interrogation that they had received ever six weeks of systematic and intensive training in guerrilla tactics and the use of several weapons. They confirmed that their tasks were to try to damage bridges, raid supply-dumps, army headquarters, roads, convoys of motor vehicles and mules belonging to the Indian Security forces, and to assassinate the Indian VIP's in Jammu and Kashmir. The transmitters and receivers which they carried were for the purpose of transmitting messages to Pakistan and receiving instructions from there.

232

One of the objectives of these Pakistani troops in civilion disguise as I have started earlier, was to cut roads and communications of vital and strategic nature. In pursuance of this objective, between 5 and 16 August, 1965, Pakistani troops tried to cut the strategic road between Srinagar and Leh. They attempted to destroy bridges and lay mines on the roads and harass convoys of the Security Forces. As perhaps the members of the Council are aware, similar attempts were made earlier, and in May this year the Indian Army was forced to counter-attack the Pakistani troops in the Kargil sector, and captured three of their posts. This was done in order to ensure the safety of the road from Srinagar to Leh. However, as is stated in the report of the Secretary-General, document S/6651, on being assured by the United Nations that military observers would be posted in the sector to ensure the safety of the road Indian forces withdrew from three posts at the end of June. During the course of the current invasion of the State, and for exactly the same reasons. Indian forces once again occupied the three posts. on two other sectors of the Cease-Fire Line also, Indian forces have been forced, purely as a defensive measure, to cross the Cease-Fire Line and to occupy the strategic points-strategic from the point of view of defence rather than of offence. These points are in the Tithwal and Uri sectors of the Cease-Fire Line. While the mopping-up operations were going on, it was learned that a large number of Pakistani troops in civilian disguise had begun to concentrate on or near the Cease-Fire Line at certain Points. The occupation by Indian forces of these points was therefore forced upon them, firstly, to seal off the routes of escape, and secondly, to prevent crossings of the Cease-Fire Line by additional troops in civilian disguise from the Pakistan side.

This is the action which Pakistan claims has led it to cross the cease-fire line-the measures that we have taken in self-defence-in the southern Sectors on I September 1965. It is a blatant perversion of the truth. Having willed themselves into believing that as soon as their trooarrived at the scene, the poeple of the State would rise in open rebellion, having allowed themselves no doubts, having been misled by their own Propaganda, the authorities of Pakistan could do no less than to order the massing of further troops in civilian disguise on or near the cease-fire line, They went a step further. Heavy artillery fire on Indian positions across the cease. fire line was ordered to Provide cover to the troops massed on the cease-fire line in civilian disguise. This can be verified by glancing through the report of the Secretary-General.

When even this served no purpose and the troops in civilian disguise already within the State began to be, killed captured or even to surrender, in large numbers, to the Indian security forces, on I September 1965 Pakistan took the ultimate. step. Pakistani troops in regular attack formation and in brigade strength supported by armoured regiments which contained Patton tanks crossed the cease-fire line, indeed the international boundary, in the Southwestern part of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The strength of the Pakistani troops who have crossed the ceasefire line, the support provided by the armoured regiments and by fast modern aircraft---all this leaves no doubt that the attack was premeditated, well planned and in utter violation of the Charter of the United Nations, the generally accepted principles of international law and the Cease-Fire Agreement.

In spite of this overwhelming evidence which clearly proves that the invasion was organized by Pakistan and is directly controlled and conducted by it, Pakistan denies that it has any hand in the matter. As soon as the Government of India became aware of the serious nature of the invasion, it instructed its High Commissioner in Pakistan immediately to call on President Ayub Khan to impress upon him the gravity of the situation. The High Commissioner was asked to tell the President of Pakistan of the grave consequences which would follow if immediate steps were - not taken to withdraw the troops, that is the troops in civilian disguise. The appointment was fixed for him with the President of Pakistan and he arrived in Rawalpindi. However, he was unable to see President Ayub Khan. Instead the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Bhutto, met him and told him blandly that Pakistan knew nothing about massive aggression of the ceas-fire line. It was an internal revolt of the people of

the State against India, he said. This fiction continues to be maintained.

According to the Press release issued by the Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations on 1 Semptember 1965, President Ayub Khan declared on that day, and I quote from the Press release :

"Referring to the Popular revolt which broke out in the occupied Kashmir on 8 August 1965; the President said :

"The successes achieved by the freedom fighters have been striking and their heroic deeds will be a source of inspiration to all those engaged in the Struggle for freedom in different parts of the word. The torch of freedom fit by these patriots has been carried from village to village and city to city.."

Presumably the Field Marshal was referring to his own troops who are supposed to be freedom fighters. But on 18 August 1965, the cat had already been lot out of the bag by Chaudhuri

233

Ali Akbar, the Home Minister of Pakistan, who said, and I quote from the Pakistan newspaper Dawn of 19 August :

"The Minister said it was natural that the people of Azad Kashmir should have the fullest sympathy for their brethren in occupied Kashmir : who can question their right to go to their help ? They have a right to be there."

The same newspaper in its edition of 20 August 1965 attributed the following statement to the Pakistan Foreign Minister :

"The cease-fire line, he said, was drawn only temporarily and it was there by an accident of history. It should have been farther down in occupied Kashmir."

To quote the newspaper Dawn again. the Pakistan Foreign Minister, replying to India's charge of Pakistani aggression in Kashmir, said : "How could Pakistan commit aggression against its own people ? People living on the two sides of the cease-fire line were indivisible. They are our own people."

Finally, here is another statement attributed by the same paper to Mr. Bhutto :

"As a matter of fact, the State of Jammu and Kashmir was Pakistani territory which India has usurped."

Pakistan claims that the people of the State are in revolt against India. This is such an absurd assertion and such a thin disguise for Pakistan's invasion that it cannot, and we are sure it will not, deceive the Council. Let us examine the facts. In the wake of the invasion, many foreign correspondents have travelled to Kashmir to report on the situation there. They have sent dispatches to their newspapers outside India, and I propose to quote only a few of such dispatches.

First, the London Times correspondent in his dispatch which appeared in that paper on 11 August 1965, said :

"There is no indication of any armed revolt by the people from the Indian side as announced by the Pakistan radio."

Secondly, the Baltimore Sun of 10 August 1965, carried a report from its correspondent in Srinagar in the following words :

"There is no evidence visible in or near the city to support the report from Pakistan of a popular uprising against India nor of repressive measures against the population."

The same correspondent stated :

"Highly reliable sources here"-that is, in Srinagar-"confirmed the Indian statement that the guerrila raids which broke out here a week ago are, conducted, by infiltrators from the Pakistani territory.... Political sources, hostile to the Indian Kashmir Government, agreed that there is no uprising of local residents. They said that their followers around the State report no signs of a revolutionary movement, which the Pakistan Government has said is operating in Indian Kashmir.

Thirdly, the correspondent of the Chicago Daily News, Mr. Paul Hurmuses, describing the Pakistani infiltrators as "marauding Pakistani guerillas" in a dispatch on 12 August, says :

"Pakistanis have infiltrated at several points along the 475 mile long, sixteen year-old ceasefire line that is supposed to be supervised by United Nations military observers."

He adds:

"The bold Pakistani moves climax a year of repeated military clashes and are by far the most serious since 1947, the year of independence for both India and Pakistan. Pakistan then sent waves of fierce Pathan fighters in a bid to seize all of the 86,000 square miles on the western flank of the Himalayas."

He further adds :

"This week's attacks were launched from 'the Azad Kashmir' of the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line."

He goes on to say :

"The UN observers on the scene have established the existence of the heavily armed infiltrators and have recorded a number of clashes between them and Indians."

Fourthly, Mr. J. Anthony Lukas, correspondent of The New York Times in a dispatch datelined New Delhi, 13 August, says:

"On the basis of most reports thus far, the infiltrators appear to have been recruited mainly from the people of Azad Kashmir rather than from among those of the Indian-held section of the disputed territory."

Is it surprising, therefore, that the only source from which glorified accounts of the revolt come is Pakistan?

The people of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir are alleged to have set up a revolutionary council. There is no such revolutionary council. The leaders of even those political parties who are opposed to the Government of the State have testified to this. This figment of Pakistani imagination-the revolutionary council-is supposed to be calling for the liberation of the people from Indian rule over a radio station alleged by Pakistan to be located some-

234

where in the State. We know where the radio station is located. It is in that put of the State which has been illegally occupied by Pakisan. further, the radio station is broadcasting on two frequencies registered by Pakistan in its name with the International Frequency Registration Board. Pakistan has infiltrated me troops, provided them with arms, ammunition, food and Indian currency, established a revolutionary council-incidentally, none of its leaders is namedsupplied them with a radio station called the "voice of Kashmir", and provided these infiltrators with heavy artillery cover. And now we are asked by Pakistan to believe that the people of the State are in revolt against India.

Did these Pakistani troops in civilian disguise, Who infiltrated across the cease-fire line, beginning 5 August 1965, achieve their objective ? They did not. Due to the prompt action taken by the security forces, with which there was wholehearted co-operation from the, local population, the Pakistani troops, although they were able to penetrate into the State at some points in considerable depth, failed miserably in all their objectives. What is more, thew so-called "liberators", not receiving any support from the local population, in fact being hunted by many brave Kashmiris, wreaked their vengeance on innocent people-men, women and children-on those who refused to co-operate, thereby proving themselves to be what they really are: marauders employed by Pakistan to commit lotting, arson, murder and rape. It is necessary for my delegation to remind members of the Council of the close parallel between the invasion of 1947-48 and that of 1965? It is necessary to inform re-presentatives that, as in 1947-48 so in 1965 the heinous acts of rape, plunder, arson, looting and murder have been committed by Pakistan troops? For the benefit of those representatives who were not in this Council when this matter was considered from 1948 onwards, I shall cite a few instances:

On 10 August, in the village of Badgam, they set fire to two high schools, The inhabitants of the village who tried to put out the fire were fired upon by them. On the night of 14 August, they started a fire in Baramula area on the outskirts of Srinagar. resulting in the destruction of 300 houses. Some of them with incendiary material in their possession were captured. A Pakistani radio broadcast admitted that this outrage was committed by Pakistani infiltrators.

Another typical incident : A group of Pakistani troops entered a village and started firing and looting, When the Indian security forces arrived on the scene, they found that eleven villagers had been killed, four wounded and six houses burnt down.

Another ghastly incident: On 8 August, some girls from the village Nangam in the northwest of the Kashmir valley went to a nearby forest to collect firewood. They detected some Pakistani troops in hiding there. The girls returned to the village and told their parents of this fact, who in their turn informed the authorities. A strong detachment of security forces was immediately sent to the forest and the surprised Pakistani troops fled, leaving behind substantial quantities of arms and ammunition. Next evening, the Pakistani troops returned to the village, surrounded it and started looting the houses and violating the women. They wanted to make an example of the village for not co-operating with them. Four village leaders were bayonetted and, when the villagers protested, seventeen of them were shot at point-blank range. The Pakistani troops then set fire to the village and left with the looted property. The leaping flames attracted the attention of an Indian Patrol, which immediately ambushed the Pakistani troops; in the encounter, thirty-six of them were killed on the spot and many more injured.

The latest incident I know of occurred on Thursday last. Pakistani aircraft--Sabre jetsattacked a village in the Chhamb sector of Jammu and Kashmir with machine-gin fire and bombed it, killing about fifty persons. During the course of the attack, the aircraft made a direct hit on a mosque. The name of the village is Jaurian.

The facts which I have recounted above, and which are amply supported by the document before the Council, can lead to only one conclusion. It is that Pakistan is once again guilty of aggression against the Indian State-of Jammu and Kashmir. In the earlier stages, it was a disguised invasion, although the disguise was very thin. Now Pakistani troops in regular attack formation, supported by armoured regiments and fast jets obtained from its military allies, are operating five to six miles on the Indian side of the cease-fire line. The aggression is so patent and deliberate that for it to be condoned by this Council would be tantamount to repudiating the obligations assumed by its members under the Charter of the United Nations, the generally accepted principles of international law and, what is more, the cease-fire agreement which was arranged with the help of the United Nations itself. Through this deliberate aggression Pakistan has torn the cease-fire agreement to shreds and reduced the cease-fire line to shambles. The only part of the UNCIP resolution of 13 August 1948, which has ever been implemented, although fitfully. by Pakistan was Part I, relating to the

235

cease-fire. That agreement has now been denounced by Pakistan through its conduct. By sending troops across the cease-fire line in the thousands, Pakistan has nullified the line. The Security Council must therefore consider the facts of Pakistan aggression and now, at least, come to the correct conclusion. The conclusion is that by condoning the aggression of 1947-48 the Council in fact, although unwittingly, gave some legal semblance to Pakistan's armed presence in a part of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. In this manner, Pakistan was given an excuse for continuing aggression and, what is more, for perpetrating further aggression.

On behalf of the Government of India, I formally demand of the Security Council to condemn Pakistan as an aggressor and to instruct it to withdraw from all parts of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The Council must not allow itself once again to be put out of action by any excuses or subterfuges. It is the duty of the Council to make Pakistan conform to the provisions of the Charter and inculcate in her a sense of good-neighbourliness, a sense of justice and a desire and willingness to live in peace and harmony with India. The following is the text of Shri Parthasarathi's another speech on September 4 :

I have already spoken about may Government's position in regard to this fresh aggression by Pakistan against the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, about the forbearance my Government has shown and the measures of self-defence that we have been forced to take.

The Council does not seem to be facing up to the simple issue of aggression. It is now considering a joint draft resolution co-sponsored by the representatives of Bolivia, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Uruguay. We have just seen that resolution. Naturally, we have had no time to study it or refer it to our Government for instructions. The Council will appreciate that I am in no position to state my Government's reactions. However, I should like to offer some general comments.

Cease-fire is a very desirable objective, but it can come only after Pakistan has been condemned as an aggressor and the Council has instructed the Government of Pakistan to witdraw its troops, whether or not they are in uniform, from the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. It is only along these lines that a durable ceasetire will be possible.

In this context, I can do no better than to read out the text of the reply sent today by my Prime Minister to the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

"I have, the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your message received on September 2.

"I appreciate the considerations that have prompted you to address an appeal to us and to Pakistan. Our Permanent Representative in New York has been in frequent touch with you and has kept you informed of the situation as it has developed since August 5. I have no doubt that from all the information that you have received from the United Nations Observers in Kashmir and on the basis of your own assessment, it is clear that the root cause of the present dangerous situation is the undertaking of massive infiltrations of armed personnel from the Pakistan side, well organised and trained in sabotage and subversive warfare, the whole operation being conceived, planned and executed by Pakistan. The infiltrators are, in fact, members of Pakistan Armed Forces. These infiltrations are still continuing. Such action by Pakistan is a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Cease-Fire Agreement, and against all canons of international law and code of good neighbourliness. It is to meet this thinly disguised invasion that the Government of India, while showing every forbearance, have been forced to take preventive military action.

"In your message you have appealed in the interests of peace that we should indicate our intention to respect the Cease-Fire Agreement, that there should be. a cessation of crossings of the Cease-Fire Line by armed personnel from both sides of the Line and a halt to all firing across the Cease-Fire Line from either side of it. While I appreciate the motivations of your appeal, I have to point out that the terms of your message are such as might leave the impression that we are responsible equally with Pakistan for the dangerous developments that have taken place. Unless your message is read in the context of the realities of the situation as they have developed, it tends to introduce a certain equation between India and Pakistan, which the facts of the situation do not bear out. Indeed, it seems to me that your message has to be read in conjunction with the report that you have sent to Members of the Security Council.

"I would like to take this opportunity. of apprising you of the salient facts of the situation. Since August 5, several thousands of infiltrators from Pakistan and Pakistanoccupied Kashmir have crossed the Cease-Fire Line. These men have come camouflaged as civilians and fully armed with modem weapons, signal equipment, large quantities of ammunition and supplies and explosives. From the

236

interrogation of the prisoners captured by us from among the infiltrators, many of whom we regular officers of the Pakistan Army, it is now known that a military Headquarters was set up in Murree in West Pakistan fin May 1965 under General Akhtar Husain Malik, General Officer Commanding, 12th Division, of the Pakistan Army. This organisation is known as Military Headquarters "Gibraltar Force". Their instructions were to destroy bridges and vital roads, attack police stations, supply dumps, Army Headquarters and important installations, inflict casualties on Indian Forces, and attack VIPs in Jammu and Kashmir. The statements of the captured prisoners and the nature and type of weapons which the infiltrators carried, large quantities of which have been captured by us, bearing the markings of Pakistan Ordnance Factories, prove, beyond a shadow of doubt that the infiltrators were armed and equipped by the Pakistan Government and have operated under their instructions.

"Pakistan, however, has denied any knowledge of these armed infiltrators and persists in the theory that there is an internal revolt in Kashmir-a revolt which does not exist and has not been noticed by independent foreign observers. Since your message was sent, the situation has been further aggravated by a massive attack launched by two regiments of tanks and aircraft supported by Pakistan troops in brigade strength, across the Cease-Fire Line and the international frontiers between the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir and West Pakistan. The attack which is in great strength is aimed at our key positions controlling our lines of communications. Even on its own admission, as indicated in President Ayub Khan's broadcast of September 1, the Pakistani attack clearly constitutes aggression. The Pakistani attack is accompanied by the usual tactics of the aggressor, namely, indiscriminate bombing of the civilian population. In a bombing raid on September 2, the Pakistan Air Force killed fifty civilians and injured an equal number in addition to bombing of a mosque. We have to meet the situation created by this latest Pakistani aggression.

"In your message, Mr. Secretary-General, you have yourself recognized that essential to the restoration of the cease-fire would be a cessation of the crossings of the Cease-fire Line by armed personnel. As I have indicated above the root cause of the present dangerous situation lies in the massive infiltrations of Pakistani armed personnel. Since the Pakistan Government disown responsibility for the armed infiltrations. your appeal to Pakistan, so far as armed infiltrators are concerned, can hardly be productive of results and the root cause of the trouble will remain.

"India is a peace-loving country. We have neither the inclination nor is it in our interest to be deviated from the path of peace and economic progress to that of military conflict. Pakistan has, however, by sending armed infiltrators in large numbers across the Cease-Fire Line brought about a situation in which we have no choice but to defend ourselves and take such preventive action as may be deemed essential. In taking such preventive action we have, in certain sectors, had to cross the Cease-Fire Line for the purpose of effectively preventing further infiltrations. This is a matter of great importance to us.

"As to the Cease-Fire Agreement, you are well aware that we have shown respect for the Cease-Fire Line all these years though Pakistan has shown scant regard for it. Over the past two years, General Nimmo, Chief Military Observer, has made Proposals for a meeting between the representatives of India and Pakistan with a view to ensuring the observance of the Cease-Fire Agreement and to preventing its violation from the Pakistan side by armed civilians. We have always accepted these proposals but Pakistan has either rejected them or not responded to them. In July 1964, we offered to come to a gentleman's agreement with Pakistan to ensure tranquillity along the Cease-Fire Line. Pakistan at first agreed to a meeting and the representatives of India and Pakistan were to meet in Karachi on the 2nd November 1964. However, a day before the meeting was to be held, Pakistan postponed the meeting unilaterally and did not suggest any fresh date thereafter.

"Pakistan's international behaviour is such as cannot be ignored in considering your appeal. It will be recalled that in 1947-48 Pakistan undertook action similar to the present one and persisted in denying its complicity for several months until the truth could no longer be hidden and it had no way but to admit to the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, in July 1948, that Pakistani forces had been fighting in Kashmir for several months. That act of Pakistan's aggression in the United Nations seems to have forgotten, but that aggression is still with us and Pakistan continues to be in forcible occupation of two-fifths of our State of Jammu and Kashmir.

"It is within your knowledge that in April this year, Pakistan launched a military attack in Our territory in the Rann of Kutch, a clear case of use of force for the assertion of its claims, which is forbidden by the Charter of the United Nation, the Bandung Declaration.

237

the Charter of the Organisation of African Unity, the Cairo Declaration and many other international declarations of our time. In spite of such provocation we showed forbearance and reached an agreement with Pakistan on 30th June 1965, for the peaceful settlement of the border question. The hope was solemnly expressed by both sides in the agreement that it would result in better relations between India and Pakistan and in the easing of tensions between the two countries. It is now clear, however, that even when Pakistan was putting its signature to that Agreement it was planning and organising the massive armed infiltrations across the Cease-Fire Line in Jammu and Kashmir, and even before the ink was dry on that agreement, Pakistan launched thousands of its armed infiltrators across the Cease-Fire Line. We cannot be expected to wait for Pakistan to violate the Cease-Fire Line and to attack us at will, and we cannot go from one cease-fire to another without our being satisfied that Pakistan will not repeat its acts of violations and aggression in the future.

"There is no other name for the massive Pakistani infiltrations across the Cease-Fire Line and across the international frontier between Jammu and Kashmir and West Pakistan, and the military attack that Pakistan has launched into our territory, but aggression. That aggression throws on us, as a sovereign State, responsibilities for defence which are our right and duty to discharge.

"To sum up, I have taken this opportunity

of acquainting you with all the aspects of the complex and dangerous situation that has been brought about by Pakistani actions. We owe it to you and to the high office you occupy with such distinction, to leave you in no doubt as to our position. Mr. Secretary-General, you have appealed for peace and we greatly apprecast your anxiety and the sincerity of your efforts. India has always stood firmly for peace and our position needs no reiteration. What is essential, however, today is that Pakistan should undertake forthwith to stop infiltrations across the Cease-Fire Line and to withdraw the infiltrators and its armed forces from the Indian side of the Cease-Fire Line and the international frontier between Jammu and Kashmir and West Pakistan. Furthermore, we would have to be satisfied that there will be no recurrence of such a situation. These have to be the starting prints of any steps towards the restoration of peace for which you as Secretary-General of the United Nations, are banding your efforts. I trust that, in the first instance, you will ascertain from Pakistan if it will accept the responsibility for withdrawing not only its armed forces but also the infiltrators, and for preventing further infiltrations. This, in fact, we take is the-basic assumption underlying your appeal."

That was the Prime Minister's reply to the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General's report (S/6651) contains the following in paragraph 9 :

"I have not obtained from the Government of Pakistan any assurance that the Cease-Fire and the CFL will be respected henceforth or that efforts would be exerted to restore conditions to normal along that line." (S/6651 Para 9).

Why has no assurance been forthcoming from Pakistan? It is because that country has no desire to end its aggression on the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. In fact, Pakistan has disowned any responsibility for sending armed troops in civilian-disguise across the Cease-Fire Line. As my Prime Minister stated in a broadcast to the nation yesterday :

"The Pakistani Government has endeavoured to create a myth-and this myth has been reiterated in President Ayub Khan's broadcast on 1 September--that infiltrators are freedom fighters and that there is an internal revolt in Kashmir".

Even today, on 4 September, neither the representative of Pakistan nor the Government of Pakistan has admitted responsibility for sending armed troops in civilian disguise across the Cease, Fire Line. The Secretary-General's report (S/ 6651) speaks of five conditions which are necessary

"Restoration of the Cease-Fire and a return to normal conditions along the CFL can be achieved. . ." (S/6651, para 15).

One of the conditions, sub-paragraph (b), states :

"A readiness on the part of the Government of Pakistan to take effective steps to prevent crossings of the CFL from the Pakistan side by armed men, whether or not in uniform". (Ibid.)

A further condition is the withdrawal of armed personnel. What guarantees can this Council give that even if Pakistan agrees to respect the Cease-Fire Agreement and the Cease-Fire Line, it will take effective steps to withdraw all the armed personnel in civilian disguise who recently crossed into the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir ? Is there any guarantee available from the Government of Pakistan ? If there is, what are the modalities of the withdrawal of the armed personnel in civilian disguise ?

In a broadcast to the nation yesterday, my Prime Minister said :

238

"What we are up against is a regime which does not believe in freedom, democracy and peace as we do".

To quote from the Prime Minister once again :

"In the agreement between India and Pakistan in connexion with the Jaurian-West Pakistan border, signed on 30 June of this year, Pakistan solemnly affirmed its hope that the agreement would result in better relations and easing of the tensions between India and Pakistan."

"The conscience of the world will be shocked to know that even at the time this agreement was being signed, Pakistan had already drawn up the plan of armed infiltration in Kashmir and was training its personnel in URI for operations to be undertaken just over a month later, even before the ink was dry on the agreement of 30 June. Such conduct speaks for itself."

It is the congenital hostility of the various regimes in Pakistan against India which dictates their policies. If the rulers of Pakistan were ever willing to live in peace with India, they would find a ready response from the Government and people of India.

The Council today speaks of a cease-fire. The Secretary-General has appealed for a cease-fire. Do I need to remind the Council that India has repeatedly offered a "no-war pact" to Pakistan. On each occasion this offer has been spurned.

To meet the present situation what is essential is :

(1) An acceptable guarantee from Pakistan that infiltrations across the Cease-Fire Line will be stopped forthwith and that infiltrators and the armed forces of Pakistan will be withdrawn from the Indian side of the Cease-Fire Line and the international frontier with the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir and West Pakistan.

(2) An acceptable guarantee that there will be no recurrence of such a situation.

(3) Above all, a starting point for any steps towards the restoration of peace.

As I understand it, there has so far been no reply from Pakistan to the appeal issued by the Secretary-General on 1 September. In the absence of such a response from Pakistan and in the absence of assurances requested earlier by the Secretary General, it seems premature for the Council to proceed with the consideration of the draft resolution contained in document S/6657. As far as my delegation is concerned, the reply of my Prime Minister to the Secretary-General's appeal-which I have just read out-constitutes our attitude towards an appeal for a cease-fire from any other source.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN ALGERIA VANUATU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI GIBRALTAR LATVIA UNITED KINGDOM PERU BOLIVIA JORDAN MALAYSIA THE NETHERLANDS URUGUAY INDONESIA EGYPT

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Aide Memoires to the U.N. Secretary-General

The following are the texts of two Aide Memoires handed over to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, by the Permanent Representative of India to the UN, on the 24th September, 1965 :

AIDE MEMOIRE I

The Government of India have received the Secretary-General's communications of September 20 and September 23. The texts of these communications are also contained in Documents S/6699 and S/6699/ADD/11 respectively of September 21 and September 23, 1965. In these communications the Secretary-General has asked for the Government of India's plan and schedule for the required withdrawal of Indian troops who are now on the wrong side of the cease-fire line and the international borders. It is seen from the two Documents referred to above that identical communications have been sent to Pakistan requesting the President of Pakistan to submit a plan and schedule for the withdrawal of Pakistan troops. The Security Council Resolutions speak of withdrawal of "all armed personnel". In the context of the relevant documentation, specially the Secretary-General's Report of September 3, 1965, the term "all armed personnel" clearly means both regular troops in uniform and armed personnel not in uniform whom Pakistan has sent across the cease-fire line and the international border. It is, therefore, not clear why the Secretary-General has chosen to address India and Pakistan in identical terms. While in the case of India, withdrawal of troops only is involved, in the case of Pakistan there is the obligation of withdrawal of armed personnel not in uniform who would not strictly come in the category of 'troops'.

In the penultimate paragraph of his communication dated September 23, to the Prime Minister of India, the Secretary-General states that "because of the difference in origin of the two

239

operations", he is "separating the supervision of the cease-fire and the withdrawals in areas outside of Kashmir from UNMOGIP, the existing cease-fire operation in Kashmir". While the government of India do not attach significance to any administrative arrangements which the Secretary General might make, they are not clear as to the difference in the origin of two operetions. The Security Council Resolution of September 6 speaks of cessation of hostilities in the "entire area of conflict". Nether that Resolution of the Council nor any other provides any warrant for treating the conflict and the operation otherwise than as a whole.

The Government of India will be grateful to receive any clarification which the Secretary General might care to give on the above two points.

AIDE MEMOIRE II

On the Lahore front the cease-fire is being vitiated by Pakistani troops who are infiltrating into sectors held by Indian troops, presumably in order to make territorial claims later. Such incidents are likely to break the precarious ceasefire and in fact an incident has occurred in burki which led to artillery fire. The Government of India have tried to stabilise the situation and Gen. Nimmo with his observers is attempting his best to do what he can. So far the exchange of fire is localised. Pakistan must accept the fact that there can be no forward movement from the positions held by Pakistani troops at the time of cease-fire. If the Pakistani troops attempt to move forward the Government of India foresee the situation getting out of control.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Letter to the U.N. Secretary-General on violations of the Cease-fire by Pakistan

The following is the text of the letter dated September 25, 1965 from the Parmanent Representative of India to the Secretary-General, U Thant, concerning the violations of the ceasefire by Pakistan :

I had the honour yesterday afternoon, September 24, 1965, to submit to you an aide memoire regarding violations of the cease-fire by Pakistan troops. In continuation of that aide memoire, my Government have instructed me to bring the following to you attention :

(1) On the morning of September 23 Pakistan armed troops in Khaki uniforms intruded into Indian territory in the Jhangar sector and started digging into the area. The local UN Team in Naushera was informed by Indian authorities of this intrusion, which is not only completely illegal but is likely serious to jeopardise the present cases-fire agreement. Our authorities have asked the UN Team to visit the site, and have also indicated that the intrusion should be vacated within 24 hours, whereafter we may be compelled to take necessary measures form the eviction of the Pakistan troops who have illegally entered our territory. (2) The UN Team at Naushera referred the matter to the UN Team at Kotli, which made enquiries from the local Pakistani Commander. The Pakistani Commander's view was that the troops were in position prior to the present cease-fire. This statement is baseless and we do not accept it. Indian authorities are awaiting a further communication from the UN Team.

(3) The Pakistani Rangers violated the ceasefire after 3.30 hours on 23rd September and entered the Jaisalmer area of Rajasthan at a number of points. They have taken positions at Ghotaru, Longanwala,-and have dug into places which are 10-15 miles on our side of the Indo-Pak border. In one case they attacked the Rajasthan Armed Constabulary post at Asutar. Their attack was repulsed.

(4) In the Barmer district of Rajasthan, Pakistan Rangers infiltrated and occupied the following points on the morning of 23rd September after the time when cease-fire should have been effective :

- (i) Bedusar
- (ii) Baori
- (iii) Kelnor
- (iv) Himo-ka-Talai

(All these points are south-east of Gadre Road inside India)

(5) In the area south of Burki, Pakistani troops started intruding into Indian held territory at two place on 24 September. In one case the intrusion began with Pakistani troops tricking in ones and twos, and building up to company strength. In another case the intrusion was committed by two companies of Pakistani troops. These intrusions have led to firing in the area.

(6) In the Fazilka area, on 24 September Pakistan troops intruded in sizable strength into Indian territory. This area was never under

240

Pakistani control and the intrusion is an obvious

and deliberate violation of the cease-fire. These intrusions by Pakistani troops are likely to lead to renewal of hostilities as happened in the Burki sector.

(7) The phenomenon of these Pakistani intrusions, infiltrations and violations, after the ceasefire, has already been brought to the notice of General Nimmo, Chief UN Military Observer, by the Chief of the Army Staff of India.

(8) Pakistan must accept the fact that there can be no forward movement from the positions held by Pakistani troops at the time of cease-fire. Any attempt by Pakistani forces to move forward is bound to affect the situation and the responsibility for any consequences flowing from this will lie squarely with Pakistan.

The following is the text of the letter dated September 28 :

Excellency,

With reference to your communication of the 20th September, 1965, I had already sent you an interim reply conveying the willingness of the Government of India to order cease-fire at the previously appointed time, namely, 7 A.M. GMT. While doing so, I had communicated the impossibility of our ordering a unilateral cease-fire and stressed the need for arranging that both sides cease-fire simultaneously at the appointed time. Subsequently, because of the delay in the communication of Pakistan's acceptance of the ceasefire, which was only communicated at the emergeny meeting of the Security Council on the morning of September 22, the Security-Council extended the time for the cease-fire to 2200 hours GMT on the 22nd September. As you are aware, the cease-fire was ordered by both sides at this hour.

On receipt of your communication of September 23, addressed to the Prime Minister, I was asked by my Government to seek clarification on certain points arising from your letter. I refer to the Aide Memoire which I handed to you on the 24th September. I received your reply to my Aide Memoire on September 25. I note your assurance that the use of the word 'troops' in the identical communications that you sent to me and to the Permanent Representative of Pakistan on September 20, connotes no restrictions on the meaning and purpose of the Security Council Resolution which relates to the withdrawal of "all armed personnel". As noted in paragraph 6 of your report (Document S/6651) "...... the series of violations that began on 5 August were to a considerable extent in subsequent days in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the CFL from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side". it will be recalled that throughout the recent discussions in the Security Council and vour discussions with the Prime Minister of India in New Delhi, the greatest emphasis has been placed by us on the withdrawal of these armed men from Pakistan. The Security Council Resolution itself, by naming 5th August as the date in connection with withdrawal to previous positions, has, undoubtedly, recognised the fact that armed infiltrators from Pakistan, to which reference has been made in your report, must be withdrawn. In your Aide Memoire it had been stated that in the expression "withdrawal of all armed personnel back to the positions held by them before 5th August, 1965", the word positions "must connote identifiable military positions of some nature which prior to 5th August 1965 have presumably been occupied by some kind of armed personnel under the Government control and/or direction". The Government of India are unable to accept this restrictive interpretation of the Security Council Resolution. In fact, such an interpretation is not warranted by the Security Council Resolutions, the Secretary General's report to the Security Council Document S/6651, and the discussions in the Council. In paragraph 15 (b) of S/6651, it will be recalled that it was proposed as one of the conditions under which restoration of the cease-fire and return to normal conditions along the cease-fire line could be achieved as "readiness on the part of the Government of Pakistan to take effective steps to prevent crossings of the CFL from the Pakistan side by armed men, whether or not in uniform." It has always been the understanding of the Government of India that the withdrawals of all "armed personnel" contemplated in the three Resolutions of the Security Council must include withdrawals of such personnel not in uniform who have crossed the cease-fire line from Pakistan since August 5. Any schedule or plan of withdrawal of Indian troops has, therefore, necessarily to be related to and coordinated and synchronised with the withdrawal of Pakistani regular forces as

well as armed men not in uniform who have crossed the cease-fire line and international border between Jammu & Kashmir and West Pakistan for both of which Pakistan must undertake full responsibility.

I would also, in this connection, refer to the Prime Minister of India's communications to you of the 4th September and the 14th September. In paragraph 8 of the latter communication it was made clear that when, consequent upon cease-fire becoming effective, further details are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infilrations that have taken place.

241

I have under instructions from my Government brought to your attention numerous violations of the cease-fire by Pakistan since the ceasefire came into effect. Pakistan thus, despite its solemn pledge to cease-fire, is once again violating the pledge given to the Security Council in pursuance of the Council Resolutions. Pakistan should be made to observe the cease-fire. The question of withdrawals will come only thereafter. I am instructed by my Government to suggest to you that at that stage the best way of dealing with the question of withdrawal of armed personnel would be for you to send your representatives and/or team of observers to establish contact and have discussions with the Governments of India and Pakistan in order to assist in working out a plan of simultaneous, coordinated and synchronised withdrawal of all armed personnel of both sides.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

KASHMIR IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, delivered the following letter to the U.N. Secretary-General on September 30, 1965 :

In continuation of my letter of September 28, 1965, I should like to convey the Government of India's reactions to your decision, as indicated in your Aide Memoire of September 25, to divide the supervision of the cease-fire between two groups of UN Observers.

The operations in the Kashmir sector cannot be separated from. the operations by the two countries in the Punjab and other sectors. It should be recalled that Pakistan not only sent a large number of armed infiltrators across the cease-fire line into the Indian State of Jammu & Kashmir, it also launched a massive invasion across the international frontier in the Chhamb-Jaurian sector. It was this latter attack which necessitated the limited defensive action by the Indian Armed Forces across other sectors of the Indo-Pakistan frontier. Your own reoprt to the Security Council (S/6651) clearly shows that the massive armed infiltrations from Pakistan were the starting point of the sequence of happenings. These operations, and the cease-fire which brought an end to them, can only be treated as one whole; and the supervision of the cease-fire has, therefore, necessarily to be a single operation to be carried out by a single group of observers under one command.

You have yourself stated in the Aide Memoire of September 25 that it is not to be assumed that in the administrative action contemplated by you to divide supervisory functions between two groups there is any suggestion of treating the conflict between India and Pakistan and the supervision of the cease-fire in different sectors otherwise than as a whole. The Government of India, therefore, all the more do not we the necessity of supervision. of the cease-fire in different sectors by different groups under different commands. The supervision of the cease-fire by two groups separately in different sectors is bound to cause confusion; and the Government of India fear that it will not be possible to achieve the close coordination,

administrative and operational, which you consider essential to the proper implementation of the cease-fire.

It may also be noted that the Security Council's Resolution of September 6 called upon the parties to cease hostilities in the entire area of conflict and requested you to take all measures possible to strengthen the UNMOGIP. Obviously, even at that stage the Security Council contemplate one group to supervise the cease-fire.

While it is clear from the foregoing that there should be only one group of observers under one command to supervise the cease-fire in the entire area of conflict, the question is whether this group should be the UNMOGIP or the UNIPOM, which you have now constituted. In justification of the establishment of UNIPOM, it is stated that UNMOGIP is limited in its terms of reference and functions to the CFL in Kashmir and that you are unable to assume authority to extend the scope of its functions beyond the CFL. I should like to point out that at one time the scope and functions of the UNMOGIP were expanded by agreement between the Chief Military Observer on the one band and the local army commanders of India and Pakistan on the other without reference to the Security Council, to include investigation of border incidents eastward from the south-end of the cease-fire line at Manawar in a sector of the border between India and Pakistan in Jammu. On the other hand if you would prefer the UNIPOM to the UNMOGIP for the supervision of the cease-fire along the entire border, my Government would have no objection to it.

The Government of India are of the view that the supervision of the present cease-fire in the

242

entire area of conflict should be ensured through a single observer organisation under a single command. They are convinced of the necessity and the desirability of this and hope that you will see your way to give effect to this important consideration. They have asked me to assure you that they will extend their cooperation to such a group in the performance of its duties pertaining to the observation and maintenance of cease-fire. I shall be grateful if this communication is circulated as a Security Council document.

INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

President's Broadcasts to the Nation on Pakistan's Aggression against India

The following is the text of a message broadcast to the nation by the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan on September 11, 1965:

Friends,

I am speaking to you at this time of grave crisis -a crisis that has been forced on us. We are engaged in this conflict with deep sorrow in our hearts. We know that the way to growth is through suffering and not despair.

President Ayub Khan of Pakistan has announced that Pakistan is at war with India. In accordance with this statement the Pakistan Air force has obviously been permitted to attack our cities and not confine themselves strictly to military targets. The Pakistan Navy has also been brought into action against our port at Dwarka. But we in India do not regard ourselves as at war with Pakistan; we have friendly feelings for the people of Pakistan and have been careful to do precisely no more than what is required to safeguard our territorial integrity. Our attacks have been confined to military installations and Pakistan troop movements.

This conflict has been forced on us, because there has been a persistent and continuous attempt, since the 5th of August, by Pakistan to take the law into its own hands and upset by force the egidmately established Government in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Both the United Nations Secretary General and the United Nations Military Observer Group in the area have recognized this. Confronted by the massive infiltration of armed men in disguise and some in uniform. others without, across the Cease-Fire Line, we have done only what was necessary to round up these infiltrators and, when Pakistan refused to call off their entry into India, to prevent further infiltration. Then on the 1st of September, when it became clear that the people of Kashmir were refusing to collaborate with the infiltrators, Pakistan, as the world knows, launched a massive attack south of the Cease-Fire Line, and across the international boundary between West Pakistan and our State. of Jammu and Kashmir, with a large number of heavy tanks, supported by regular infantry units of the Pakistan Army and jet aircraft of the Pakistan Air Force. The attack was obviously intended to sever communications between Kashmir and the rest of India. Pakistan then attacked other Indian towns from the air. It. therefore, became necessary for us to thwart this aggression, to strike at the bases from which this aggression was being launched and to forestall other attacks all along the border which Pakistan has been clearly planning.

But in the midst of this tragic conflict thrust on us by our neighbour, I wish to remind you that we should not and cannot forget our traditions, our ideals and our history. We detest war and all its horrors. Our troops have so far only fought for peace and for the defence of our land. They went to Korea, many years ago, at the behest of the United Nations, for the safeguarding of peace. They went to the Congo, again at the behest of the United Nations, to prevent the development of the conflict in the Congo into a fratricidal war. The campaigns, of 1962 were inflicted on us by China. And, today, we are driven to battle with Pakistan-a battle not of our seeking. We have repeatedly offered to Pakistan a 'no war' declaration; and in 1963, when we undertook to talk with the Government of Pakistan about Kashmir and other related matters, we even proposed a disengagement of troops all along the Cease-Fire Line. But Pakistan rejected this offer. She seeks now as in 1947, to secure, by force, settlements of her

choosing. Even now, she has declined to promise the Secretary General of the United Nations, whom we shall soon have the opportunity of welcoming here, that she will respect the Cease-Fire Line.

We have no desire to escalate the conflict. At every stage it has been Pakistan that has taken the first step in widening the conflict. U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations, is trying to bring about a settlement in terms of the United Nations resolutions of September 4th and 6th. I can assure him that India will always be prepared to give the fullest consideration to any suggestions that result in their turn of peace between India and Pakistan, But if the conflict started with Pakistan sending armed men into Kashmir, they must be withdrawn no less than Pakistan's regular army and Pakistan armour. And the United Nations Security Council must ensure that these acts of aggression are not repeated again and again in Kashmir.

It is to me, as I know it is to all of us, a matter of profound satisfaction that in this crisis we have all. closed our ranks, set aside the superficial differences of creed and caste, and behaved first and last, like Indians. The Sikh leader Sant Fateh Singh has postponed his last for the establishment of the Punjabi Suba and I dare say he will be satisfied with the eventual solution of this problem agreed to by the Government and the leaders of the Punjab. We have sixty million Muslims who are honoured citizens of our country. Practically every Muslim organisation, all Muslim Members of Parliament, and ever), articulate Muslim in India, from Cape Comorin to Srinagar, have pledged loyalty and support to the stand of the Government of India.

We are fighting today not for a piece of territory but for fundamental principles. Victory in oar struggle for the maintenance of India's freedom and federal union, which includes Jammu and Kashmir, is vital to the saving of free institutions. India has a freely elected Government, it free Press, reliance on law and a non-communal State which respects all religions. We are resisting a military dictatorship, a controlled Press and a theocratic State. We believe in freedom even for those who think differently from us. The interests of democracy demand our victory; otherwise the lamp of freedom will go out in Asia. We have also to avoid any form of hatred of the people of Pakistan, who are our kith and kin. Friendship with them has always been our primary objective. It is not our desire to hurt Pakistan to save India. Our commitment to peace is well known. We do not believe in any unbridgeable chasms, There are more things which hind us together than keep us apart. In this dreadful situation, let us have a few moments of introspection and make our spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice prevail.

May I congratulate our officers and jawans on the front for their courage, heroism and sacrifice and express to them the gratitude of the whole nation. They have not only displayed gallantry and valour in the field, they have also shown chivalry. There can be no dignity without magnanimity. Valour and honour go together. We are proud of our soldiers, our airmen, our naval ratings, their achievements and their valour, but above all, we are proud of their nobility, which is a great part of the gift of life. And let the rest of us, who are not on the field of battle, remember their readiness to sacrifice even the most precious gift of life and adopt an attitude of courage and self-denial.

The following is the text of President Radhakrishnan's broadcast dated September 25 :

I spoke to you a fortnight ago on the 11th of September. Since then, we have seen grim tragedy. U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations Organisation, came here to take the first steps for the restoration of peace. We responded positively to his suggestion of a ceasefire as we were anxious to put an end to this wasteful bloodshed when the cream of both our countries was being cut off. The cease-fire took effect from 3.30 a.m. on the 23rd instant.

We deplore the suffering and destruction, the disruption of family life; the wasting of human resources and the inevitable casualties of young men. War which sometimes becomes necessary for defensive purposes is still an evil and a danger to humanity. It does no good to any country since it leaves a trail of bitterness, fear and suspicion, thwarts all attempts at social and economic development. The other day I went to two Military Hospitals here and saw among the wounded young men of all communities, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh and Parsi. There is a general upsurge in the country which has dissolved our minor differences and integrated our people to a remarkable extent. There is oneness of feeling and purpose among our people, especially among the- fifty million Muslims who have given a striking testimony of their deep patriotism.

I should like to express our profound sorrow to those who have been bereaved by this war and our deep sympathy to the sick and wounded with prayerful wishes for their rapid recovery.

The country will remember their memorable services with immense gratitude. It is my earnest hope that the spirit which has become manifest in these hard days will continue with us in the years to come.

244

I should like to congratulate our Prime Minister and Government and our Chiefs of Staff, Genera Chaudhuri, Air-Marshal Man Singh and Vice-Admiral Soman, on the hard and excellent work which they and those working under their leadership have done in these difficult days. We have today retrieved our prestige and it is my hope that our Army, Air Force and Navy will continue to function with daring heroism and skill and be treated as a force to be reckoned with.

It is not our wish to destroy Pakistan or threaten its existence. Pakistan came into being as a result of the partition of India with goodwill and consent of our leaders. We want Pakistan to remain independent and sovereign. The people of Pakistan and India have ethnic, cultural and historical ties of long standing and we should co-exist as brothers, cooperating in economic, cultural and other affairs.

KASHMIR ACCESSION COMPLETE

This war was forced on us. Confident of victory against us, with mighty modem weapons, Pakistan tried to force the issue of Kashmir. Mao Tse-Tung stressed that guerillas must live off the land and can succeed only if they have the friend-ship and help of the local inhabitants. Pakistan sent across the Cease-fire Line armed infiltrators

to incite a revolt in Kashmir but they failed to gain the support of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. They failed even as the raiders assisted by Pakistan troops had failed in 1947. On that occasion Indian troops were not there. The Maharaja of Kashmir, supported by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullab, asked for India's intervention to repel the raiders. The Maharaja acceded to India and legally that accession was final and complete. Sheikh Abdullah said in the Security Council :

"Thousands of tribal Pathans equipped with mechanised weapons of war, swooped down on us not merely as armed bandits, but as, a centrally directed force with the avowed object of subjugating our land to the vassalage of Pakistan at the point of the gun."

In the Jammu & Kashmir Constituent Assembly, be repeated: "Our accession to India is complete." Sheikh Abdullab on the 13th of April 1952 said :

"The relationship existing between India and Kashmir which had been sanctioned by the blood of countless martyrs was irrevocable and no power on earth could 'render us asunder' ".1

The same temper and attitude were shown by the people of Jammu and Kashmir when the infiltrators came in August, 1965. Maulana Massoodi, a close associate and friend of Sheikh Abdullah, is reported to have told the Indian correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, "We Moslems feel much closer to Kashmiri Hindus than to Panjabi (Pakistani) Mussalmans."2

Pakistan assumed that India was too weak or too afraid too proud to fight. India, though naturally disinclined to take arms, felt the necessity to defend herself when attacked. Pakistan also assumed that communal disturbances would occur in the country and in the resulting chaos she could have her way. Her miscalculations must have come to her as a rude shock.

India is a democracy. It is an essential condition of a democratic people that they are free from external aggression, from the imposition of an outside will by force, subversion or infiltration. The people are free to shape their destiny as they choose, India is what the world aspires to be a multi-racial, multi-religious society. A democracy does not attempt to mould the whole world in a single pattern. Every individual has the opportunity for self-expression and selfdevelopment. India is a symbol of the good society. The conflict with Pakistan turned out to be a major moral issue of our time, dictatorship or democracy, a controlled press or a free press, a non-communal State which respects all religions or a theocratic State. Many religious fanatics try to reach heaven by creating a hell on earth.

The present conflict was calculated to involve the United Nations Organisation afresh in Jammu & Kashmir and compel it to issue a call to India to hold a plebiscite. It is argued that the democratic way of life demands the application of the principle of self-determination to Kashmir and its future should be decided by a referendum. Selfdetermination does not apply to parts of countries. If it did. it would fragment and disintegrate groups and countries. Frequent reference is made to the Security Council resolution of August 1948. But there are three parts of the resolution which have to be read together. Part II provided for the complete withdrawal of Pakistan troops from Jammu & Kashmir. This requirement was not carried out by Pakistan. This part also provided that Pakistan will use its best endeavour to secure withdrawal from the State of Jammu & Kashmir of tribesmen and Pakistan nationals not normally resident therein who had entered the State for the purpose of fighting! The responsibility for the security of the whole State was assigned to India. By

2 17th September, 1965, P.5

245

refusing to vacate the aggression, Pakistan sought to prevent the implementation of the resolution, though they still talk about it. The U.N. resolution, Part III, which spoke about consulting the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, could not be implemented if the truce agreement

¹ The Kashmir Government Bureau of Information, New Delhi, issued this authorised version of the speech.

was not carried out by Pakistan. The past seventeen years have created a situation where a plebiscite is neither practical nor necessary. The conditions for it are incapable of implementation. If we think of it, we would worsen relations all round.

Every effort was made to ascertain the wishes of the people. A Constituent Assembly was set up and when the Kashmir Constitution was formulated a provision was made reserving twentylive seats in the Kashmir Legislative Assembly for the elected representatives of Pakistanoccupied Kashmir to be filled some day by the elected representatives. These seats are still waiting to be filled by a democratic election based on adult franchise. In accordance with the Indian Constitution, elections to the State Assembly and the Central Parliament have been held regularly on the basis of adult suffrage. The people of Kashmir have the right to choose their own Government and way of life. Their language, their religion and their culture and their economic needs are well met in a democratic framework. The people of Jammu & Kashmir are managing their affairs in full accordance with law and their own Constitution. Thus the accession of Jammu & Kashmir to India is legally. constitutionally, politically and ethically complete and just.

The Sino-Indian border troubles of 1962 have been used by Pakistan to secure the assistance of China. China combines commonsense and bravado in her foreign policy. China threatens trouble though she acts in accordance with her own interests. China knows that if she intervened on the ride of Pakistan, she would invite the opposition of many countries, great and small. Her intervention would lead to a general war with all its disastrous consequences. China is aware of this danger of the extension of the war resulting in great Power involvement. She is. therefore, content to create a diversion of small scale activity along the Sino-Indian border to oblige Pakistan. But all the same we have to be alert and watchful.

PLEA FOR CO-EXISTENCE

Let us forget the bitterness off recent months and enter an era of peaceful co-existence. We must seek the unity of man with his neighbours, with the world that he has built with the knowledge that can save or destroy him, which can stimulate or stifle him, with the machines which can enrich or menace his spirit. As members of the international community, holding that humanity is above all nations, we should Sincerely adhere to the peaceful settlement of all disputes. The only concern of a true man is to be as human as possible. The German philosopher Schopenhauer complained that most men were like monkeys, it only made it worse he lamented, that from a distance they often looked so deceptively human. Most wars are caused by misunderstandings, resentments, frustrations and nationalist emotions. These we have to subduce if we wish to behave like human beings.

China and Pakistan are our neighbours and they should be persuaded to become our good and friendly neighbours. This is not impossible, difficult though it may seem today. We should work or that goal.

dirgham pasyat ma hrasyam

Look far ahead; do not be shortsighted."

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC KOREA CONGO CHINA OMAN **Date :** Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Vice-President's Broadcast to the Nation

The following is the text of a message broadcast to the nation by the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, on September 18, 1965 on the Pakistani aggression against India :

There are times in the life of every nation when all its energies and resources must be devoted to the achievement of a great aim, and when faith in this aim has to be consciously reaffirmed. We have armies in the field, we have men who are bravely risking their lives and performing feats of valour. Their dedication is unconditional; they do not ask questions. It is for us to assure them that we are with them heart and soul, and just as we honour their great sacrifices, we shall see that they are honoured by posterity, when we are called to account for all that we have thought and done.

WAR FORCED ON US

This war, in which we are engaged today, is none of our seeking. It has been forced upon us. We have done as much as any people could to stand by our national commitment to peace. We have desired peace with all our heart and worked for it with all our strength. We wish no one ill, we covet not ail inch, yes not an inch, of any

246

one's territory. But we cannot surrender the principles on which our State, our whole idea of a common life is based. And this is, indeed, what we were being asked to do. For Kashmir is not only a part, and a lovely part of India, but its being a part of India represents a noble principle not only of our culture, but of the culture of mankind.

There were dark days in our life when the demand for partition of the country appeared as an ominous pre-condition for our independence. Its monstrous implications were ignored by its advocates. The Indian Muslims were in fact asked to perjure themselves by asserting and defending the falsehood that because they were Muslims they could not be citizens of the same State as those among whom they and their ancestors had been born and had lived and to the rich fund of whose composite culture they had during centuries made highly valued contribution. They were being asked to uproot themselves, and abandon hearth and home, neighbour and culture, friendship and goodwill. And now we Indians, we Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians and Parsis, we for whom India is and always has been one country, our country, are being asked at the point of the sword to admit that Kashmir cannot legitimately belong to India because the vast majority of Kashmiris are

Muslims and must be offered up to Pakistan.

CALL FOR UNITY

Let us, at this moment, strengthen our faith in ourselves and our ideals. Let us remember that those brave men, Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Christian, Parsi brave men, are laying down their lives to prove that we are one people, firmly united by common interests and ideals, and that our unity will stand any test. The Muslim among us should realise that he is where he is by God's will, that his Indian citizenship is a great moral and spiritual commitment. He has to be a true" a dedicated follower, of Islam. He has to drive fear out of his heart, that fear which is the mother of selfishness and hatred, and of much political and social evil. He has to foster goodwill and trust, to render service for the sake of service, to look beyond his life on earth to the day when he will be answerable for what he has done and left undone to promote understanding, cooperation and peace among men. The Muslim's fellow-countrymen should appreciate and cherish this commitment, they should eradicate all suspicion and distrust, and, as representing the beliefs and traditions of the great majority, help to mobilise all sentiments in the service of the common interest.

DEDICATED SERVICE

We have an army at the front, the guardian of our honour and the bulwark of our security, The distinction it has achieved makes it obligatory on us to convert ourselves into another army, an army of thoughtful citizens who perform, on their own initiative, all the tasks that need to be performed for the victory, of our ideals. Where the soldier takes orders from his commander, we take orders from our conscience. We must plan all our work as if there were battles to win. We must put our awareness, our efficiency, our sense of discipline to as severe a test as soldiers on the battlefield, and be all inspired by a single aim. This is not the time for discussion; our thinking must be swift and silent and purposeful. We must allow the best to take the lead, the best, I mean, in purity of motive, in aptitude and experience, in the ability to organize and command. And we must fall in line where we belong, letting a strict selfappraisal be the judge. It is our right, as citizens of a democracy, to be individualistic, to do things in our own way. But to defend this very right we must now insist on order, on not claiming priority in any matter for personal reasons, pin understanding and not complaining. The men behind the plough, the miners in our mines, the workers in our factories should put forth their best in the service of the Motherland, for they supply the sinews of war. Those engaged in the great adventure of education, teachers and students alike, have to apply themselves assiduously to develop their capacities with a view to dedicating them to the service of the people. Much depends on the business community in particular, which supplies our daily needs. In fact, our whole morale, in a way, depends on our businessmen. If they raise prices because they must have their broad margin of profit at any cost, if they hoard or hold back essential goods, much of our thought and energy will be diverted into wrong channels and the feeling might be created that the war means sacrifice for some and undeserved gain for others.

The strength of a people lies in an inner harmony not only of declared aims but also of instincts. Instincts are endowed by nature; we cannot count on them. We must, therefore, cultivate the habit of doing the right thing spontaneously. This is a time when we should spontaneously follow our leadership, placing in it our full confidence and trust, and allowing it full freedom of action. It is a time when values which command our total dedication and commitment are in jeopardy, and therefore demand our total dedication. The basic principles of our national existence and the freedom to live by them are in danger and we may count no cost too high to protect them. For without them life as a moral adventure becomes meaningless-and. living on without them is worse than death. it is a time when each of us must encourage the other to contribute his best, and through sympathy, cooperation and goodwill make sure that

247

not only the ideals we serve and the victory we achieve but the inner harmony of our thoughts and motives is handed down to a grateful posterity. Let us clinch our teeth and take the unshakable grim resolve not to rest or tarry until our principles are vindicated and the freedom of our motherland is unmistakably assured,

CHINESE CHALLENGE WILL BE MET

As I speak to you news comes that the Chinese who have played us false once before are out for mischief once again. They are poised to push their way into our Himalayan frontier at Sikkim and in Ladakh. If they persist in their evil designs, they would probably have set in motion forces which may materially alter the shape of the world-not, I trust, very much to their advantage. China is out to kill freedom in the world; it is out to strangle the growth of democratic institutions; it aims at the domination of the Afro-Asian Lebensraum and in its wild dreams at the ultimate domination of the world. Let the world beware. But whatever the world may or may not do, we know our duty. We shall not falter, we shall not waver, we shall not hesitate to meet the challenge on behalf of all that is noble and great in the human spirit and God willing we shall prevail.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CHINA

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Broadcasts to the Nation on Pakistan's Aggression against India

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, broadcast the following message to the nation on September 3, 1965, on the situation arising from the Pakistani aggression against India:

My fellow countrymen,

I speak to you tonight to acquaint you with the situation that has arisen as a result of the Pakistani aggression against us and to share with you the anxieties and the responsibilities devolving on us in this critical hour. As you know, on the 1st September, Pakistan mounted a heavy attack in brigade strength in the Chhamb sector of Jammu. The attack was supported by heavy artillery and tanks of the Pakistan army. Our armed forces went into action against then and knocked out several tanks and many army vehicles. Pakistan's initial thrust has been halted. An instance of what Pakistan is doing in that area is the bombing by the Pakistani Air Force of civilians, killing many men, women and children, as well as destroying a mosque. The people of Jammu and Kashmir are facing the situation with great fortitude, I wish to pay a warm tribute to our security forces. The whole nation is proud of them and has the fullest confidence in their ability to defend the country. The whole country stands behind them.

The attempt of the armed raiders who had entered Kashmir earlier to damage bridges and administrative and military centres and to commit other acts of sabotage, has largely failed. The raiders failed also in enlisting the sympathy of the local population. In fact, they had to indulge in acts of loot and arson to sustain themselves. The raiders were able to move in villages for a few days under the cover of darkness, but this phase is now over and many of the infiltrators have been driven to seek cover in thick jungles. The presence of these infiltrators within Kashmir and their sporadic attempts at sabotage make it essential that we should be continuously alert and vigilant.

The infiltrators were well armed with modem weapons, and the whole operation was conceived, planned and executed by Pakistan. This, we believe, has been established beyond doubt in the reports submitted by the Chief Military Observer to the United Nations Secretary-General. These reports, in spite of our request, have not seen the light of the day. We have dealt successfully with hundreds of infiltrators and, as an inescapable measure of self-defence, we have had to take military action to occupy certain strategic posts beyond the cease-fire line in order to block the routes of the infiltrators. Some bands of raiders are, however, still attempting to come in with the full backing of the Pakistan army. Pakistan has denied responsibility for such infiltrations. The Pakistan Government has endeavoured to create the myth, and this myth has

been reiterated in President Ayub Khan's broadcast of the 1st September, that the infiltrators are freedom fighters and that there is an internal revolt in Kashmir. The whole world knows that there is no revolt. The Indian people of Kashmir have remained calm and have co-operated with the authorities in tracking down the infiltrators. They have been the victims of arson, murder and looting of property by the bands of Pakistani armed infiltrators. In expressing my sympathy, I wish to pay a tribute to the brave people of Jammu and Kashmir.

In 1947-48, Pakistan continued to deny for several months after it had sent her troops illegally into Kashmir, that they were there. It was only in 1948, when the truth could no longer be hidden, that the Pakistan representative confessed to the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan that Pakistani forces had been fighting in Kashmir for several months.

248

In the Agreement between India and Pakistan in connection with the Gujarat-West Pakistan border, signed on June 30 of this year, Pakistan solemnly affirmed its hope that the Agreement would result in better relations and easing of tensions between India and Pakistan. The conscience of the world would be shocked to know that even at the time that this Agreement was being signed, Pakistan had already drawn up a plan of armed infiltrations into Kashmir and was training its personnel in Murree for the operations which were undertaken just over a month later, even before the ink was dry on the Agreement of 30th June. Such conduct speaks for itself.

The Pakistani ruling circles accuse India of practising colonialism in Kashmir. President Ayub seems to have forgotten that the State of Jammu and Kashmir juridically and in fact, is a part of India. People of Kashmir are Indian citizens who enjoy all the rights and privileges guaranteed to them under the Constitution of India unlike their unfortunate brethren across the cease-fire line in Pakistan occupied Kashmir.

Let me add that our quarrel is not with the people of Pakistan. We wish them well, we want them to prosper and we want to live in peace and friendship with them.

What we are up against is a regime which does not believe in freedom, democracy and peace as we do. It talks glibly of a plebiscite in Kashmir, while it is not prepared to have a free election in its own country. In the State of Jammu and Kashmir there have been three elections since 1949. What once was a princely State, ruled on dynastic principles is now a State in our Federation under a Constitution which guarantees civil rights, freedom of worship and free elections. How would Pakistan like a plebiscite in the Pakhtoon area to find out whether it wishes to. remain a part of Pakistan ? How would Pakistan like a plebiscite in East Bengal to find out whether the people of East Bengal want to be ruled from Rawalpindi?

What is at stake in the present conflict is a point of principle. Has any country the right to send its armed personnel to another with the avowed object of helping to overthrow a democratically elected Government ?

I have received a communication from the Secretary-General of the United Nations containing an appeal to both sides to observe the cease-fire line. We will send a reply to the Secretary-General after giving his communication the careful attention it deserves.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations has appealed both to Pakistan and to India for peace. We believe in peace. We have worked for it and we shall never cease to work for peace.

Those who want peace will always have our support and co-operation, but they must face the realities of the situation. A cease-fire is not peace. We cannot simply go from one ceasefire to another and wait till Pakistan chooses to start hostilities again.

President Ayub in his recent broadcast referred to the conversation he had had with me in October, 1964. It is perfectly true that when I agreed to meet President Ayub I had done so with a desire to promote a better understanding between India and Pakistan. He had brought up the Kashmir question and said that Pakistan felt strongly about this matter. At that time, I had told him in reply in the clearest possible terms that if public opinion in Pakistan was very strong on this matter, the Indian opinion was also equally strong if not stronger than in Pakistan. There was, therefore, no easy solution to this problem. I asked him to devote attention to other issues which were so urgent, for instance, the question of continuous firing across the cease-fire line. President Ayub said that he was himself worried over this and was willing to have this position reviewed immediately. In fact he himself suggested a meeting of the commanders of the two sides to sort out this problem. When subsequently such an idea was mooted, Pakistan did not react favourably. President Ayub did raise the question of evictees and I also referred to the huge number of refugees coming into India. It was agreed between us that the Home Ministers of the two Governments should meet to discuss this matter. On my return to India. action was initiated for a meeting of the Home Ministers. Specific dates were suggested on more than one occasion but Pakistan on one pretext or another did not agree to our suggestions for quite some time. Eventually, 23rd November, 1964, was fixed and India's delegation was announced, but this meeting was called off by Pakistan on the ground that they were busy with their elections. These details I am mentioning because apparently President Ayub seems to have forgotten them altogether. That can be the only reason for his having made the observations that he did.

What is the duty and responsibility of our citizens in this hour of serious crisis. Your foremost duty at the present moment is to do everything possible to ensure that peace is not disturbed and that communal harmony is maintained. There are no Hindus, no Muslims, no Christians, no Sikhs, but only Indians. I am confident that the people of this country who have given proof of their patriotism and common sense on so many occasions in the past will stand united as one man to defend their country. We must all be on guard against mischief-makers and enemy agents who may try to instigate communal

249

disturbances. The Government will deal firmly with any such persons.

Our security scheme in regard to Civil Defence

measures is being enforced with immediate effect in the Punjab and in Delhi. Later, it would be extended to additional areas. nose of you who are called upon to participate in this Scheme should come forward and undertake the task in the spirit of a soldier at his post. Home guards will be strengthened in the urban areas. I would like men and women to join the Home guards in large numbers. To the industrial workers, I would like to address a personal appeal. I know of their patriotism and I am sure it would be uppermost in their minds. We have to maximise production in our industrial units and we have to maintain our communications, our harbours and our supply lines in a state of maximum efficiency. Every worker should make the best possible contribution he can towards the achievement of these objectives.

The men of business and industry have a very heavy responsibility in the present situation. The supply of essential consumer goods to the community must be maintained. Prices have not only to be maintained; they have to be brought down. Men engaged in the wholesale and retail trades must themselves exercise great restraint and serve the country at this time with a sense of patriotic duty.

The country has to prepare itself for hard days ahead. Everyone must perform his duty fully and faithfully. We may have to suffer damage from air raids. The nation must get into the mood which is necessary for undergoing sufferings and making sacrifices cheerfully. This is the price of freedom which we all have to pay, This is a call to the nation to rise and meet the challenge.

The following is the text of the Prime Minister's broadcast dated September 23

My deaf countrymen,

At 3.30 this morning hostilities between India and Pakistan which began on the 5th August with an invasion of infiltrators, came to an end. The blackout has been lifted. But let us not mistake it for the dawn of peace. Let us analyse the situation in which we are and consider what lies ahead.

The cease-fire as you know was put off by 15

hours because Pakistan's agreement to it was delayed. Although Pakistan's reply was a belated one, we are nevertheless glad that it did come after all. They wanted the cease-fire no doubt. indeed they needed it, but as is their practice they wanted to put up a show of resistance till the very last moment. Even after having informed the Security Council of their acceptance of cease-fire and on the eve of its implementation Pakistan has behaved in a most unworthy and atrocious manner. The bombing of civilian population in Amritsar in broad day light must be most strongly condemned. They did it deliberately and caused much loss to fife and property.

There is also the threat from no less a person than the President of Pakistan himself and from his Foreign Minister. Both of them have talked of a wider conflagration in the future. All this shows that Pakistan is still in a bellicose mood. While we would like to see peace between India and Pakistan and indeed we are anxious to see this achieved. we cannot shut our eves to the realities. I must state clearly that if Pakistan launches an attack again on the State of Jammu and Kashmir which is an integral part of India or on any other part of our territories, we shall meet the challenge with full determination and full force. Let there be no miscalculations again. This is our firm policy in regard to the defence of the country and it would be implemented with determination

While the conflict between the armed forces of the two countries has come to an end, the more important thing for the United Nations and all those who stand for peace is to bring to an end the deeper conflict between a theocratic State and a secular State, between a free democracy and a guided democracy. How can this be brought about? In our view, the only answer lies in peaceful co-existence. India has stood for the principle of co-existence and championed it all over the world.

Peaceful co-existence is possible among nations, no matter how deep the differences between them, bow far apart they are in their political and economic systems, no matter how intense the issues that divide them.

Time and again, we have declared that we

have no quarrel with the people of Pakistan and we wish them well. Even in the fighting that has just ended, all our attacks were directed at the Pakistani war machine. We have not bombed civilians, we have not shelled Lahore. we did not retaliate against air raids from East Pakistan, we have not attacked Karachi, though most of the aircraft which used to attack our territory had their base there. In contrast, Pakistanis have chased and shot down an unarmed civilian Plane carrying the Chief Minister of Gujarat and his wife. They have thrown bombs on the civil population in Rajasthan, Gujarat and Punjab.

After having unleashed a pre-planned massive attack of India, thus compelling us to take counter-measures, Pakistan has been carrying on a deliberately false propaganda that India is out

250

to destroy Pakistan. Nothing can be further removed from the truth. India has no intention whatsoever of destroying Pakistan. It is in fact Pakistan that has acted against India cotinuously. It is Pakistan that has invaded India three times in 17 years. It is Pakistan that wants to destroy our secularism which is the very basis of our State. It is Pakistan that tries to raise the communal bogey in an attempt to divide our people. it has to be remembered that there are 50 million Muslims in India and they are equal and proud partners in building up a new order in this country. They have fought arm-in-arm with their comrades in the battle against Pakistan and have won the highest military honours. Pakistan will never be permitted to succeed in its evil designs against India.

The armed forces of the country have risen gloriously to the occasion. They have displayed remarkable gallantry and military skill. The brave men of our Army and Air Force have operated is a well coordinated team and the officers have actually led the forces in the battlefield on the ground and aerial flights in the skies. They played with their lives cheerfully. Many deeds of heroism have been reported from the battle front. The whole nation-is full of warm appreciation and gratitude for our troops. Theirs, however, is a continuous task and I know that they are fully alive to their responsibilities. I would also like to refer to the men of the armed police force who have had to meet the challenge of Pakistani infiltrators and paratroopers. At many places they had to stand shoulder to shoulder with our armed forces to fight the invaders. In this task, many of them laid down their lives. But they have succeeded in adding a glorious chapter to the history of Indian Police.

What has been the greatest source of strength to Government during this period of trial is the united will of all the people who stood up together to do their duty by the country. India is a vast country with a very large population. Among our people we have many communities. We use different languages in different areas. Each one of us professes the faith of his choice. But all of us constitute a well-knit nation. Of this there has been the clearest possible demonstration during these critical days. Punjab has been in the forefront. The citizens of Punjab has shown a remarkable courage, sense of discipline and organisation. Their morale has always been very high. The people of the other border areas, particularly those of Rajasthan and Gujarat, have shown great courage and fortitude. I know that among the civilian population, the casualties have been substantial. The sacrifices of our people in these areas will not go in vain. They have stood up for the whole country and all the people feel beholden to them. To the kith and kin of those who have martyred for freedom I send our respectful sympathies and condolences. As a Government we will do everything possible to lighten the sorrow of those whom these brave soldiers of freedom have left behind.

As I told the Parliament yesterday, the Chinese threat is still with us and they alone know what they intend to do in the future. We have, however, to be prepared to meet the challenge from whichever quarter it comes.

We will have to take a long-term view of measures for civil defence. Improvisations at short notice are not good enough and considerable thought will be given to this matter specially in respect of the border areas. The people can play an important role by volunteering themselves for services in this connection. Their response has been commendable. We have been receiving a large number of voluntary contributions every day to the Defence Fund. These are most welcome and we greatly appreciate the gesture of the donors.

In the coming days and weeks, we must make a realistic re-appraisal of our plans and policies. If the experience of the recent past holds any lesson for us all, it is this; we must endeavour to be as self-reliant as possible. In the ultimate analysis, it is the strength of the nation itself which matters most and which is our best safeguard. The responsibility for this endeavour lies not on the shoulders of a few, but on each one of you my Brothers and Sisters. A democratic society such as ours depends for its strength on the voluntary and disciplined efforts of all its citizens. It is a compulsion from within and not from without. So far as I am concerned, I am full of confidence about the capacity of our people to meet effectively the challenge of peace, as we have met the challenge of aggression.

To the many friendly countries who have shown understanding and sympathy, I must express the gratitude of the people of India. It is specially gratifying that almost all the countries of the world, except those who are clear partisans, have recognised that India had to act in the recent hostilities purely in self-defence to meet a wanton and naked aggression upon our territories. India's faith in peace is unshaken. With us it is a matter of principle and not of expediency. But adherence to peace does not and cannot mean that we should not take up arms to defend ourselves when attacked.

When Pakistan launched an attack on August 5, 1965, she had done so on the basis of certain assumptions. The first apparently was that there would be some sort of an uprising or revolt in Kashmir. The second seems to have been the

251

hope that there might be communal disturbances in India. The biggest blow to Pakistani ambitions was dealt by the brave people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. They bore the brunt of the first wave of aggression with remarkable unity and fortitude. They gave full cooperation to the State Government so ably led by Sadiq Saheb, the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, and to the Security Forces of the country. The second expectation of Pakistan proved to be even more illusory. The Pakistani aggression brought to surface the latent strong internal unity of the country. Our people came forward, all of them, as Indian patriots to fight a foreign challenger. We have to keep up the same spirit. Let us not slacken our efforts and activities. We must remain alert and vigilant. All the people of India should be ready and determined to defend their motherland, in any emergency, with all their heart and all their might.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on the Cease-fire

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following statement in Parliament on September 22, 1965, about the views of the Government of India on the question of cease-fire:

I place on the Table of the House a copy of the Security Council resolution* dated the 20th September, 1965, relating to the current conflict between India and Pakistan-a conflict which commenced on the 5th August, 1965, when Pakistan launched a massive attack on India by sending thousands of armed infiltrators across the cease-fire line in our State of Jammu and Kashmir.

As the Hon'ble Members would see, the Security Council had demanded that both Governments should order a cease-fire effective from 12.30 p.m. Indian Standard Time today, the 22nd September, 1965. On the question of cease-fire, the views of the Government of India were stated in detail and without any ambiguity in my letters of September 14 and 15, 1965, addressed to the Secretary-General. As stated in these letters, the Government of India had clearly accepted that they would order a cease-fire without any preconditions on being informed that Pakistan had agreed to do the same. On receiving the Security Council resolution, therefore, we sent a communication to the Secretary-General, in accordance with our earlier stand, informing him that we would be prepared to issue orders for a simple cease-fire effective from the appointed time and date, provided Pakistan agreed to do likewise.

Throughout yesterday, there was no further message from the Secretary-General, but in the early hours of this morning we received a message from him advising us to order a unilateral cease-fire in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Security Council Resolution, with the proviso that our troops could fire back if they were attacked. This, of course, was entirely impossible. In a battle which is continuing, it is just not possible for one side to ask its soldiers to stop firing, leaving the other side free to continue its operations. Our representative at the United Nations, was, therefore, instructed to inform the Secretary-General accordingly.

A further report was received a short while ago that at the request of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, an emergent meeting of the Security Council was convened, at which an announcement was made, on behalf of Pakistan that they also had agreed to issue orders for a cease-fire and cessation of hostilities. From our side, the requisite orders are now being issued to our field commanders to effect a complete cease-fire by 3.30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The Security Council Resolution refers to other matters which will require consideration subsequently. However, the policy of the Government of India in regard to matters which are of vital importance to us and which relate to the present conflict, has been stated by me on more than one occasion on the floor of this House and also in my recent communications to the Secretary-General.

I do not propose to go into any further details at the present stage. Detailed discussions will have to take place and there would have to be a fuller study of the problems to which I have just referred. For this purpose, our representative at the United Nations will keep himself available to the Secretary-General.

There will now be cessation of hostilities. Peace is good. However, there is still a threat from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, which he held out today, while speaking in the Security Council. We have, therefore, to be very watchful and vigilant.

The nation has recently been going through its greatest trial. The times have been difficult but they have served a great purpose. The whole

* Not included.

252

world knows now that the people of India-Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Parsecs and others, constitute a united nation with a determined common will and purpose. On the battle front, the supreme sacrifice has been made by the members of all communities who have shown that they are Indians first and Indians last.

To our armed forces, I would like to pay on behalf of this Parliament and the entire country our warmest tributes. By their valour and heroism, they have given a new confidence to the people of India. Those who have lost their beloved on the battle front, have made a contribution to the preservation of our independence which will never be forgotten by a grateful nation. Their sorrow and their pride are shared by the whole country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now seek your permission to express to all the members of this august House, to all the political parties in the country, to the leaders of public opinion, of labour organisations, of business and industry, and of many other voluntary associations, my feelings of the deepest gratitude. In the hour of trial each one of the 470 million people of this country stood up shoulder to shoulder to meet the challenge to our freedom.

I should like to inform the House that on 18th September, 1965, I received a message from Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, USSR, offering his good offices for bringing about improved relations between India and Pakistan. Mr. Kosygin is impelled by noble intentions. No one can ever contest the view that ultimately India and Pakistan will have to live together as peaceful neighbours. We cannot therefore say no to any efforts, which may help to bring about such a situation, made by those who are sincere and genuine in their feelings of goodwill and friendship. I have, therefore, informed Mr. Kosygin today that we would welcome his efforts and good offices.

I would also like to give the House some further details about the tragic accident in which the other day, we suffered a grievous loss. Investigations conducted on the spot show that the aircraft in which Shri Balvantray Mehta was travelling, was shot down by a Pakistani plane. The marks on the fuselage establish that gun fire had been used. Preliminary investigations by the Air Force authorities who also have visited the scene confirm that the aircraft was shot down at a low height. The ammunition recovered at the site of the crash also proves that the attacking aircraft was a Pakistani plane. That a noncombatant civilian aircraft should have been shot down in this manner is one of the most inhuman acts which we must all deplore and condemn. Shri Balvantrayji, his wife and the others who were travelling with him have laid won their lives at the altar of the freedom of the country. Their names will remain enshrined in our memory.

We are, Sir, still faced with the Chinese ultimatum. The House is aware that almost at the same time when the Chinese Government announced the extension of the time-limit of the ultimatum to India by 72 hours on September 19, their troops started provocative activities at several points of the border. On the Sikkim border, about which the Chinese have been making baseless and threatening allegations, the Chinese troops crossed the well-known and delimited boundary at Dongchui La and Nathu La on September 20 and 21 respectively. They fired at our observation posts. They have tried also to intrude into our other territories. Our armed forces have clear instructions to repel the aggressor.

Yesterday we sent a reply to the Chinese note of September 20 in which India was alleged to have intruded into Dum Chale and committed armed provocation. The Chinese charge was rejected as a fabrication and a cover-up for the intrusion and firing at Tsaskur to which I have referred a little while ago.

The House is aware that on September 19, the Chinese Government sent us a note couched in unbecoming language, extending the period, of the ultimatum, making demands for destruction of military structures etc. Regarding the socalled military structures we have already told the Chinese Government that if after joint inspection any structures are found on the Tibetan side of the border there can be no objection on their being demolished. I have been told that China has announced that some of these so-called structures have been destroyed by our troops while withdrawing. All this is a product of their imagination.

I must tell the House that we view with grave concern the Chinese activities on the border and the armed intrusions into our territory. We have urged the Chinese Government in our note of September 21 replying to the Chinese note of September 19 to forsake the path of belligerence and intimidation and to return to the path of peace and reason in its relations with India. I hope that even at this late hour China will respond to this call and prevent a major crisis.

We do not, however, know what the Chinese will do next. We have to remain vigilant all along the frontier.

These are times of the greatest trial for the nation, but the people all over the country are now in that mood which alone ensures the preservation of country's freedom. We may have

253

to face many ups and downs, but I know the people have steeled themselves into a resolve to meet even this bigger challenge. On our armed forces, there may be a heavier responsibility. I have no doubt that they are in good spirits. We have no intention of under-estimating the gravity of the situation. But we have resolved firmly to meet this challenge to our freedom.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CHINA **Date** : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Defence Minister's Statements in Parliament on Pakistani Aggression against India

The Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, made the following statement in Parliament on September 6, 1965, about the aggression committed by Pakistan on the Indian territory :

Honourable Members are aware that I have been keeping them apprised from time to time about the aggression being committed on our territory by the armed forces of Pakistan, clandestinely at first and openly thereafter. The first wave of aggression was through armed infiltrators constituted from regular and irregular soldiers of the Pakistani army, though Pakistan assumed a posture of innocence With regard to these happenings. On September 1 the Government of Pakistan threw off this posture and put in its regular forces in the shape of a massive armed attack in the Chamb sector of our State of Jammu and Kashmir. This attack was mounted with a large force of infantry and tanks and accompanied by air cover. Naturally, we have had to repel all these attacks and our armed forces have been giving an exceedingly good account of themselves, notwithstanding the difficulties which they had to face.

We have, as I informed Honourable Members earlier, had to carefully watch the developing situation and have had to take an overall view of the defence of the country.

On the afternoon of September 5 Pakistani aircraft intruded across the International boundary at Wagah near Amritsar and fired rockets at an Air Force unit. Anti-aircraft action drove them away. This violation was reported but there were further. violations over the same border by the Pakistan Air Force and it was quite apparent that Pakistan's next move was to attack Punjab across the International border. The indication that this was going to happen was building up over some time. In order to forestall the opening of another front by Pakistan, our troops in the Punjab moved across the border in Lahore Sector for the protection of the Indian border.

In Kashmir Sector, in Chhamb, violating the International border, Pakistan came across with a large number of Patton and Sherman tanks, supported by both Heavy and Medium Artillery. We repulsed these attacks and have taken positions in the vicinity of Jaurian where we have held the enemy. The position is well and strongly held and the strategic importance of it is fully realised. I would like to say that in the last 24 hours we have destroyed three more Pakistani Sherman tanks. Fighting is still going on and two positions into which the enemy had infiltrated have been cleared of the enemy.

In the Valley and along the cease-fire line, within the last 24 hours the situation has been generally quiet. I would like to bring to the notice of Hon'ble Members action taken two days ago at North of Tithwal where our troops occupied three Pakistani positions which were overlooking us and covering the road to the Northern Sector intensively used by the infiltrators.

Our aircraft carried out a number of sorties over West Pakistan this morning and attacked a number of military installations including a goods train carrying military stores and inflicted considerable damage. All our aircraft returned safely.

We have taken the decision to effectively repel Pakistani aggression in the full knowledge that the whole nation, irrespective of party alignments, is one with the Government in this matter. The Prime Minister has received the fullest assurances from all quarters in this regard. I am sure Honourable Members and the country will show appreciation of the great gallantry with which our Army has been fighting against odds in our State of Jammu & Kashmir in extremely difficult terrain as in the Kargil and Haji Pir areas. The House is undoubtedly also proud of the performance of our boys in the Air Force who have destroyed several Pakistani Sabre Jets. I have no doubt now that our armed forces will give a worthy account of themselves.

The following is the text of the Defence Minister's statement dated September 8 :

I would like to keep the Honourable Members apprised of the developing situation in our efforts to contain and throw out the Pakistani aggression on our territory, since I made the statement on the floor of the House on 6th September.

Our Army which moved across the Punjab border to deal with the Pakistani forces who had invaded Kashmir and which were trying to open another front in the Punjab has gained certain positions which it has held despite vigorous

254

counter. attacks from the other side. Our Air Force has been giving-very good support to our ground troops. Our air action to hit the bases from which Pakistan has been launching air attacks on our territory has been continuing.

In the Chhamb-Jaurian sector our forces have made the enemy retreat and captured substantial number of vehicles besides stores. There are signs of his making a stand again. In other sectors of Jammu and Kashmir our troops have given a very good account of themselves. In the Haji Pir area, our troops have captured another Pakistani post three miles west of the Pass and repulsed a Pakistani counter attack. Proceeding towards the north, from the Poonch side, our troops have, with great gallantry, captured three important hill features in the bulge where not only have they inflicted heavy casualties on the enemy, but they have made a record haul of arms and ammunition and stores. The Pakistanis were well entrenched in these posts and had obviously been using them as bases for supporting and assisting infiltrations into Jammu & Kashmir. In other areas of Jammu & Kashmir also our ground forces have been inflicting losses on the enemy.

The Indian Air Force has achieved remarkable success, not only in the role of support to our ground troops, but also in strikes at the bases from which Pakistan has been mounting attacks on our territory.

Our air strikes in support of the Army were made over the Dera Baba Nanak area. The

Air Force also struck at Pakistani ground forces concentrated in Sulemanki Head Works area and poised for an advance into India. The Sargodha and Chaklala air-fields of the Pakistani Air Force have been attacked by our planes as they were being used as bases by the Pakistani Air Force to support the aggression by Pakistani ground troops on our territory. Our Air Force have also intercepted and fought with the Pakistani Air Force in the latter's attempts to bomb air-fields and civilian targets in widespread areas. ranging from Jamnagar in the west to Kalaikunda near Calcutta in the east. The Pakistanis had earlier bombed the civilian areas of Jaurian and Ranbirsinghpura. They have continued this process of bombing over Amritsar, Ferozepur and other civilian areas. No military target has been damaged in these areas, but there have been sizeable civilian casualties and damage to civilian property. Evidence has been collected to show that Pakistan had made plans to undertake these operations, as early as April.

In the ground fighting, apart from inflicting other losses on the enemy, our troops have destroyed three Pakistani tanks and captured two, complete with their crew. To arrest the advance of our forces, the Pakistanis blew up the Dera Baba Nanak bridge in Pakistan territory. The Air Force has knocked out thirteen other Pakistani tanks. In pursuance of the Army's overall plan to check attacks at the bases from which they are mounted and sustained, our armed forces have crossed the Jammu-West Pakistan border and are advancing. Simultaneously, in order to forestall Pakistani attacks in the Barmer-Kutch sector, our troops have made a forward move in that area. Gadra city, which is five miles from the frontier, has been occupied. As operations are still in progress, Hon'ble Members will appreciate that I am not in a position to give further details.

In air battles in our own territory and in strikes over West Pakistan airfields, our Air Force have in the past two days given a very good account of themselves. Their record is 11 American F-86 Sabre Jets destroyed, one F-104 C aeroplane destroyed and two damaged, two B-57 bombers, two four-engined American transport aircraft and one C-130 aircraft destroyed. Pakistani aircraft destroyed by ground fire are one F-86, one F-104C, one B-57 bomber and one C-130 aircraft. In two days' fighting, 21 Pakistani aircraft have been destroyed and two damaged. Our own losses have been substantially less.

Hon'ble Members will no doubt have seen the details of the different aerial actions given out till last evening by the official spokesman. Last night, the Halwara airfield was bombed twice by Pakistani aircraft but no damage was done. An attempt was made by Pakistani aircraft to bomb Delhi. One C-130 aircraft was knocked out in the air and two others were chased away.

Pakistan has dropped a number of parachutists, some in uniform, others disguised, with a view to attack and disrupt our military installations, particularly the air bases. Many of the parachutists have already been rounded up by our security forces and others are in the process of being mopped up. In this task, the Security Forces have received considerable assistance from our people.

Last night, the Pakistani Navy bombarded, under air cover, the Port of Dwaraka in Gujarat State. A report just received shows that no military installations have been bit. None of our aircraft was involved in this incident and no aircraft has been lost as claimed by Pakistan.

Sir, to sum up, I should like to give the House a broad picture of our strategy. The conflict began with infiltrators coming across the ceasefire line. We restricted our action to measures along the cease-fire line. Pakistan, however, chose to extend the area of conflict by attacking in the Chhamb sector, across the international

255

boundary, between the State of Jammu & Kashmir and Pakistan, using heavy tanks, and heavy artillery. This was followed. by an air raid on Amritsar as well as on points in the State of Jammu & Kashmir far from the frontier where the fighting was in progress. It was in these circumstances, and purely as a defensive measure, that our Armed Forces had no option but to take action against the bases in West Pakistan. Our advances in the Punjab have immediately achieved their objective of relieving the pressure on our troops in the Jaurian-Akhnur sector where the Pakistani forces have withdrawn and are being pursued by our troops. The enemy is still on our side of the Cease Fire Line and international frontier in certain places and have yet to be cleared from these areas. In the meanwhile, Pakistan has attempted to escalate the war in the Eastern sector. We have no quarrel with Fast Pakistan and while our troops have taken up positions within our territory in order to meet any threat of aggression by Pakistan, at the present moment I do not visualise our taking any action to escalate the war in that field except to the extent Pakistan's action compels us to do. If Pakistan's intention is to escalate the fighting in other fields, as evidenced by the naval bombardment of Dwarka Port, our forces are prepared to meet the threats which may be posed by Pakistan. As far as we are concerned, our action is limited to make Pakistan realise that we will not tolerate any interference with the territorial integrity of India of which Kashmir is a part. We have to prevent the mounting of any attack by the Pakistan military machine on our territories.

The following is the text of the Defence Minister's statement dated September 10 :

I would like to apprise the House of developments since I made a statement two days ago about our measures to deal with the Pakistani aggression on our territory.

In the Jammu-Sialkot sector, a heavy battle has been fought with the Pakistani troops which brought in concentrated armour to resist our advancing forces. We have nevertheless made a substantial advance and held our position after inflicting heavy loss on the enemy. As many as 28 Pakistani tanks were destroyed by our troops in this ground battle and we have taken a large number of prisoners. Inevitably, we have also suffered substantial loss of armour in the battle though much less than Pakistan.

In the Dera Baba Nanak area, notwithstanding the blowing up of the bridge by the Pakistanis, our patrols have advanced to the other side of the river. Heavy shelling is now being done from both the sides. In the Wagah Sector, Pakistan has made very heavy counter attacks which continued throughout last night; all these attacks have been repulsed. In the Khalra axis, our progress is satisfactory. In the Kasur sector, the Pakistanis. have put up very heavy counter attacks with tanks add we have had to withdraw from our forward position. In this fighting our ground troops destroyed as many as 23 tanks in one day on the 9th. Pakistan has heavily shelled our troops at our border near Ferozepur but we are holding our position. Some shells have fallen on Ferozepur town. In the Sulemanki sector, all Pakistani attacks have been repulsed and after one battle alone, 70 Pakistani dead have been counted by us.

In the Jammu and Kashmir area, there is little to report except that intermittent firing goes on. In the Jaurian area, the position is unchanged. Our troops moving from is Poonch side have continued their advance north-eastwards and have again captured a couple of posts.

Enemy action in attacking Jamnagar airfield and bombarding Port Dwaraka rendered preventive action necessary in that area.

In the Barmer-Pakistan sector, further patrol activity is going on to gauge Pakistan's further moves.

The Air Force has concentrated on giving support to our ground troops and is also causing maximum damage to those airfields in West Pakistan from which attacks have been mounted on our territory. In air attacks, our Air Force in the last two days set fire to a train carrying to the front 23 Patton tanks, causing considerable damage, and destroyed another ten tanks in other sectors. All the strikes by the Air Force, coupled with the Army's own record of knocking out Pakistani tanks have amounted to a heavy toll of the enemy's armour strength.

In the air-raids on Sargodha and other airfields our aircraft have mounted repeated sorties which have caused damages to enemy aircraft on the ground, to his installations and run-ways. There have been no particular air battles. We, however, lost one Hunter aircraft by- ground fire and one Mystere which was damaged and had to force-land in our territory. Pakistan has been mounting attacks on our airfields, particularly Halwara, Adampur and Pathankot. These have not been able to do any great damage. One Pakistani F-86 aircraft was shot down over Jammu by our ground fire and similarly one Pakistani B-57 bomber has been shot down over Amritsar.

The enlargement of the conflict has not been of our seeking. Militarily, we had to take effective steps to stop Pakistani aggression in Chhamb which was launched with heavy armour and air support at the far end of our long line of communication. We had to draw out the Pakistani

256

forces elsewhere to release the pressure in the Chhamb-Jaurian sector. Also, there were cancentrations of troops on the Sialkot and Lahore fronts, which could have taken in the rear our troops engaged in Chhamb. We, therefore, meant to engage the Pakistani forces from wherever they were threatening a thrust on us. The heavy battles that have since been fought in the Sialkot and Lahore sectors corroborate the need for this. In engagements of this kind of heavy fighting some ups and downs are to be expected. It will be clear that on the whole our objectives have been well achieved. We have engaged the menacing Pakistani forces in many sectors and have, by and large, held the positions despite the heavy counter attacks mounted by Pakistan. Heavy fighting is continuing and our Jawans and Air Force are giving a good account of themselves.

As I indicated earlier our overall purpose is a limited one, to prevent the mounting of attacks by the Pakistani military machine on our territory and we hope that Pakistan will realise that we will not tolerate interference with the territorial integrity of India, of which Kashmir is a part. We do not wish to extend the areas of conflict. It is Pakistan which has again started firing along the East Pakistan-India border. What its designs are, we do not know, but we will remain prepared to meet a threat if one develops there. Pakistan has been resorting to bombing of civilian areas like Jammu, Ranbirsinghpura, Jaurian, Amritsar, Ferozepur, etc., where considerable damage to civilian life and property has been caused. Notwithstanding the malicious Pakistani propaganda, particularly abroad, that we have bombed civilian areas in Rawalpindi and Karachi, we have refrained from any such action.

Our air strikes in the Rawalpindi area have been limited to the Chaklala airfield from which sorties have been mounted for aggression on us, and elsewhere also; we have been attacking their air bases only. It is Pakistan which has resorted to unfair means as is evidenced by Indian Air Force markings observed on a Pakistani F-86 plane by our pilots. We hope that Pakistan will even at this late stage give up the false pretences which it has been making ever since the induction of Pakistani armed personnel in disguise into our State of Jammu and Kashmir.

PAKISTAN INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ANGUILLA USA MALI

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statements in Parliament on the Chinese Ultimatum

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following statement in Parliament on September 17, 1965 on the Chinese ultimatum:

I want to inform the House that this morning we received a communication from the Chinese Government demanding that within three days we should dismantle our defence installations which they allege are located on their side of the border in Tibet across the Sikkim border. I might for the benefit of the House, read out the relevant portions of the communication, although if would be placing the communication and our reply on the Table of the House.

In its notes the Indian Government continues to resort to its usual subterfuges in an attempt to deny the intruding activities of Indian troops along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary. This attempt cannot possibly succeed. Since cease-fire and troop withdrawal were effected along the Sino-Indian border by China on her own initiative in 1962, Indian troops have never stopped their provocations, and there have been more than 300 intrusions into China either by ground or by air. The Chinese Government has repeatedly lodged protests with the Indian Government and served warnings to it, and has successively notified some friendly countries. The facts are there, and they cannot be denied by the Indian Government by mere quibbling. Moreover, the Chinese Government has four times proposed Sino-Indian Joint Investigation into India's illegal construction of military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary, but has each time been refused by the Indian Government. Now the Indian Government pretentiously says that the matter can be settled if only an independent and neutral observer should go to the border to see for himself. It further shamelessly asserts that Indian troops have never crossed the Sikkim-China boundary which has been formally delimited, and that India has not built any military works either on the Chinese side of the

257

border or on the border itself. This is a barefaced lie. How can it hope to deceive anyone ?

"As is known to everybody, the Indian Government has long been using the territory of Sikkim against China. Since September 1962, not to mention earlier times, Indian troops have crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, which was delimited long ago, and have built a large number of military works for aggression either on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself. There are now fiftysix such militay works, large and small, which they have built in the past few years all over the important passes along the China-Sikkim boundary, thus wantonly encroaching upon China's territory and violating her sovereignty. In these years the Chinese Government has made thirteen representations to the Indian Government. But the Indian Government has all along turned a deaf car to them and does not have the slightest respect for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Far from stopping its acts of aggression, the Indian Government has intensified them by ordering its troops to intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocations.

We are sending a reply to all those points and as I said I shall place the reply on the table of the House. I will read out the relevant portions of our reply.

"Ever since the Sino-Indian border problem was raised by the Chinese Government, the Government of India had made strenuous attempts to settle the question peacefully and with honour. Even after the unprovoked Chinese attack across the border in October-November, 1962, the Government of India consistently followed the policy of, seeking a peaceful settlement honourable to both the parties concerned.

As has been pointed out in various notes to the Chinese Government in the past, the Government of India has given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to cross the international boundary in the Eastern and the Middle Sectors and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. The Government of India are satisfied after careful and detailed investigations, that Indian personnel as well as aircraft have fully carried out their instructions and have not transgressed the international boundary and the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector at any time at any place. The Government of India are, therefore, absolutely convinced that the allegations contained in the Chinese note under reply are completely groundless. The Government of India are constrained to reject these allegations and to reassert emphatically that they do not accept the claims, to vast areas of Indian territory in the Western, Middle and Eastern Sectors of the border put forward in the Chinese note under reply. As regards China's stand on Kashmir and on the present unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, it is nothing but interference on the part of China calculated to prolong and to enlarge the conflict."

The background of the matter is that in September 1962 some defence structures were constructed on the Sikkim side of the Sino-Indian frontier. These structures have not been in occupation since the cessation of hostilities in November, 1962. Since Chinese Government alleged that some of these structures were on their side of the border, India had in its note of September 12, 1965, gone to the extent of suggesting that an independent Observer be allowed to go to this border to see for himself the actual state of affairs. The Chinese Government has not, unfortunately, accepted this reasonable proposal and has reiterated its proposal for joint inspection. In our reply which is being sent today, we. are informing the Chinese Government that their contention is entirely incorrect. Nevertheless, as an earnest of our desire to give no ground to the Chinese for making this a pretext for aggressive action, we are informing them that we have no objection to a joint inspection of those points of the Sikkim-Tibet border where Indian personnel are alleged to have set up military structures in Tibetan territory. The Government of India on their part are prepared to arrange such an inspection as early as possible, at an appropriate official level, on a mutual convenient date.

We have sent a reply to the Chinese note accordingly and hope that Chinese Government would agree to action being taken as proposed.

I know the House would feel concerned about the intentions of the Chinese Government. We do hope that China would not take advantage of the present situation and attack India. The House may rest assured that we are fully vigilant and that if we are attacked, we shall fight for our freedom with grim determination. The might of China will not deter us from defending our territorial integrity. I shall keep the House informed of further developments.

The following is the text of the Prime Minister's statement on September 20 :

I place on the Table of the House the text of a further note* which was handed over to our Charge d' Affaires in Peking yesterday.

The House will recall that we had taken an attitude calculated to maintain peace when replying to the last note which we had received from the Chinese Government. It is clear from the

258

kind of response which China has sent that what China is looking for is not a redress of grievances, real or imaginary, but some excuse to start its aggressive activities again this time acting in

^{*}Not included.

collusion with its ally, Pakistan. The extension of the time-limit for the ultimatum was, in our view, no more than a device to gain time to watch what comes out of the discussions in the Security Council.

The allegations which China has been making in the series of notes that it has been sending to us, are such that they would hardly justify any civilised Government in having recourse to force, even if the allegations were true. If there are any structures on Chinese territory in areas where the border is delimited and not in dispute even according to the Chinese, surely, there is nothing to prevent the Chinese Government from having them removed, instead of suggesting to us that we should have them removed, which would only be possible by our men going into their territory. Similarly, no one can imagine that any Government would threaten another on the ground that their cattle have been lifted or on the ground that out of the thousands of Tibetans who have sought asylum in this country two or four are being detained here against their wishes.

To justify its aggressive attitude, China is pretending to be a guardian of Asian countries who, according to China, are being bullied by India. The basic objective of China, therefore, is to claim for itself a position of dominance in Asia which no self-respecting nation in Asia is prepared to recognise. Large or small, strong or weak, every country in Asia has the fullest right to preserve its independence and sovereignty on terms of equality. The dominance of the Chinese cannot be accepted by any of them. We reject China's claim to tell us anything about what we should or should not do about Kashmir which is an integral part of India. Our offer of resolving the differences over these minor matters by peaceful moves is still open.

However, China's aggressive intentions are clear from the fact that even while they have in their note extended the time-limit by 72 hours, in actual fact they have started firing at our border posts both in Sikkim and in Ladakh. If China persists in aggression, we shall defend ourselves by all means at our disposal.

CHINA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN

Date : Sep 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE

Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement in Parliament

The following is the text of a statement laid by Shri Dinesh Singh, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, in both the Houses of Parliament, on September 8, 1965. regarding the Second Afro-Asian Conference :

As the Honourable Members are aware, the second Afro-Asian Conference was scheduled to be held at the level of Heads of State/Government at Algiers on the 29th June, preceded by the Conference of Foreign Ministers on the 24th June.

Just before our delegation was to leave Delhi. it was reported that President Ben Bella had been deposed. However, the situation appeared to be stable and the Standing Committee of 15 nations, which meets from time to time to make the arrangements for the conference, held an extraordinary meeting on June 20th and confirmed that the conference would take place as scheduled. The official delegation and four Members of Parliament, therefore, left for Algiers on the morning of the 21st June.

Meanwhile, however, the initial calm in Algeria was disturbed by demonstrations in favour of ex-President Ben Bella. In view of the circumstances in which the conference was going to be held and recent developments in Algeria, 13 Heads of State/Government of countries which were to participate in the Afro-Asian Conference, who were then meeting in London at the Commonwealth Conference, issued an appeal on June 21st to the Algerian Government to postpone the conference. and to take active steps to reconvene the conference as soon as possible. The text of the appeal is at Annexure I.

On the 24th June a further extraordinary meeting of the Standing Committee took place, at which the postponement of the Foreign Ministers' Conference to the 26th afternoon was decided

259

upon, in order to enable delegations, which were on their way, to arrive at Algiers. By this time, the Afro-Asian Commonwealth Heads of State/ Government had renewed their appeal on the 23rd June, stating that since all the Foreign Ministers of Afro-Asian countries were unable to attend the Foreign Ministers' Conference, it would not be competent in such circumstances for the Foreign Ministers then gathered in Algiers to take a decision on behalf of Afro-Asian countries. It would be more appropriate for the Standing Committee to continue its functions, and to announce a new date in due course.

The Indian delegation, which had been in close consultation with most other delegations, (list of delegations is at Annexure II) 35 of whom had arrived in Algiers by that time decided to sponsor along with a number of other countries, a resolution at the Foreign Ministers' Conference on 26th June, which included a tribute to Algeria for the efforts Algeria had made for the holding of the Conference, a reaffirmation of the determination to hold a representative and successful conference at Algiers, and the postponement of the Summit and the Foreign Ministers' Conference. Ceylon, Japan, Laos and Thailand agreed to co-sponsor the resolution.

On the 26th June, at the time that the Foreign Ministers' Conference was to take place, an announcement was made to the effect that in lieu of the Foreign Ministers' Conference, there would be a further extraordinary meeting of the Standing Committee of 15 nations. At this meeting, a resolution was moved by Ethiopia, and cosponsored by Pakistan and adopted without opposition postponing the summit conference to the 5th November and the Foreign Ministers' meeting to the 28th October, 1965. The text of the resolution is at Annexure III. Among the reasons which contributed to the unanimity of approach regarding the postponement of the Conference were the impact of the appeal of the 13 AsianAfrican Heads of State/Government belonging to the Commonwealth for postponement of the conference and the absence of a large majority of African States from the Algiers meeting.

Thus, the Foreign Ministers' Conference scheduled for the 24th and later 26th June was not held. The Standing Committee set up at the Jakarta meeting of 22 Asian-African countries in April, 1964, will continue to make arrangements for the holding of the Afro-Asian Conference on the newly decided dates.

Our stand on the Algiers Conference was that we were ready to participate and to make a constructive contribution to the success of the. conference in forging Afro-Asian unity and cooperation. We had made all our preparations for this purpose. On the announcement by the new Algerian Government and confirmed by the Standing Committee that the Algiers Conference would be held as scheduled, we sent our delegation to Algiers for participating in the conference. Subsequently, there was increasing volume of opinion in favour of postponement of the conference. Many African States which had earlier accepted the invitation to participate in the conference announced their decision not to do so. The final picture on the scheduled date of the Foreign Ministers' meeting was that only about 35 countries out of a total of more than 65 Afro-Asian countries were present in Algiers and the large majority of African countries were absent. In the light of these developments, we felt that the conference should be postponed. The holding of a truncated Afro-Asian conference with very small representation from Africa was likely to bring about a split and a polarisation among Afro-Asian countries rather than serve the interests of Afro-Asian cooperation and solidarity. Our delegation worked hard to secure agreement among other delegations for the acceptance of this view. In this it was successful. It was also able to counteract the efforts of some countries who for their own reasons were determined to hold the conference notwithstanding the absence of a large majority of countries from Africa.

The stand taken by our delegation at the Algiers Conference was appreciated. The Head of the Algerian Government, Colonel Boumedienne, has sent a message to the Prime Minister expressing his appreciation of the positive role played by our delegation at the Algiers Conference.

ANNEXURE I

Text of Appeal

The Heads of State or Government of Ceylon, Gambia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra-Leone, Tanzania. Uganda and Zambia met today to consider the recent developments in Algeria in relation to the forthcoming Afro-Asian Conference commencing on 24th June. In view of the importance of the Conference and its objectives they are of the opinion that it would be preferable to postpone the Afro-Asian Conference for the present. They

260

further suggest that active steps should be taken to reconvene the Conference as soon as possible.

While the Governments, of Ceylon, Gambia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra-Leone, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia recognise that changes which have taken place in Algiers are the exclusive concern of Algerian authorities they nevertheless make an earnest appeal that the life of Mr. Ben-Bella may he spared on humanitarian grounds.

ANNEXURE II

List of Delegations

ASIA

 Japan. 2. Philippines. 3. People's Republic of China. 4. Mongolia. 5. North Korea. 6. North Viet-Nam. 6-A. Viet Cong (SVNLF)*. 7. Thailand. 8. Indonesia. 9. Laos. 10. Nepal.
 India. 12. Pakistan. 13. Ceylon. 14. Afghanistan. 15. Iran. 16. Turkey. 17. Syria.
 Lebanon. 19. Jordan. 20. Saudi Arabia.
 Iraq. 22. Kuwait. 23. Yemen.

AFRICA

U.A.R. 2. Libya. 3. Sudan. 4. Tunisia.
 Algeria. 6. Morocco. 7. Mauretania. 8. Mali.
 Guinea. 10. Cameroon. 11. Ethiopia. 12. Somalia. 13. Senegal.**

ANNEXURE III

Text of Resolution

The Permanent Standing Committee of the second African Asian Conference held an extraordinary session on the 26th June at 7 p.m. Having learnt of and taking into account, the different views of the Heads of African and Asian delegations present in Algiers, the Standing Committee found a general consensus on the following points :

Considering that the mandate given to the Standing Committee by the meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs at Djakarta remains valid till the opening of the Foreign Ministers' Conference,

Considering that the second African Asian Conference should obtain all conditions to achieve success in accordance with the hopes reposed in it by the peoples of Africa and Asia,

Considering that all the requisite conditions have been fulfilled to hold the African Asian Conference on the scheduled dates,

Considering that some delegations whose participation was confirmed, have not yet arrived and this despite the postponement of the Foreign Ministers' Conference,

Considering that the success of the Conference demands the participation on the widest possible basis of African and Asian States,

Considering that the delegations which have come to Algiers wished to ensure the success of the Conference and to express fraternal support for the Algerian people and their heroic struggle :

- 1. Expresses its full satisfaction for the efforts made and sacrifices undertaken by Algeria for the preparation of the Conference.
- 2. Re-affirms that the choice of Algeria as the venue of the Conference is a tribute by the people of Africa and Asia to the Algerian people who have paid a heavy price for the cause of national independence and the triumph of the principles of Bandung.

- 3. Re-affirms its conviction that all African and Asian States must exert their maximum efforts to strengthen Afro-Asian solidarity and consolidate their forces against colonialism, imperialism and neocolonialism.
- 4. Decides the postponement of the Conference of the Afro-Asian Summit, which shall meet in Algiers on the 5th November, 1965, and the preparatory meeting of the Foreign Ministers on October 28th, 1965.
- 5. Calls upon all countries of Africa and Asia to make maximum efforts to ensure the total success of the Afro-Asian Conference.

* Not known in what capacity they were invited.

** Only arrived just in time for Foreign Ministers' Conference which never opened.

261

USA ALGERIA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA JAPAN LAOS THAILAND ETHIOPIA PAKISTAN INDONESIA GHANA KENYA MALAWI NIGER NIGERIA TANZANIA UGANDA ZAMBIA MALAYSIA PHILIPPINES CHINA KOREA NORTH KOREA MONGOLIA NEPAL IRAN SYRIA TURKEY JORDAN LEBANON SAUDI ARABIA IRAQ KUWAIT YEMEN LIBYA SUDAN TUNISIA MALI MOROCCO CAMEROON GUINEA SENEGAL

Date : Sep 01, 1965

October

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vo. XI OCTOBER No. 10

CONTENTS

PAGE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Joint Communique on President's State Visit 263

ETHIOPIA

President Radhakrishnan's State Visit 264 President's. Speech at the Haile Selassie University 265 President's Speech at his Banquet to the Emperor 267 Joint Communique 267

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

President's U.N. Day Broadcast 268 Prime Minister's Message to the Secretary-General on Cease-fire 269 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the General Assembly Debate on World Affairs 270 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the Trusteeship Committee on Southern Rhodesia 277 Syed Mir. Qasim's Statement in the General Assembly on Pakistani Aggression against India 279 Dr. Rafiq Zakaria's Statement in the General Assembly on Pakistani Aggression against India 283 Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in the Political Committee on Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons 289 Shri G. Parthasarathi's Utter to the Secretary-General on the financing of U. N. **Observer** Corps 293 India's Aide-Memoire to the Secretary-General on the Training of Irregulars in Pak-occupied Kashmir 294 India's Reply to Pakistan's Request for Security Council Meeting

295 India's Protest to the Security Council against Pakistan Foreign Minister's Abu ses 295

RUMANIA

Joint Communique on President's Visit 297

SUDAN

First Indo-Sudanese Trade Agreement Signed 298

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Agreement on Supply of Transmitter Signed) 300 Institute of Russian Studies : Agreement Signed 300

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreement Signed 301

YUGOSLAVIA

Joint Communique on President's State Visit 302

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

NORWAY SLOVAKIA ETHIOPIA INDIA USA PAKISTAN SUDAN RUSSIA YUGOSLAVIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Joint Communique on President's State Visit

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued on October 7, 1965 at the end of the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan's State Visit to Czechoslovakia :

In response to an invitation from the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Antonin Novotny, the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, paid a State visit to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic from the 4th to 7th October, 1965.

President Radhakrishnan and party visited Prague and Bratislava and saw aspects of the development and progress of the people of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The warmth of welcome and hospitality extended to President Radhakrishnan in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is a measure of the friendship between the two countries.

During his stay in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, President Radhakrishnan had talks with President Novotny and other Czechoslovak leaders. In the course of the talks, which were held in the traditional atmosphere of friendship and mutual confidence, views were exchanged on the development and the strengthening of relations between the two countries as well as on important international questions.

The two Presidents expressed their great satisfaction at the progress achieved in developing co,operation between the two countries and in promoting political, economic and trade relations and cultural, scientific and technical exchanges. They emphasised the need to develop this cooperation further for the benefit of the two peoples. In this context, they expressed their satisfaction that negotiations for a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation and agreements for further collaboration in scientific and technical matters and in peaceful uses of nuclear energy will soon be concluded. President Radhakrishnan conveyed the thanks of the Government and the people of the Republic of India for the continued assistance in establishing important branches of heavy industry in India.

The two Presidents consider the development of relations between Czechoslovakia and India as evidence of the growing strength of the principles of peaceful coexistence and solidarity, on the basis of which the two countries have effected their friendly and mutually beneficial cooperation. The two Presidents attach special importance to the purposeful and mutually advantageous economic cooperation which contributes to joint efforts to eliminate deformations caused by the colonial system, to liquidate gradually the economic backwardness of developing countries, to raise the living standards of their populations and to level up the standard of the productive forces in developing countries with those in the industrially advanced countries.

The two Presidents noted that there was a common approach to principal international questions, emanating from the common fundamental interests of the peoples of the two countries in the struggle against imperialism and for peace, disarmament and ensuring international security. Both countries strive to promote principles of peaceful coexistence among states with different political and social systems, support the national liberation movements, strive for the liquidation of colonialism in all its forms, and fight for the right of all peoples to independent political and economic development, for eradication of all forms of discrimination and for social progress. The two Presidents agreed that the policy of nonalignment had played a vital role in promoting these objectives and in reducing world tensions and stressed the significance of the non-aligned countries in the maintenance of world peace. They also underlined the importance of the United Nations Organization in the development of international cooperation and maintenance of peace and security, favoured the strengthening of that organization and the enhancement of its effectiveness in accordance with the principles of the Charter, and emphasised the need for membership of all countries and just representation, particularly of newly independent states, in the major bodies of the United Nations.

The two Presidents expressed their deep concern at the aggravation of international tension and denounced the use or the threat of the use of force for effecting political objectives. They also condemned the foreign intervention in the internal affairs of the sovereign states.

263

The two Presidents agreed that the situation in Vietnam was a grave danger to world peace. They expressed their respective views on the subject. They are convinced that the problem of Vietnam should be solved on the basis of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 on Indo-China by respecting the right of the people of Vietnam to decide their town destiny without foreign intervention.

President Radhakrishnan informed President Novotny about the recent armed conflict with Pakistan. President Novotny reaffirmed that Czechoslovakia's stand on the question of Kashmir as officially stated on various occasions, remained unchanged. He expressed his confidence that India and Pakistan would resolve differences in a peaceful way and without foreign intervention, would succeed in developing the present cease-fire into a stable peace and would develop relations of friendship and cooperation.

The two Presidents considered it urgent to intensify efforts aimed at attaining agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They affirmed their determination to coordinate the efforts of the two governments in achieving this goal. They also favoured such measures as the liquidation of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other states, the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the conclusion of a treaty of non-dissemination of such weapons in any form, either directly or indirectly. They believe that such steps would contribute substantially to the alleviation of international tensions, halt the accelerating arms race and restore the necessary confidence among States.

The two Presidents discussed the question of security in Europe and stressed the necessity of a peaceful settlement of the German problem which is of cardinal importance for the maintenance of peace throughout the world.

The two Presidents expressed their strong opposition to the policy of colonialism and imperialism and call upon the colonial powers to implement without delay the United Nations resolutions on this subject and to grant independence to countries under their domination.

The two Presidents expressed their full satisfaction with the visit of President Radhakrishnan and the results of their talks. They expressed their conviction that this visit would contribute to a further promotion of the traditional friendship and the mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries.

President Radhakrishnan thanked President Novotny and the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic for the warm and cordial welcome accorded to him. He renewed the invitation to President Novotny to visit India. President Novotny accepted the invitation with thanks.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA CZECH REPUBLIC USA VIETNAM CHINA SWITZERLAND PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

ETHOPIA

President Radhakrishnan's State Visit

The President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, paid a State visit to Ethiopia from October 10 to 13, 1965. On October 11, a Banquet was given in his honour by His Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia.

Speaking on the occasion, President Radhakrishnan said :

Your Imperial Majesty, Your Excellencies, and distinguished guests,

It has been a source of great pleasure for me and members of my party to have been able to accept the kind invitation of His Imperial Majesty and be with you just now.

In our country and in many parts of the world His Imperial Majesty is admired affectionately and treated as a great and good man. He has suffered for the people of Ethiopia. He led the people in the battle field and when calamity overtook, then he appealed to the conscience of the world; he pleaded with the League of Nations, suffered exile and came back to power and since he came back to power, he has been trying to modernise Ethiopia, to bring to it all the great benefits which the modem industry, economic progress and modern reforms can offer to a people.

264

We have been greatly struck by the fact that though he is a devout Christian, he allows every freedom of thought, expression and belief to Muslims, to the Jews and others who inhabit this land. The calamities which intolerance brings -racial and religious-are to be seen in different Darts of the world and are overcome only by the growth of tolerance and understanding, the spirit which His Imperial Majesty is showing in the administration of his country.

It is true that though we are not an industrially advanced nation, we are cooperating with the people of Ethiopia in a small measure to help them to raise the standard of living of their people. In industrial, educational and military world we have rendered some kind of cooperation.

Your Imperial Majesty referred to the troubles through which we are passing. May I assure you that these are not of our seeking. We did not bring about these troubles. From the beginning an attempt was made to impose a nation's views by the use of arms. You yourself suffered so many calamities here by the aggressive acts of foreign people and you can understand. We were suddenly taken aback when a large number of infiltrators were brought into our part of the country to cause a revolt there and undermine the stability, law and order. Those attempts failed. Then again the process did not end. They crossed the international border and the cease-fire line and used heavy armour, aircraft etc. to again enforce their view. Again they were the first to bomb our cities, first to use their Navy to attack one of our sea ports. In this way we had to defend ourselves when attacked. A State or Government cannot abdicate its function when its very Stability is at stake. And that is all that we are attempting to do. We echo the wishes and belief of Ms Imperial Majesty that an honourable settlement will be reached and that we will be prepared for that. In the

United Nations and other international organisations it will be open for us-for Ethiopia and India to work together to strengthen the bonds of peace, the bonds of friendship of nations and make this world a world worthy of civilised humanity. When we are attacked by brutal weapons etc., it means failure so far as human relations are concerned and we have to admit that failure and look within ourselves with one another and find out where the fault lies and correct that. That is what we all should do. We are born into this world to love and not to hate and destroy. We should work for that goal. We are all pilgrims on that pathway, to the goal of a world without wars, a world of cooperation with one another, in industry, in education, in public life, health reforms, etc.

It is my earnest hope that India and Ethiopia may get closer together and have more opportunities of helping each other and making themselves felt as partners in this one task of achieving a civilised existence on earth for humanity. May I now request you to drink to the health of His Imperial Majesty and to the strengthening of the bonds of friendship between Ethiopia and India.

ETHIOPIA USA INDIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

ETHOPIA

President's Speech at the Haile Selassie University

The President, Dr. Radhakrishnan delivered the following speech at the Haile Selassie University, Addis Ababa, on the occasion of the conferment on him of an honorary degree of Doctor of Letters, on October 12, 1965 :

Your Imperial Majesty and friends, I am very happy to be here in this University atmosphere

because I spent a large part of my life in Universities. The Universities do not know the barriers of race or nationality. Your University, Your Imperial Majesty, from the members you introduced to me, I found, was really international in character. So, in an atmosphere like this, I feel quite happy.

His Imperial Majesty talked about my views on religion. I may tell you that in Asia, Africa, America, Europe and Great Britain, I have spoken in Christian Churches, Muslim Mosques, Buddhist Monasteries, Jewish Senagogues, without any injury to my intellectual conscience or compromise of my spiritual conviction. Wherever I have spoken I stood loyally by the two fundamental principles of true religion-inward awareness, outward compassion. You must deepen your awareness and you must extend the objects of your compassion till they embrace the whole Universe. That is the true essence of religion. Today when violence is increasing where people are trying, to get out of fear, darkness and anxiety, where they are trying to find out new pattern of life to which they can adjust themselves, the University has a great function to play and point out to them the unity of the human race and the unity of knowledge. The house of knowledge cannot be divided against itself. Whatever sciences you may understand and whatever their specialization you may pursue, there is one pursuit which govern all of them and without it nothing can be really intelligible. We are living in an age when different cultures, civilizations, etc., are mingling together. There is a

265

great story you all know by Banyan. There was a house there, the 'House of Interpreters'. it is always kept open, he said and the mission of man cannot be fully discharged unless he is able to interpret one to the other. This interpreting function is a very essential one in this country and in our era. To them, to the creative interpreters, is confined the future destiny of mankind. It is they that have to interpret different cultures and civilizations and make out that we all stem from the same root and have fundamental unity of purpose governing them. The function of the creative interpreter is a great one. Today it is much more important than in any other period. Whatever the cultures which you build, or establish or the civilization you adopt, they sustain themselves by perennial self-renewal. If you do not renew yourself, you stagnate and you pass off and fade out. If you ask the reasons for the decay of civilizations, it is not always external conquest or physical destruction by epidemics, earthquake etc., it is the decay of the human spirit by merely stagnating and not responding to the new challenges which the world faces today. Several societies which suffered from these petrifying traditions which are unable to interpret us. Perpetual self-renewal is the price we have to pay for sustaining ourselves in this world. If we are unable to do it, we will not be able to live in this world. So these different civilizations came together. We have to interpret one to the other, find out what is common between them, what is real unity. That is what we should do.

A University is intended to promote not merely knowledge but wisdom. In the Book of Job, it is said that wisdom is more precious than the rubies. Even the topaz of Ethiopia cannot buy it, even pure gold is not its equivalent. It is something which you acquire by the spending of a few moments in your life when you recollect your thought, when you sink within yourself, get beneath to the layer of your mind, body, etc. and get into the very quick of the nerves and conscience where the Supreme dwells. It is there that you have to get into, contact with your own fundamental reality that dwells there. You may be there if you sink your consciousness. You will then realize that all men are akin to each other and they form one family. Our duty today is to look upon each other as members of one family for the pursuit of wisdom, that true truth which inculcates this. Our own great prophet Gandhi said, 'People say God is truth, I say, Truth is God'. Even the athiest cannot deny it. He may deny God, be cannot deny the pursuit of truth. That is what a University stands for.

I am most grateful to you for the honour you have done me and I may tell you also that this University already international in character and may become the nucleus of the household of God.

While conferring the Degree, His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia said :

Mr. President,

On the occasion of Your Excellency's visit to our country it gives us special pleasure to receive you at this institution itself dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and truth. It is altogether fitting that Your Excellency should be the focus of this occasion, for Your Excellency has yourself since your youth been dedicated to that cause. Your marked achievement to the august rank of professor at the youthful age of twentyeight, your consistent endeavour to pursue knowledge and the numerous books that have flowed from your pen, to this bear witness.

Today more than ever before man realizes the bond of unity that exists within the race; he is endeavouring to employ the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of the ages. He is employing modem science and technology; he is reaping the benefits, however limited, of political and economic unity; and to that extent, he is transcending the age-old barriers that have divided the race so long and is endeavouring to reflect on the welfare not only of himself and his immediate neighbour, but also on the welfare of all the human race. This endeavour is in harmony with the spirit of the mystics of ages gone by. ".....in the mystic traditions of the different religions we have a remarkable unity of the spirit. Whatever religions they may profess they are spiritual kinsmen. While the different religions in their historic forms bind us to limited groups and militate against the development of lovalty to the world community, the mystics have always stood for the fellowship of humanity," so Your Excellency has taught us. And in an effort to carry out this teaching-to pursue truth-to promote those bonds common to the human race, Your Excellency has dedicated your whole life. To free the human race from superstition and fear that originates from ignorance; to enable him. to transcend the apparent obstacles of race and religion, and to help him recognize the blood-ties of the whole human race, Your Excellency has laboured. To this generation, so tormented between modem knowledge and ancient faith, your scrupulous studies have pointed the way by which man may be saved from traditional superstition and modem scepticism.

Were the thoughts of Plato and Socrates. the beliefs of Christianity and Judaism not harmonized with Hindu philosophy; were Yoga and its various stages not exposed to Western thought; had Western. religion and philosophy not been exposed to the philosophy and religion of the East through Your Excellency's persistent endeavour,

266

how much the poorer would human thought have been !

In the history of the human race, those periods which later appeared as great have been the periods when the men and the women belonging to them had transcended the differences that divided them and had recognized in their membership in the human race a common bond, Your Excellency's constant endeavour to challenge this generation to transcend its differences, to recognize its common bond and to work towards a common goal has doubtless made this age pregnant with greatness. It is, therefore, in recognition of these labours that We, with unequalled pleasure, bestow upon Your Excellency the Degree of Doctor of Letters, honoris causa.

ETHIOPIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

ETHOPIA

President's Speech at his Banquet to the Emperor

The following the text of the President's speech at the Banquet given in honour of His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, at Addis Ababa on October 12, 1965 :

Your Imperial Majesty, Your Highnesses, Excellencies and distinguished guests,

The three days we have been here have been most profitable and useful for us. One great

advantage we derived was to know in person His Imperial Majesty. He was for us people at a distance a figure of legend, one who passed through great difficulties and yet never lost faith and ultimately gained his point and recovered his kingdom. What he passed through is well known to you all. We look upon him as a man of great determination, patience, faith, vision and imagination.

The other day I went to the Military Academy here. The instructors were not from this province and the students were not confined to this province. We found them all there. He organized African Unity, and tried to make the African States realize their natural and human resources, and bow with the application of science and technology and with human effort Africa could easily become a prosperous part of the world. How he did it, I was able to get an idea of this evening while I was at the Africa Hall. He gave awards to people who have helped in the progress of Ethiopia. That is what he did in all directions : industrial, economic, literacy. etc.

Again, he had great faith in collective security and international organisation of the United Nations. He sent his forces to Korea, to the Congo and the development which has taken place in this country itself is a manifest testimony to his great administrative ability and imagination. We have learnt a great deal from him. There are some relations between his country and ours and they are cordial and friendly. We have no problems which separate us; all problems unite us.

We believe in respect for all religions. We do not believe in any kind of single theocratic religion which we have to adhere ourselves. We believe in the equality of freedom for all nations. We believe in friendship with every country of the world. We believe in the goal of brotherhood. The African Unity is only a step towards the achievement of the brotherhood of the world, I take it. That is how I have grasped it. In all these ways, he has been of great service and our experience has been a memorable one and we will long remember it. We wish you to drink to the health of His Imperial Majesty, Indo-Ethiopian Friendship and world peace.

Volume No

1995

ETHOPIA

Joint Communique

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued on October 13, 1965 at the end of the President's State visit to Ethiopia :

On the invitation of His Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie I of Ethiopia, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, President of India paid a State visit to Ethiopia from 10th to 13th October 1965. He was accompanied by Shri A. M. Thomas, Minister for Defence Production.

The President of India visited Addis Ababa and Dire Dawa and was present at the graduation ceremony of the Military Academy at Harar. President Radhakrishnan was received everywhere with a warmth and cordiality which were in keeping with the traditional bonds of friendship between the peoples of India and Ethiopia. He was greatly impressed with the many achievements of the people of Ethiopia.

267

The two Heads of States had a most useful exchange of views on matters of mutual concern. There were also present on the Ethiopian side Tsehafi Taezaz Aklilou Habte Wold, Prime Minister and Minister of Pen, Tsehafi Taezaz Tefera Work Kidane Wold, Minister of the Imperial Court, Ato Amanuel Abraham, Minister of Posts, Telephones and Telegraphs, Ato Seyoum Haregot, Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, Doctor Minasie Haile, Vice Minister of Information and Blata Mesfin Ybegashet, Ethiopian Ambassador to India. On the Indian side there were present Shri A. M. Thomas, Minister for Defence Production, Shri Y. D. Gundevia, Secretary to the President, Shri J. K. Atal, Ambassador of India in Ethiopia, and Doctor S. Gopal, Director of the Historical Division in the Ministry of External Affairs.

The talks took place in an atmosphere of frankness and understanding to be expected between two friendly countries which have an identity of views on basic principles or respect for all religions, non-alignment, peaceful co-existence, anti-colonialism and anti-racialism and which are determined to promote international peace and Afro-Asian solidarity.

The President of India conveyed the high regard in which Ms Imperial Majesty was held in India as the high architect of modem Ethiopia and a pioneer of African Unity. Doctor Radhakrishnan also paid warm tribute to the Emperor's efforts in strengthening non-alignment and his readiness, to support the cause of justice and peace in every part of the world.

The two Heads of State were most gratified that co-operation between the two countries is developing successfully in all fields, especially industrialization and community development and that an agreement of friendship and scientific, economic and technical co-operation will soon he concluded.

Recalling the Bandung Principles and the Declaration of the non-aligned countries at Cairo in 1964, the two Heads of State laid particular stress on the principles of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. In this context they declared that traditional and established boundaries of States should be regarded as inviolable. They condemned the threat or use of force in settling territorial or boundary disputes and affirmed that such disputes should be settled by peaceful means and without outside interference.

President Radhakrishnan explained India's recent armed conflict with Pakistan with regard to Kashmir and the attempts of third parties to aggravate the conflict. The President described in detail the process by which Kashmir had become a constituent part of India. In this regard the Emperor supported the principle that selfdetermination should apply only to colonial territories, which have not yet attained their independence and not to parts of sovereign or independent States. The Emperor also appreciated India's efforts to stabilise the present cease-fire. His Imperial Majesty and the President declared their conviction that religion should not be allowed to influence policies anywhere in the world.

The two Heads of State expressed the hope that the second Afro-Asian Conference would strengthen Afro-Asian solidarity. They expressed support for general and complete disarmament under effective international control as vital to the peace and progress of the world and reiterated their full support to the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and the promotion of international co-operation.

President Radhakrishnan thanked His Imperial Majesty for the warm welcome and cordial hospitality accorded to him and his party and invited Ms Imperial Majesty to visit India. His Imperial Majesty accepted the invitation with pleasure.

ETHIOPIA INDIA USA INDONESIA EGYPT PAKISTAN **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN 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, 1965:

Friends, October 24 is celebrated as the United Nations Day all over the world as the United Nations came into existence on October 24, 1945, that is, twenty years ago. The organisation unites the nations in a partnership to make the world free from war and secure in peace. In these twenty years the organisation with agencies attached to it has contributed effectively to the welfare of mankind.

268

There can be no peace in the world as long as more than half the world suffers from hunger, illiteracy and disease. So the United Nations is pledged to the social and economic betterment of mankind. In the last twenty years it has achieved to a considerable extent the spread of education, health and technical assistance. We may recall that the United Nations has supplied the peace keeping force in the Congo, assisted in the peaceful solution of West New Guinea (West irian) between Indonesia and the Netherlands, negotiated a cease-fire agreement between Arab States and Israel. It intervened to arrange a cease-fire agreement between the Greek and the Turkish communities in Cyprus. It is today engaged in negotiating a cease-fire agreement between India and Pakistan. It is our hope that the United Nations will exercise its great power with a due sense of responsibility in a world where big powers are inclined to exert pressure in their own interests or prejudices. If the United Nations acts with justice, confidence will increase in the world that she is the servant of all nations and not a mere instrument of the big powers.

Our faith in the United Nations is illustrated by our work in the United Nations and its agencies, on the several commissions and committees. As early as 1953-54, India was appointed Chairman of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission in Korea; and, more recently, our troops have gone out to Gaza and the Congo for peacekeeping operations at the behest of the United Nations. The United Nations is for us a symbol of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world for peaceful and constructive international relations.

A major nuclear war has been averted till now. A direct line of communication between Washington and Moscow is set up to avert any armed conflict due, to misunderstanding. The nuclear test ban treaty which prohibits all nuclear explosions except those underground is ratified by many nations and way lead to complete disarmament under effective international control. The co-operation between the two great nuclear powers in space research and other fields may extend to other matters and help to avert a nuclear catastrophe.

A Disarmament Commission is meeting in Geneva. We aim at the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This can become effective only if the nuclear powers undertake not to deliver them in any form, directly or indirectly, to nonnuclear powers. China is also a nuclear power, but she is not a member of the United Nations. It is our hope that China will not use her nuclear power in wanton disregard of human life. and world opinion.

The United Nations is committed to the creation of a world order based not on a precarious peace of checks and balances or on fear of one another but on the rule of law and the sense of justice.

If the United Nations has not been as successful as some of us hoped, the fault is not with the organisation as with the members who constitute it. The United Nations reflects the realities of the world in which we live. For one thing, it has moral authority but no coercive power.

While we strive for a world without war, we recognise that so long as men remain weak and wicked, and nations are aggressive and adventurous we should have defensive arms. We should attempt to raise the quality of men and nations and create friendliness and spirit of brotherhood among nations and not produce bad blood and nourish ill feelings. We have to remove anger and hate from our minds. In the long run human beings have to be moved to desire peace above all things. We should be prepared to make sacrifices of privilege and possition, power and prejudice, if peace is to be attained. May we all have the wisdom, the courage and the strength for it.

INDIA CONGO GUINEA INDONESIA THE NETHERLANDS ISRAEL CYPRUS USA PAKISTAN KOREA RUSSIA SWITZERLAND CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Message to the Secretary-General on Ceasefire

The following. is the text of a message dated October 18, 1965 from the Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, to U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, on the question of stabilisation of the Cease-fire :

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your message of October 14, in which you have expressed your concern that the withdrawals foreseen in the Security Council Resolutions have not taken place, and have requested the Government of India to take the necessary steps to bring about the withdrawals called for in the Security Council Resolutions. You have also indicated that the cease-fire which was accepted by both sides was becoming increasingly effective. and that, therefore, the subsequent step of withdrawal by both parties should now be undertaken.

To begin with, Pakistan has shown no inclination to observe the cease-fire agreed to under paragraph 1 of the Resolution of September 20. In its letter of September 26, 1965, document No. S/6715, the Pakistan Government through its Permanent Representative, has taken the position that military disengagement should proceed

269

concurrently with an honourable political settlement. He has further stated that without selfexecuting arrangements and procedures for a settlement "it is hard to envisage an effective programme for the withdrawal of forces". The conditions and reservations made in the Pakistan Government's communication in regard to disengagement and withdrawal of forces are amply reflected in Pakistan's attitude in the field towards the observance of ceasefire. Furthermore, Pakistan has not only shown no intention to undertake responsibility for withdrawal of its armed personnel whom it sent to Kashmir in civilian clothes, it is, as we have informed you, undertaking massive preparation and training of persons in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir for being sent again into Jammu & Kashmir as armed infiltrators. We have brought to your attention numerous violations of ceasefire by Pakistan, including the latest serious ceasefire violation involved in an attack by four Pakistani fighter bombers on the Indian village of Bandah, 36 miles within Indian territory in Rajasthan on October 13. So long as Pakistan continues to show scant regard for the ceasefire, it is difficult to see how paragraph 1 of the Security Council Resolution can be properly implemented.

According to the Resolution of the Security Council of September 20, the question of withdrawals has to be taken up only after the ceasetire has been effectively established. While I commend the efforts made by yourself and your observers to secure a real and effective ceasefire, I fear we are still far away from the realization of this objective.

On our part we have accepted the ceasefire without any preconditions or reservations. We are anxious that an effective ceasefire should be established immediately. I understand efforts are being made by the observers to convene a meeting of military commanders with a view to reaching agreement regarding fixation of the ceasefire positions.

I would invite your attention to my letter of September 28, 1965, in which the position of my Government has been made clear. We feel that since a cease-fire has not yet been effectively established, the stage for a planned schedule of withdrawals over the entire area of conflict has not yet arrived. The local commanders in particular areas should first meet under the auspices of the Observers and enter into discussions with a view to reaching agreement on the stabilisation of the ceasefire. Thereafter, we are agreeable to appropriate representatives of India and Pakistan meeting in the sub-continent to consider the question of withdrawals, together with the Chief Military Observer of the UNMOGIP whom you have entrusted with overseeing the operations.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date** : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the General Assembly Debate on World Affairs

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the general debate of the U.N. General Assembly on International Affairs on October 12, 1965 :

The election of His Excellency Amintore Fanfani, Foreign Minister of Italy, as President of the twentieth session of the General Assembly has been a source of great satisfaction to us. His election to this high office was a tribute to the great country which he represents and also a testimony to the high esteem in which Foreign Minister Fanfani is personally held by us all. The Government and the people of India have close and friendly relations with the Government and the people of Italy. It is, therefore, with particular sorrow that my delegation learnt of the accident suffered by the President of our Assembly a couple of days ago. We wish his speedy recovery and hope that he will return to preside over our meetings with renewed vigour.

I should also like to take this opportunity to place on record our appreciation of the work done by His Excellency Mr. Alex Quaison-Sackey, the Foreign Minister of Ghana, who presided over the nineteenth session of the General Assembly with such distinction under the most trying and unusual circumstances.

I wish also to welcome to the United Nations the delegations of the Gambia, the Maldive Islands and Singapore. Wtih the addition of these three sister Afro-Asian States, the membership of the United Nations has risen to 117 and we have come nearer to our goal of universality. In the tradition of Afro-Asian co-operation my delegation looks forward to close collaboration and association with the delegations of the Gambia, the Maldive Islands and Singapore both in the United Nations and outside. We wish the people of these countries all progress and prosperity.

UNITED NATIONS

Since I spoke in this Assembly last year, our Organization has passed through a period of much travail and uncertainty, as well as a sharp controversy which could have shaken it to its very foundations. I say this because the controversy which immobilized this great Assembly had

270

financial, constitutional and political aspects. The very fact that the protagonists on the two sides of this debate refused to allow the struggle to be fought to the bitter end and rather permitted a consensus to grow, and that finally both sides bowed to that consensus, showed that they were determined to preserve the Organization. It would be idle to pretend that that period of forced inactivity of the Assembly, and the underlying difference of opinion between the two super Powers, has not affected us all. But equally we must recognize that it has had the effect of focussing the attention of the peoples of the world on the weakness as well as the strength of this house which we have all built, brick by brick. That it was in this year of internal crises of the organization that for the first time a Member State pulled out of it must be considered unfortunate; it is also a portent and a warning. This withdrawal is being exploited by another Member State, which seems to find the responsibility of fulfilling its obligations under the Charter too onerous. All these years that we have spent in striving to bring the Organization closer to our goal of universality would have gone in vain if in addition to the withdrawals of Member States from the Organization, those who are yet to join us were to start prescribing conditions for their own participation-conditions which the Organization, they demand, must fulfil before they will join it. The need for the participation of the People's Republic of China in all the activities of the Organization is obvious; and time and again my delegation has supported moves in this direction. It is also clear that Indonesia should return to the fold. Equally obvious, however,

is the fact that the Organization could not survive if it were to give in to threats or accept conditions. The coming months, years and decades should be able to show whether the peoples of the world, dreading the scourge of war, have acquired the maturity and the seriousness of purpose which are essential for the preservation of peace, so that to them forbearance is not merely a necessity but a principle.

TERRITORIAL AGGRANDIZEMENT

The trouble spots of the world and violent interference in the affairs of others have mostly arisen because States have not refrained in their international relations from resorting to threats or to the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of other States. The desire for territorial aggrandizement and the chauvinism of certain States has led to the repeated use of force despite the clearly enunciated principles in the Charter of the United Nations. The Policy of confrontation with the State of Malaysia is one example. Hardly had that State come into being when it was faced with threats of annihilation backed up by penetration of armed infiltrators. While our desire to maintain friendly relations with Indonesia is sincere, our sympathies are with the peace-loving State of Malaysia it its hour of need.

CYPRUS

For two years now the brave people of Cyprus have been facing interference from without, armed and otherwise-intereference designed at best to curb the sovereignty and independence of the State of Cyprus and at worst to partition the Island along sectarian lines. We in India were subjected to this cursed process decades ago culminating in the partition of the country in 1947. As we have all seen, partition only creates new problems. We, therefore, view with the utmost sympathy the efforts of the Government of Cyprus to maintain the unfettered sovereignty, independence and unity of the State of Cyprus.

THREATS FROM CHINA

Our own experience in the past few months with two powerful neighbours has shown us that there is still a strong urge in those two countries to take recourse to arms. Twice in the last months my country and my people have faced blatant and adventurist aggression from Pakistan. During the same period we have faced ultimatums and serious threats of aggression from the People's Republic of China. It is clearly established that there was a sinister connexion between the aggression of one and the ultimatums of the other. These two forces of reaction, fanaticism and violence seem determined to combine against all those values which we cherish. It appears to us that these dictatorships next to us abhor the prospect of our success in combining the democratic way of life with planned economic growth. The world is aware that we have all along been firm adherents of the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. It was with this faith, and in the secure trust that aggression and trespass against us, if only brought to the notice of the United Nations, would be effectively tackled, that we continued to concentrate on the task of improving the standard of living of our own people. However, the inability of the United Nations and of the international community to condemn the aggressor and lend succour to the victim of aggression has caused us deep disappointment. In our case, as in other areas, especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, peace and justice have been the victims of intertional power politics.

PAKISTANI AGGRESSION

I mentioned a moment ago how, within the last months, we have twice become the victims of Pakistani aggression. The first time was in April last, when Pakistan surreptitiously moved its forces into the Rann of Kutch and later, with

271

heavy armour, took certain posts well within our territory in that area. Our only fault there was that, while defending ourselves, we refused to allow the strife to be escalated. For the sake of peace and we establishment of good-neighbourly relations we indicated to Pakistan ourselves and through others that we were prepared to exercise the utmost restraint in spite of grave provocation. Thus once again we gave proof of our earnest desire to reduce tensions and of our willingness to resolve differences between our two countries. It was the same spirit which had moved our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, on 28 November 1950 to offer Pakistan unconditionally a nowar pact, an offer which was renewed by Prime Minister Shastri last year. Pakistan's aggression in the Rann of Kutch and in Kashmir this year reveals why it has consistently refused to accept an offer of this nature.

It was in this larger context that we signed, on 30 June 1965, the Agreement on the Rann of Kutch, a boundary dispute born out of the spurious claims made by Pakistan. Pakistan mistook our readiness to arrive at a peaceful settlement, our self-restraint, as a sign of weakness.

Even before the ink was dry on the Pakistani signatures on this agreement, Pakistan commenced on 5 August a fresh and major aggression on India. In fact, while the Kutch Agreement was being signed, preparations were already in full swing in Pakistan to send across the old Cease-Fire Line thousands of troops in civilian disguise. Starting on 5 August 1965, this aggression continued unchecked and unabated despite the fact that India promptly took it up with Pakistan. India brought this to the attention of the United Nations Chief Military Observer, General Nimmo; the Chief Military Observer brought it to the attention of the Secretary-General; and finally, the Secretary-General himself brought it to the notice of the Security Council on 3 September. Pakistan's replies were a bland denial of responsibility, a familiar techniques adopted by aggressors. Between 5 August and 14 August, we showed the utmost forbearance and self-restraint. hoping that our protests to Pakistan and the reports of the United Nations Observers about the massive assault on the Cease-Fire Line would have some effect. For ten long days while armed marauders were on the rampage, we kept hoping that good sense might prevail, that good advice might be forthcoming, and that pressures for peace might emanate from the United Nations. In the meanwhile, our brave people in Kashmir threw some of the infiltrators out and rounded up a good number. But as some of them were being dealt with, more armed aggressors in civilian disguise came in, wave after wave, each one equipped with band-grenades, rifles, Sten-guns and other automatic weapons as well as material for sabotage and incendiary action. Conclusive evidence was forthcoming from these armed personnel captured by us to show that thousands

more were poised for further infiltration. in order to meet this continuing aggression, our Security Forces, in an entirely defensive and limited action, moved to block the routes and plug the passes in that mountainous terrain through which the infiltrators were coming.

PAK PLAN TO GRAB KASHMIR

Clearly, the rulers of Rawalpindi, engaged in a planned campaign to subjugate our people and grab our territory in Kashmir, entertained the wild hope that the people would rise in revolt. When this hope was shattered and the people of Kashmir fought the armed marauders manfully and with valour, the rulers of Rawalpindi decided to turn their violent political gamble into a fullscale military adventure. On 1 September Pakistan crossed the international boundary and the old Cease-Fire Line, causing the uprooting of thousands of people and posing a grave and imminent, threat to the only line of communication between the State of Jammu and Kashmir and the rest of India. This line of communication was the road to Ladakh in North Eastern Kashmir, where the Indian troops, ever since the Chinese invasion of 1962, have safeguarded the cause of liberty at the price of eternal vigilance. Pakistan crossed into our territory with the maximum force and fanfare. A force of two regiments of heavy tanks, supported by Pakistan infantry and with air cover, penetrated twelve to fifteen miles within Indian territory, while the Commander-in-Chief of Pakistan, General Musa, exhorted his troops to bite the enemy deeper in order to destroy him. On 5 September they extended the area of conflict by undertaking aerial bombing of the town of Ranbirsinghpura in Jammu and the city of Amritsar in the Punjab. It was then that India took action in self-defence.

I have gone into this matter in some detail because I want to inform this Assembly of the anatomy of this. second agression by Pakistan against India. In defence of the motherland against this treacherous aggression, our armed forces displayed rare courage and valour in the face of superior weaponry, thwarting the design of the Pakistani aggressor to grab our territory. The whole country, all my countrymen of all faiths, stood as one man in the defence of the motherland. This was the biggest disappointment to and defeat for Pakistan, which had pinned its hopes on the emergence of forces of discord and disintegration in India.

INDIA'S DESIRE FOR LASTING PEACE

Some of the representatives have expressed concern about the armed conflict between India and Pakistan. We fully share their concern, as indeed we appreciate their sincere desire for lasting peace between our two countries. This con-

272

flict is not of our seeking; at no time have we sought it. Eighteen years ago we came to the United Nations as complainant against Pakistani aggression. Our approach to the United Nations is a testimony to our faith in peaceful methods of resolving situations. In that faith we have tried every possible method to develop and maintain friendly relations with Pakistan. it was in that faith that we tried our utmost to prevent the present conflict from escalating and promptly responded to the appeal of the Secretary-General and the Security Council for an unconditional cease-fire.

As the representatives will appreciate, peaceful and friendly relations among States are not possible without a genuine respect for the rule of law, and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of one's neighbours. Three times in eighteen years Pakistan resorted to the use of force against India, contrary to its obligations under the Charter.

A lasting peace between India and Pakistan cannot be brought about by ignoring these facts, much less by appeasing the aggressor, it is, therefore, necessary for me to make my Government's position clear beyond any shadow of doubt. Legally, constitutionally, morally and on the basis of the will of the people, the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union. This is the position on which India takes its stand and will continue to do so. The people of Jammu and Kashmir, together with their fellow citizens in other parts of India are the architects of the largest democratic State in the world, a State rooted in popular will expressed through freely chosen institutions and periodic general elections, based on adult franchise. There is no better way of giving reality to the freedom of the people.

While Pakistan pursues the path of violence and aggression, while it talks to us and to the United Nations in terms of threats and while it attempts to enlarge the struggle on our northern frontiers. we cannot do any less than defend ourselves. But let Pakistan think in terms of taking covetous eyes off our territory, let Pakistan think in terms of not trying to undermine or erode the territorial integrity and secular democracy of our country, and it will find in us the friendliest and the most cc-operative of neighbours ready to resolve our differences.

COLONIALISM

Although we have been preoccupied with our own immediate and pressing problems, I wish to assure this Assembly that the major problems of the world, such as decolonization, apartheid, disarmament and economic development of the less developed world, are very much in our thoughts. When India threw off the shackles of colonial rule in 1947, the shape of the world changed, a historic event which released the forces of freedom and progress. As a founder Member of the United Nations, India took the initiative in pressing for the liberation of subject peoples everywhere in the world. In the Trusteeship Council, in the Fourth Committee and in the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, my delegation persistently championed the cause of freedom and independence and exposed the misdeeds of the colonialists in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In the early years we were in a minority and the imperialist and colonialist Powers controlled and managed even the agenda and the discussions in the United Nations. It was an uphill task even to get items relating to apartheid and colonialism included in the agenda of the General Assembly. I am happy to say that in this regard the United Nations has made very great progress and the colonial Powers can no longer manipulate the agenda of the General Assembly or mislead it into believing that conditions in Southern Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola, Aden and other colonial territories, are by any means satisfactory.

In December 1960, the General Assembly adopted the historic Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and in 1961 the Assembly established the Special Committee on Decolonization, with which we have been intimately associated. The discussions in this Committee have exposed to the world the appalling conditions that prevail in the remaining colonial territories, and it is to the work of this Committee that the peoples in colonial territories have looked for hope and inspiration. The resolutions adopted by the Committee as a result of sustained and dedicated efforts of its Afro-Asian members, have had beneficial results. But the hard core of colonialism still remains entrenched in Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea. It is not fortuitous that the Governments of Southern Rhodesia, Portugal and South Africa are colluding to suppress the indigenous people in denying their freedom and fundamental rights. South Africa continues unabashed its policies of apartheid in defiance of world opinion and has gone further by extending them to the mandated territory of South West Africa. It was my delegation which first brought this question of South West Africa before the United Nations and the people of South West Africa have our full sympathy and support in their struggle against the South African racist regime. India has not only disapproved of and condemned Portuguese colonialism. but we have taken positive action against the colonial Powers. The freedom struggle in Angola and Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea is a source of inspiration to freedom loving peoples and we hope that all Member States will give their full support to the resolutions adopted by the Special Committee during its tour of Africa in May-June this year.

273

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Equally dangerous and ominous is the situation in Southern Rhodesia where a white minority regime is allowed to continue its repressive rule over a vast African population against its wishes. The equivocal posture adopted by the United Kingdom with regard to Southern Rhodesia is as disappointing as it is regrettable, The United Kingdom is responsible for the administration of the colony of Southern Rhodesia and it must take steps to see that Southern Rhodesia gets independence without delay under a government which is fully representative of the people of the territory, a Government that is elected on the basis of one man, one vote. It is for the Government of the United Kingdom to see that all repressive legislation is withdrawn and freedom fighters released from prisons.

SUPPORT FOR FREEDOM OF COLONIAL PEOPLES

The territories of British Guiana, Mauritius and Fiji are ripe for independence and freedom. But the traditional divisive policies of the United Kingdom have resulted in creating tensions among the peoples thus retarding their emergence into freedom. We are gravely concerned at the recent developments in Aden where the Constitution has been abrogated and a reign of terror and repression unleashed to suppress the brave Arabs struggling for their freedom. It is the duty of the United Kingdom Government to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) so that the people in Aden, British Guiana, Fiji, Mauritius, Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland and many other territories attain their independence immediately. It is no use telling the world that they have given independence to 700 million people during the last twenty years. Freedom is never given by colonial Powers. It is taken by colonial peoples after hard and bitter struggle and it is extraordinary that the colonial Powers should take credit for this. As long as there are any people anywhere in the world who are not yet free and independent, India will continue to fight for their rights and freedom.

APARTHEID

One of the issues that has long been a source of great concern to India is the question of the racial policies of the Republic of South Africa. The pernicious policies of apartheid provide the most explosive material for conflict and cut at the very root of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights, and are contrary to civilized behaviour.

We in India have been associated with the struggle for racial equality in South Africa for the past sixty years. The name of Mahatma Gandhi is synonymous with this struggle. We first brought up this matter before the United Nations in 1946 and we were the first country to break diplomatic, commercial and trade relations with South Africa. Even long before General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) was passed, we had adopted the measures enumerated in that resolution. It is a matter of regret to us that many countries continue to have commercial, trade and other contacts with the Government of South Africa, thus assisting that Government in its ruthless suppression of the indigenous people. To the powerful Western friends of South Africa, we address an appeal to carry out the provisions of that resolution and undertake an economic boycott of South Africa. Unless those countries put into practice what they have said in this Assembly, the South African Government will not change its policies because an economic boycott merely by the countries of Africa and Asia will not put sufficient pressure on that Government to alter its racist policies.

My delegation promptly responded to the appeal of the Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid to give financial assistance to the families of the victims among those valiant fighters against racism. We hope and trust that all members of this Assembly will respond to that appeal and give generously to this fund.

The people and the Government of India fully support the just struggle of the people of South Africa and are determined to give them whatever support they need.

DISARMAMENT

The goal of a world without arms and wars continues to remain one of the primary objectives before the international community. The General Assembly has since its very inception given its most earnest consideration to the problems of disarmament and measures aimed at the lessening of international tension. It is true that the progress achieved so far has been somewhat slow, but this is to some extent inevitable. because the goal of a disarmed world is completely unprecedented in the history of mankind. Again, disarmament is a highly complex matter and requires patient, careful and serious examination, which has to take account of security and other vital considerations.

The question of disarmament has been considered in various forums and some limited agreements have been reached. One of the most constructive debates took place recently in April-June 1965 in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which comprises the entire membership of the United Nations and thus represents the aspirations and anxieties of the international community. The Disarmament Commission, in its two resolutions, laid down useful guideline, and provided a fresh mandate, particularly in

274

regard to priorities, to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament for its work as a negotiating body.

The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, which is holding a continuing conference since 1962, has just concluded a six-week session. As at its past sessions, the Committee considered in a thorough manner the questions of general and complete disarmament and measures aimed at the lessening of international tension. In particular, the Committee devoted its concentrated attention to the questions of a comprehensive test ban treaty and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. India took an active part in these discussions and along with the other nonaligned members submitted joint memoranda containing proposals, which could form the basis of agreements on these two most important issues in the field of disarmament body.

NUCLEAR TESTS

The Assembly is aware of the deep anxiety with which my country has viewed the continuance of nuclear tests, the initiatives that we have taken and the persistent efforts that we have made to secure a complete prohibition of all nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons test explosions for all time. My Government was, therefore, gratified when the Partial Test Ban Treaty was concluded and was not only one of the first to subscribe to it, but has striven to secure its adherence by all countries and also its extension so as to cover underground tests as well. We are firmly of the view that the Treaty should receive universal adherence so that the present and future generations of mankind are saved the grave damage to their health from the deadly fall-out and a curb is placed on the nuclear arms race. It is a matter of profound regret to my delegation that the People's Republic of China,

along with certain other countries, has not so far considered it necessary to accede to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty. The nuclear test by China earlier this year, at a time when the Disarmament Commission was meeting in New York, can only be regarded as a deliberate affront to the world community.

As regards underground nuclear tests, we believe that, notwithstanding differences among nuclear Powers regarding the question of identification and the need for verification, a partial treaty could be entered into for cessation of tests above a certain threshold, which could be agreed upon by the nuclear Powers. This threshold could be lowered subsequently as a result of the continuing exchange of scientific data and other negotiations. At the same time, we consider it imperative that while negotiations are going on to resolve the differences between the nuclear Powers, all underground tests should be discontinued forthwith.

NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

My delegation also feels that the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be accorded high priority. It was at Indian's request that an item on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons had been included in the agenda of the last session of the General Assembly and we welcome the initiative of the Soviet Union in this matter at the current session. Even though my country has possessed the capacity for quite some time now to manufacture nuclear weapons, we have refrained from doing so. We believe that not only any further proliferation of nuclear weapon capabilities should be checked but the existing proliferation should be reversed.

My country has made certain specific proposals in this regard at the conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, and I would not like to repeat them here. I would, however, reiterate our firm conviction that the only practical approach to this problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is that both the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers should undertake simultaneous obligations through an international instrument that might be agreed upon. It is essential that, while the non-nuclear Powers renounce production, acquisition and control of and access to nuclear weapons, the nuclear Powers should also refrain simultaneously from further production of these weapons and their delivery vehicles and reach agreement on a reduction of existing stockpiles. That would really be the essence of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

The Disarmament Commission, to which I referred earlier, has recommended to the Assembly, vide its resolution DC/224, to consider urgently the proposal made by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Cairo in October 1964, for the convening of a World Disarmament Conference to which all countries would be invited. My delegation was a co-sponsor of the resolution approved by the Disarmament Commission. We consider it important that the World Disarmament Conference should take place as early as possible and that France and the People's Republic of China should take part in it.

My delegation earnestly hopes that the discussion on disarmament in the First Committee will be fruitful, so that, when the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament reconvenes in Geneva soon after the debate here, it may be able to reach agreements on a comprehensive test ban and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and thereby make possible more agreements in the field of disarmament.

275

DEVELOPMENT DECADE

I have spoken at some length on the political problems that confront this Organization. These are no doubt urgent problems that require our utmost attention. But the solution of these problems is not an end in itself; it is only a means towards the achievement of a higher objective, an objective which is solemnly enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, namely, the promotion of "the economic and social advancement of all peoples". It was for the fulfilment of this objective that the General Assembly designated the current decade as the United Nations Development Decade. We have already reached the mid-point of the Development Decade. It is time for us to take stock of our achievements during the first half of the Decade and to draw up a plan of action for the second half.

Although the United Nations and its agencies have been making ceaseless efforts for the attainment of the goals which we set for ourselves for the Development Decade, the progress so far has been painfully slow. That we shall have to intensify our efforts considerably in this direction if we expect to come within slight of our goals cannot be better emphasized than by recalling the poignant words of the distinguished Secretary-General in his address to the thirtyninth session of the Economic and Social Council :

"The misery of the developing world is a progressive misery. It threatens to grow worse in the second half of the Decade."

And again, in his report to the current session of the General Assembly, he has reminded us that "shocking disparities in conditions and levels of living" continue to persist. But let these words not lead us into despair and inaction; on the contrary, they should goad us into more intensified activity to meet the challenge that faces its of removing the spectre of poverty from the world and making it a better place to live For all peoples.

UN CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

The developing countries of the world, which are struggling hard to improve their economic conditions, had placed very high hopes in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which for the first time focussed attention in a unified manner on their problems in the various fields and called for an integrated approach to their solution on the part of the developing as well as the developed countries. These hopes and aspirations found eloquent expression in the Final Act of the Conference. Since then, some progress has been made in implementing the recommendations contained in the Final Act with regard to the setting up of the organizational machinery. The Trade and Development Board has held two sessions and the various committees set up by the Board have started functioning. However, as the Secretary-General has pointed out in his report to the

General Assembly, despite the progress made in the organizational and administrative field, the hopes generated in the developing countries by the agreements reached in Geneva have not been fulfilled. The organizational machinery added to the United Nations family at the last session of the General Assembly got off to a good start at the first session of the Trade and Development Board, which devised the means to launch the new machinery. But, unfortunately, the Board at its second session found itself confronted with serious difficulties because of our inability to organize ourselves with enough courage, purpose and coherence to create a society in which the fruits of progress are more equally shared. We sincerely hope that the developed countries will adopt a more constructive attitude and will take the initiative in dispelling the clouds of doubt which engulfed the second session of the Board.

CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

My delegation will address itself in some detail to the various issues related to economic development in the deliberations of the Second Committee. At this stage, I would like to make a general reference to one or two important issues which are likely to come up for decision at this session. One such issue is the establishment of the proposed Capital Development Fund which has been recommended by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. My delegation feels that it would be useful to have such a fund, which could provide capital assistance to the. developing countries in the form of grants and "soft loans". While I am on the subject of economic assistance to developing countries, I would like to pay a tribute to the successful activities of the-Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, which continue to make an invaluable contribution to the development effort of the developing countries. We support the Secretary-General's call for increasing the annual target for voluntary contributions to the two programmes to \$200 million. We also welcome the progress made in the establishment of the Asian Development Bank, which can play a very useful role in the economic development of Asia.

SPECIALIZED AGENCY FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOP-MENT

Another important decision which this Assembly will be called upon to take is the proposed establishment of a Specialized Agency for Industrial Development, which has also been recommended by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. My delegation expresses

276

the hope that the examination by the General Assembly of the recommendations on the subject by the Conference on Trade and Development and the Economic and Social Council will lead to the prompt establishment of the Agency for Industrial Development, which could provide effective assistance to the developing countries in the promotion and acceleration of their industrial development.

I have come to the end of my review of the urgent problems of the world, more particularly problems of our own region, as they appear to us and as we prepare to face them-problems of defence and disarmament, politics and international intercourse, economic relations and developmental activities. And now I ask myself where exactly the United Nations stands, twenty years after the founding of the Organization. It is clear that these twenty years have seen both the rise and the decline of monolithic systemsin the field of defence as well as in the field of international trade and economics. I would make bold to say that the winds that sweep our globe are not winds that can be characterized as either East wind or West wind. North wind or South wind. They are winds of co-operation and cohesiveness, on the one hand, and winds of confrontation and fragmentation, on the other.

THREAT OF DISINTEGRATION

On the one band, in our world, there is an effort to build and consolidate institutions which make economic co-operation and collaboration workable, first on a regional and then on a global basis; there is an attempt to draw a tally of bow much conservation of resources that can be utilized for the have-nots of our earth is possible, if only the dream of total disarmament can be made a reality. Thus we keep working to safeguard liberties through opposition to fragmentation. On the other hand, there is at work the classic dictum, "Separate your enemies, sow seeds of disintegration in their midst, and then finish them oil one by one". The new nation-States of Africa and Asia are thus facing, even before they have had a chance to consolidate their freedom, this threat of disintegration, because there are in the world adventurist Powers, self-styled revolutionaries, who, hearkening back to primeval instincts of sectional and religious loyalties, wish to do nothing so much as to scatter the seeds of disruption and disintegration as far and as wide as they possibly can.

We in India have had some experience of fighting these attempts to divide us through hearkening to religious loyalties. We are determined to be on the side of those forces in this world which work for co-operation and collaboration for the purpose of consolidating and conserving resources for growth on a regional and global basis. We view the United Nations as a symbol of these principle, of co-operation, collaboration and consolidation. And we see the United Nations as a rallying point for all progressive forces opposing the attempts to fragment new nations.

INDIA ITALY USA GHANA THE GAMBIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE CHINA INDONESIA MALAYSIA CYPRUS PAKISTAN ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA MAURITIUS FIJI SWAZILAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA EGYPT FRANCE SWITZERLAND

Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the Trusteeship Committee on Southern Rhodesia

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee on October 8, 1965 on Southern Rhodesia:

Mr. Chairman,

At the outset I would like to take this opportunity to express my most sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this Committee. I would also like to express my sincere greetings and congratulations to Mr. Bruce of Togo, Vice-Chairman of this Committee. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of great satisfaction for my delegation that a member of the Indian delegation has been unanimously elected Rapporteur of this Committee.

My delegation attaches great importance to the discussions in this Committee. It is a matter of no mean pride to many of us to have participated in the proceedings of this Committee, a Committee which, if I may say so. has many a time shared the sorrows and sufferings of the people under colonial exploitation. This Committee has also been, from time to time, inspired by the hopes, aspirations and achievements of people under great stress and intense pressures. This Committee has expressed, above all, the bond of common endeavour in attempting to make real in all its dimensions and richness the true destiny of man, irrespective of class, colour or creed and to persistently proclaim the unity of man in freedom

Mr. Chairman, the task to which this Committee has devoted itself, the task of decolonisation, is not yet complete. Much remains to be done. Forces of reaction and disruption not only lurk in odd corners of our world but at special points of advantage to them muster strength. We must and we will unitedly and determinedly fight them. This battle is twofold, firstly, a fight for the basic political and economic freedom of peoples as in Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola,

277

South-Arabia, South Africa, South West Africa, etc., secondly, a mighty struggle to break the bonds of neo-colonialism that encourage reactionary forces of racism, religious fanaticism, economic dependence and general instability to secure its interests and perpetuate its position in economic and strategic fields.

Mr. Chairman, the task of consolidating our freedom and, it I may so put it, of "defusing" the various "time-bombs" left by the colonialists to

disrupt our societies and weaken them is often as difficult, if not more so than that of our freedom struggle. Often the United Nations has had to intervene in this fight. With the attainment of our independence, we often experience that the strategic and economic interests of power politics of the erstwhile colonial powers assume a more subtle form but nevertheless continue to hinder a normal and rapid progress of the newly independent countries. In the process of planning for our economic development, in the process of consolidating our freedom, we have all, from time to time, come across this unfortunate experience.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the task of decolonisation is yet incomplete.

To take some specific and poignant examples: in Southern Rhodesia the conditions are becoming more and more insufferable day by day. The situation is not only explosive but a serious danger to international peace. Here all the elements of racism, reaction disunity, fanaticism and of exploitation of man by man are being encouraged and concentrated. Here it is being planned that Angola, Mozambique, South West Africa be kept in one form or another in perpetual bondage.

As regards Southern Rhodesia, our contention is that legally, constitutionally, politically and morally Great Britain is responsible for the situation in Southern Rhodesia. As long as full freedom is not granted to all the people of that country, we maintain that the Government of Great Britain cannot and must not abdicate her responsibility in that territory. The legal arguments put forward by the U.K. about their inability to interfere in Southern Rhodesia have been rejected by this Committee and the General Assembly. Southern Rhodesia is a British Colony and has to be dealt with as such.

We learn that as this Committee is deliberating this very problem, in London a meeting is being held where consultations are going on between the Government of the United Kingdom and the socalled Government of Southern Rhodesia. We maintain that those who have "usurped" authority in Southern Rhodesia cannot be the main, much less, the only participants in any discussions on the future of Southern Rhodesia and the transfer of power. As long as there is no agreement after proper, democratic processes of consultations with the true representatives of all the people of Southern Rhodesia, it is inconceivable and it will be illegal, unconstitutional and morally wrong for Great Britain to discuss or decide the future destinies of the people of Southern Rhodesia with the white minority government.

My illustrious colleagues from Tanzania, Kenya and others have eloquently spoken at length and have put forth proposals which are practical and just as well as helpful and reasonable. We feel that the issue of the independence of Southern Rhodesia is an issue of the greatest importance and significance in the whole process of decolonisation. This is an urgent matter not only for discussions but, perhaps, intervention by the United Nations.

The question of the independence of Southern Rhodesia, the method and the manner in which it would be attained, is of the greatest significance for the peace, stability and progress of the whole of the African Continent and of Asia.

The United Kingdom Government have informed this Committee and other Committees of the United Nations that they are greatly concerned with developments in Southern Rhodesia but all these months they have not produced any positive plan for the speedy and peaceful solution of this problem. We also are well aware that they would like to give constructive thought to this problem, and yet it appears that Great Britain, either for economic, strategic or other reasons, seems on the point of abdicating her historic responsibility and may fatter in her footsteps in the fulfilling of the task that the U.N. Charter has enjoined her to fulfil. If in the process of granting independence, U.K. Government would leave behind legacies which would devide the country racially, tribally or on basis of any reactionary programmes then it would be Britain who would be held responsible by history and by this august body for the misery and conflicts that would follow.

Mr. Chairman, time and again my delegation had had the opportunity of expressing our considered and, we think, constructive views for the solution of this difficult problem. In this we have fully associated ourselves with the resolutions and the decisions of the Organization of African Unity and the Addis Ababa Conference of the Heads of African States. In the Special Committee of Twenty-four, in the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly my delegation has co-sponsored all resolutions on Southern Rhodesia. This morning I wish only to reiterate our views on this matter :

(i) Firstly, the Government of India have declared that any unilateral declaration of independence by the white minority government will be illegal, unconstitutional and as such will not be recognised by the Government of India.

278

- (ii) Any agreement or delegation of authority to Mr. Smith or his successors who do not represent the majority of the population would mean that Great Britain abdicates her responsibility in the process of the liberation and freedom of the people of Southern Rhodesia.
- (iii) The granting of independence to Southern Rhodesia must be preceded by the granting of full democratic rights to the people of Southern Rhodesia.
- (iv) Immediate steps should be undertaken to hold a constitutional conference of all concerned to work out the future constitutional arrangements so that immediate measures can be taken for the holding of elections based on the principles of one-man-one-vote and the establishment of a Government representing the majority of the people.
- (v) The United Kingdom Government must get the authorities in Southern Rhodesia to repeal all repressive and unjust laws.
- (vi) The United Kingdom Government should also make the authorities in Southern Rhodesia to release all political prisoners so that proper climate is created for holding a fully responsible constitutional conference which

would, without delay, lead to the colony taking steps towards its independence without delay.

We appeal to all States here not to co-operate and assist the usurper authorities in Southern Rhodesia who repress the freedom struggle or give them direct or indirect support of any kind.

It is conceivable that the forces of racism, tribalism and reaction in Southern Africa may or would try to focuss all their energies on Southern Rhodesia in order to maintain their postures of privilege and supremacy. It appears as if their whole citadel of power in Southern Africa rests as it were on their status and position in Southern Rhodesia. If battles are joined the legitimate aspirations of freedom hungary people of Southern Rhodesia may have to express themselves through a Government in exile. Many a people in Africa and Asia have had to carry on their struggle in exile.

The valiant people of Southern Rhodesia have our full sympathy. We shall do everything in our power not only to plead their case and advance their cause both at the United Nations and outside but we am prepared to give them full support until their struggle is crowned with success.

INDIA USA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA UNITED KINGDOM TANZANIA KENYA ETHIOPIA PERU HUNGARY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Syed Mir Qasim's Statement in the General Assembly on Pakistani Aggression against India

Syed Mir Qasim, Member of the Indian Delegation and Minister without Portfolio, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, made the following statement in the General Assembly on October 5, 1965 on the Pakistani aggression against India :

It is not my intention to take the time of the General Assembly over a discussion of the entire gamut of the conflict between India and Pakistan. I have already indicated the main cause underlying this conflict in my reply of 29 September to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. However. it is necessary to say a few words on some of the points raised subsequently by the representative of Pakistan.

First of all, he said that my memory was playing tricks with me and that it was the then ruler, Maharaja Hari Singh. and not the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, who had decided. of their own free will. to join India. Let us see whose memory is at fault.

The representative of Pakistan should know that although the Instrument of Accession which was executed by the Maharaja was legal in every respect, as in the case of similar instruments, relating to hundreds of princely States in the subcontinent. when the Instrument was received in New Delhi, the Government of India accepted the offer of Accession not at the request of the Maharaja alone. They did so only after the representatives of the National Conference-the political party enjoying the overwhelming support of the people of Jammu and Kashmir-had gone to New Delhi and convinced our national leaders that the Instrument signed by the Maharaja had the. full backing and consent of the people. Here is what Sheikh Abdullah-whom Pakistani leaders then described as a "quisling" but for whom they now pour forth such false solicitude--said in his inaugural address to the State Constituent Assembly in 1951:

"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

279

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,"

Earlier, speaking at the 24 1st meeting of the Security Council, in 1948, Sheikh Abdullah said

"Under those circumstances, both the Maharaja and the people of Kashmir requested the Government of India to accept our accession". (Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, 24 1st meeting, page 22).

In the same statement Sheikh Abdullah said :

"I was explaining bow the. dispute arosehow Pakistan wanted to force this position of slavery upon us. Pakistan had no interest in our liberation or it would not have opposed our freedom movement. Pakistan would have supported us when thousands of my countrymen were behind bars and hundreds were shot to death

"Then, suddenly, Pakistan comes before the bar of the world as the champion of the liberty of the people of Jammu and Kashmir". (Ibid., page 21).

In the light of what I have quoted above, it is clear that it is not my memory which is playing tricks with me.

Referring to India's charge that Pakistan had committed aggression against India not once but three times, the representative of Pakistan said the following in regard to the first aggression, in 1947-48 : "But at that time Kashmir was not a part of India" (1342nd meeting, page 76).

The question is one of aggression, and the representative of Pakistan cannot evade that charge by saying that at that time Kashmir was not a part of India. I had myself made it clear in my statement of 29 September that Pakistani invaders were resisted by the people of the, State even before the State had acceded to India and even before the Indian troops had gone to their rescue. Thus here again what I said was in complete accord with facts. The representative of Pakistan boasted that although India had tried desperately hard it had never obtained any finding of aggression against Pakistan by the Security Council. That statement is more a commentary on the manner in which the Security Council functions than on the facts of the case. The facts were established by the Security Council's own agencies. In its report, the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan observed:

"..the situation that confronted the Commission upon its arrival was different from that which had been envisaged by the Security Council during the deliberations which preceded the formulation of its resolutions, inasmuch as regular Pakistani troops were within the frontiers of the State of Jammu and Kashmir participating in the fighting". (S/1100, para. 2).

What was the difference in the situation ? The difference was this. Sir Mohammad Zafrullah Khan, the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan, had earlier, on 15 January 1948, informed the Security Council that-and I quote from his letter of that date :

".... Pakistan Government emphatically deny that they are giving aid and assistance to the so-called invaders or have committed any act of aggression against India. On the contrary and solely with the object of maintaining friendly relations between the two Dominions, the Pakistan Government have continued to do all in their power to discourage the tribal movement by all means short of war". (Ibid., annex 6, document I, para. 3).

The United Nations Commission', reporting a few months later, observed :

"According to the Security Council's resolution of 17 January, the Government of Pakistan was requested to inform the Security Council immediately of any material change in the situation. In a letter addressed to the Security Council, the Pakistan Government agreed to comply with this request. The Government of Pakistan had, however, not informed the Security Council about the presence of Pakistan troops in the State of Jammu and Kashmir". It is India's complaint that this fact of vital importance was ignored by the Security Council. I leave it to representatives here to draw their own conclusions.

But let us go a little further. The representative of Pakistan has described Sir Owen Dixon, the these United Nations Representative, as one of the distinguished jurists of our time, who was the Chief Justice of Australia and not "a Pakistani prejudiced against India" (1342nd meeting, page 78-80). Well, then the verdict of such a distinguished jurist should be acceptable to Pakistan. I would therefore quote Sir Owen Dixon from document S/1791. He stated-:

"Upon a number of occasions in the course of the period beginning with the reference on 1 January 1948 of the Kashmir dispute to the Security Council, India had advanced not only the contention to which I have already referred

280

that Pakistan was an Aggressor, but the further contention that this should be declared The Prime Minister of India, at an early stage of the meeting, made the same contention and he referred to it repeatedly during the conference. I took up the positions, first that the Security Council had not made such a declaration; secondly that I had neither been commissioned to make nor had I made any judicial investigation of the issue; but thirdly that, without going into the causes or reasons why it happened, which presumably formed part of the history of the sub-continent, I was prepared to adopt the view that when the frontier of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was crossed on I believe 20 October 1947, by hostile elements, it was contrary to international law, and that when, in May 1948, as I believe, units of the regular Pakistan forces moved into the territory of the State, that too was inconsistent with international law." (S/1791, para. 21).

The facts of aggression were so clear that that jurist had no hesitation in pronouncing his view that Pakistan had committed aggression.

The representative of Pakistan bravely at-

tempted to belittle the importance of the crucial date, 5 August 1965; that is, the day on which the massive assault on the cease-fire line by Pakistani troops in civilian disguise began. He said :

"It all depends on what you take as the starting-point, on which date you regard as useful for the case you wish to argue either before the Security Council or before the General Assembly". (1342nd meeting, page 83-85).

But I was not arguing; I was stating a fact recognized by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The representative of Pakistan went on to say :

"The first date that struck us was 15 May 1965, several months before the alleged infiltrations into Kashmir by armed and unarmed Pakistani personnel. And what was that? It was Indian occupation of three Pakistani posts in the Kargil area, clearly on our side of the cease-fire line, from which they were compelled to withdraw on the personal intervention of the Secretary-General of the United Nations". (Ibid.).

I am glad that the representative of Pakistan mentioned that incident. It gives me an opportunity to quote again from the first report of the Secretary-General on the current conflict, document S/6651 of 3 September 1965 :

"In the interest of preserving the CFL"that is, the cease-fire line-

"I appealed to the Government of India to withdraw its troops from the Pakistan side of the line. On assurance from that United Nations Observers Would henceforth be stationed on both sides of the line in that area, which India considered strategically vital to the security of the Srinagar-Leh Road, the Government of India agreed to do so and in due course the Indian troops were withdrawn, thus closing the matter and making unnecessary any further consideration of a report on it to the Security Council. Subsequently, there were, some military attacks on the road by armed elements from the Pakistan side". (S/6651 para 4).

The Government of India showed respect for the cease-fire line and agreed with the Secretary-General that their troops should withdraw from the three posts on the condition that United Nations Observers would be stationed in the area. However, what was the attitude of the Government of Pakistan? As the Secretary-General himself says, subsequently there were military attacks on the road by armed elements from Pakistan. But what is more, when the massive assault on the cease-fire line by Pakistan armed troops in civilian disguise commenced on 5 August 1965, the Secretary-General repeatedly asked the Government of Pakistan to respect the cease-fire line.. What was Pakistan's response ? I will again quote from the Secretary-General's report :

"I have not obtained from the Government of Pakistan any assurance that the cease-fire and the CFL will be respected henceforth or that efforts would be exerted to restore, conditions to normal along the line. I did receive assurance from the Government of India,"--mark these words, "I did receive assurance from the Government of India,"- "... that India would act with restraint with regard to any retaliatory acts and will respect the ceasefire agreement and the CFL if-Pakistan does likewise." (S/6651, para. 9).

Referring to my statement that there was no binding commitment on the part of India to hold a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir, the representative of Pakistan said : "What an extraordinary statement to come and make to this Assembly". Was this really an extraordinary statement ? Let us examine the facts. I can do no better than to quote our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, whom the representative of Pakistan does not wish to forget, When proposals for a plebiscite were submitted to the Government of India by the United Nations Cornmission, the late Prime Minister made it perfectly clear that he was accepting the proposal only on certain conditions. This is how the matter was recorded in the United Nations Cornmission's Report :

"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." (S/1196, Aide-memoire 1, para. 2).

I have no desire to go into further details, but representative's who may be interested in the matter would find a mass of material in the records of the Security Council and in the reports submitted by United Nations Representatives clearly establishing the, fact that Pakistan carried out neither part I nor part II of the resolution referred to by the late Prime. Minister in his statement quoted above.

Now we come to the assertion by the representative of Pakistan that his country was prepared to refer the matter of non-implementation of the first two parts of the resolution of 13 August 1948 to arbitration but that India was not. India is a signatory to the Charter and has accepted arbitration as one of the peaceful methods for settling international differences. What is more, India has applied this principle in practice wherever its application was appropriate. The Bagge Award in respect to a boundary dispute, with East Pakistan is an illustration. India has also accepted the principle in the case of the Sind-Kutch boundary question. In fact, India has always been willing to refer boundary disputes to arbitration since boundary disputes involve demarcation, which is a technical problem, and can be resolved by an arbitrator assisted by technical experts.

Problems which involve a country's political ideology and, in fact, its very existence as a State cannot be left to the decision of an arbitrator. Who is to decide whether the claims of secular democracy in India or of theocracy in Pakistan are more important? How can we commit the destiny of a people to the hands of an arbitrator?

281

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan had raised the question of a plebiscite. I thought I had made clear India's position in this matter. But as the representative of Pakistan has raised the question again, permit me to say a few words on it. It was not the people, of Kashmir who asked for a plebiscite at the time of acceding to the Indian Union. It was India which made the offer to the people of Kashmir. And would it have made such an offer even at that time when the Indian forces were fast pushing out the Pakistani aggressor from the remaining territory of Jammu and Kashmir? Would it have made such an offer if it entertained any doubts about the outcome? If Pakistan had the slightest hope of a plebiscite going in its favour, would it have obstructed the implementation of the resolutions the way it did? For some four years India, as well as the people of Kashmir, waited patiently for the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council which was frustrated by Pakistan's intransigence. They waited in the hope that in the process of ascertaining the wishes of the people, it would be possible to associate our brethren living in that part of the State which lies to this date under Pakistan's illegal occupation. After a long wait, the people of the rest of the State went ahead. Their wishes were ascertained fully both during the elections for the Constituent Assembly as also when the Constitution was formulated and adopted by the Assembly. In the elections, the issue of accession to India was squarely placed before the people, and the, electorate signified its hearty support of the ratification of accession by electing us of the National Conference to the Constituent Assembly with overwhelming support. Subsequently, the Constituent Assembly set the seal on this process. The wishes of the people were thus ascertained. Thereafter, two general elections have been held in the State. In all the three elections held on the basis of universal adult franchise, that party has been returned to power which formally and emphatically supported the irrevocable association and complete integration of Jammu and Kashmir with India. Need I remind the representatives that apart from ratifying the accession to India, apart from supporting the political party which stands for irrevocable association and complete integration with India, apart from reaffirming their wishes at periodic elections, the people of Jammu and Kashmir have twice within eighteen years given their answer

in blood to Pakistan. Thus there is no justification for any further ascertainment of the wishes of the people. The Government of India has made its position clear on this point and I hereby reiterate it. There will be no plebiscite.

The representative of Pakistan, speaking about the Muslims of India, said :

"Finally, the representative of India-and I find this is a peculiar weakness in Muslims who come to represent or plead India's case at the bar of international opinion-finds himself, and I sympathize with him, in the position of having to be more Catholic than the Pope." (1342nd meeting, p. 91).

We Muslims of India are quite used to these cheap jibes. We understand the reason or rather the frustration behind such insulting remarks not only from the, representatives of Pakistan who speak at the United Nations, but also, more so. from the founders and leaders of Pakistan.

282

The frustrations are there because the founders and leaders of Pakistan failed in their efforts to persuade the great nationalist Muslim leaders of India to accept their favourite theory that religion determines nationally. It was those frustrations which led them to call one of the greatest of our leaders. Imam-ul-Hind. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad-who was the President of the Indian National Congress at the time of its greatest achievement, that is, the independence of Indiaa "show-boy". It was those frustrations of the founders and leaders of Pakistan which led them to question the. patriotism and the greatness of Maulana Hussain Ahmad Madani. Once again, it was those frustrations which led them to call Sheikh Abdullah a "quisling". Those cheap jibes and insults do not call for any comments. India is proud of having the third largest Muslim population in the world, with nearly 60 million Muslim citizens sharing with their fellow citizens not only the rights-and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution but also a common heritage, a common history and a common struggle in the cause of freedom. Now the Muslims of India, along with Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, Buddhists and Zoroastrians and others, are, united in fighting the third Pakistani aggression against our country.

In the armed conflict with Pakistan, among the very first to shed blood in the defence of our country were the Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir. The highest decoration for valour on the battlefield, Param Vir Chakra, was awarded to a Muslim : a Muslim by the name of Havildar Abdul Hamid, who knocked out three tanks of the Pakistani Army. Was he a mere show-boy ? Perhaps Pakistan labels heroes in that fashion. We honour them.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA AUSTRALIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Dr. Rafiq Zakaria's Statement in the General Assembly on Pakistani Aggression against India

Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, Member of the Indian Delegation and Minister for Urban Development, Government of Bombay, made the following statement in the General Assembly of the United Nations on October 15, 1965 on the Pakistani aggression against India :

I listened carefully to the statement of the representative of Pakistan yesterday, in reply to the statement of my Minister for External Affairs. Nothing that he said came as a surprise to us; it covered no new ground and made no new points. Ever since India lodged a complaint with the Security Council against Pakistan's aggression, the representatives of Pakistan, whether in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, have played the same tune. But facts are facts and cannot change because Pakistan chooses to turn and twist them or uses a new instrument for the purpose. In his statement the Minister for External Affairs of India invited the attention of the representatives to something which is fundamental to this issue. The incontrovertible fact that three times in eighteen years Pakistan has committed aggression against our territory twice in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and once in the State of Gujarat and that by doing so Pakistan has consistently and deliberately refused to honour its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

The representative of Pakistan gave no reply to it; he has, I submit, none. Instead, he tried to escape from it by sidetracking the whole issue and posing as a champion of the people's right to self-determination.

It is ironical that an aggressor who tries to seize a neighbour's territory by force should pretend to espouse the right of self-determination of the victims of its own aggression. It is even more ironical when he ignores the fact that the people, whose right of self-determination he seeks to advocate here, not only fought its armed hordes but are an integral part of the largest democratic State in the world.

Almost the entire statement of the representative of Pakistan yesterday was nothing more than a repetition, in most places word for word, of the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in this Assembly on 28 September 1965. As delegates will recall, this statement was dealt with in detail by Syed Mir Qasim, an acknowledged leader of Kashmir, a co-worker of Sheikh Abdullah in the freedom struggle of Kashmir, and a delegate of India, in his statement of 29 September 1965. The representative of Pakistan has, however, avoided dealing with the basic issues to which Syed Mir Qasim referred. I do not propose to weary this august Assembly by covering the same ground all over again. It would be taking its patience unnecessarily. Only a few glaring misrepresentations of fact need attention and I shall deal with them presently.

The representative of Pakistan said that he was particularly outraged at the statement of my Foreign Minister that :

"Legally, constitutionally, morally and on the basis of the will of the, people, the state of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union." (1558th meeting, p. 31).

283

The Pakistan representative went on to assert that :

"...in law, in morality and in the will of the people...India's continued occupation of Kashmir manitestry lacks any basis." (1362nd meeting, p. 73-75).

The legal and constitutional status of Jammu and Kashmir as a unit of the Indian federation has been explained time and again in the Security, Council and in the General Assembly. Repetition would only result in wasting the valuable tame of this Assembly. Suffice it to say that the legal position cannot be questioned by, any reasonable or prudent person. This has been stated not only by the lather of the representative of Pakistan, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, out also by two permanent members of the Security Council.

Speaking in the Security Council on 4 February 1948, the United States representative said :

"The external sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir is no longer under the control of the Maharaja.... with the. accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India, this foreign sovereignty went over to India and is exercised by India, and that is how India happens to be here as a petitioner." (Security Council, Official Records, Third Year, p. 371).

Similarly, the representative of the Soviet Union stated :

"The Kashmir question was settled by the Kashmir people themselves who consider themselves to be an inalienable part of the Republic of India.". (Security Council, Official Records, Twelfth Year, paragraph 84).

It is amateurish, therefore, to question the legality of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union. It is, in law, as much a part of India as any of the other fifteen states. This position is also reflected without any ambiguity in the reports of the United Nations Commission, a fact-finding body which was set up by the Security Council. Further, the Legal Adviser to the United Nations Commission, who was asked by it to examine the issue, could not come to any other conclusion than that the legality of the accession of the state of Jammu and Kashmir to India was unquestionable.

The representative of Pakistan sought to rely upon the statements made by his father on the constitutional status of Jammu and Kashmir years after the accession had taken place at his initiative and with his full support. There are innumerable statements made by Sheikh Abdullah. but I shall only give one or two quotations from them in which the Sheikh Saheb explained both the legal and moral aspects of this accession.

Speaking at the 241st meeting of the Security Council, Sheikh Abdullah sad:

".... 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." (Security Council, official Records, Third Year, p. 25).

Again, in the course of his opening address on 5 November 1951 to the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah said.

"The problem may be posed in this way. Firstly, was Pakistan's action in invading Kashmir in 1947 morally and legally correct, judged by any norm of international behaviour? Sir Owen Dixon's verdict on this issue is perfectly plain. In unambiguous terms he declared Pakistan an aggressor.

Secondly, was the Maharaja's accession to India legally valid or not? The legality of the accession has not been seriously questioned by, any responsible or independent person or authority.

These two answers are obviously correct. Then where is the justification of treating India and Pakistan at par in matters pertaining to Kashmir? In fact, the force of logic dictates the conclusion that the aggressor should withdraw his armed forces, and the United Nations should see that Pakistan gets out of the state." Putting the basic issue before the people of Kashmir while inaugurating the election campaign of the Jammu and Kashmir National Conference on 24 August 1951 at Gandarbal, Sheikh Abdullah made it clear that the decisions of the Constituent Assembly on those issues were final and irrevocable. To quote his words :

The decisions of the Constituent Assembly regarding the future affiliation of the State, the future of the State ruling dynasty, the question of compensation to landlords and the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir will be final and no power on earth can reverse them. It will be of special interest for his son to know that, while speaking in the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir on 19 August 1952, Sheikh Abdullah 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.

Again, as my Foreign Minister pointed out, it is on the basis of the will of the people that

284

the state of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union. The representative of Pakistan has also questioned this. Here, again, I can do no better than to quote his own father who, at a press conference in Delhi on 18 June 1948, said :

We, the people of Jammu and Kashmir, have thrown our lot with the Indian people, not in the heat of passion or in a moment of despair, but by deliberate choice.

Thus, for six crucial years, Sheikh Abdullah continued to uphold the completeness and irrevocability of the constitutional, legal and moral relationship between the state of Jammu and Kashmir and the Indian Union. I concede that as a citizen of the Republic of India, which guarantees freedom of expression, Sheikh Abdullah had every right to change his views. But surely, no one can seriously suggest that this change in his personal view should reverse the whole process which he himself, as the leader of the people of Kashmir and as the Prime Minister of that state, set in motion in 1947 and which has been freely and democratically endorsed by the people of the state of Jammu and Kashmir.

I am very sorry to state that the representative of Pakistan, Mr. Tariq Abdullah appears to take his citizenship and the responsibility attaching to that citizenship rather lightly. Only a few months ago, he was serving as an Indian citizen in our High Commission in London. On his appointment, he had taken a solemn oath of allegiance to India and to the Constitution of India. His appearance, therefore, as a member of the Pakistani delegation, is indeed surprising. I would have thought that Mr. Tariq Abdullah would have been among the first to denounce Pakistani aggressors who tried to destroy the freedom of our people in Kashmir. Instead, for reasons best known to him, he has chosen to betray them and has joined hands with the aggressors. A man who swore loyalty to one country until a few months ago, and champions suddenly the cause of the enemy thereafter, cannot carry conviction with this august Assembly; he stands self-exposed. He has served neither his father nor the cause of Pakistan; certainly not the interest of the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir by his strange behaviour. He has in his fevered imagination painted a false picture of the conditions in Kashmir. He has of course not been there for some time, but the tourists and foreign correspondents who have been on the spot, give the lie to his picturesque dramatization of the so-called internal revolt.

The representative of Pakistan alleged that the general elections held in the State of Jammu and Kashmir in 1957 and 1962 were rigged. In support of this, he gave some figures of un-opposed candidates confined to the Valley of Kashmir and Ladakh. He made no reference at all to the hotly contested elections in the rest of the State, both in 1957 and 1962. May I ask him as to why he forgot to mention the elections in 1951, the first elections, when his father, Sheikh Abdullah, was the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir-I mean, the vital elections to the Constituent Assembly in which forty-three out of forty-five seats in the Valley and Ladakh

were uncontested. Does he want to suggest that his father had rigged these elections ? He calls the Constituent Assembly "so-called"; but does he know that Sheikh Abdullah was the father of that Constituent Assembly and swore by it? Again, be describes Mr. G. M. Sadiq a close associate and for decades a co-worker together with his father-as a puppet. But then would he say the same about his father, when he ruled as the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir from 1947 to 1953? His new-found friends in Pakistan described his father as such and even worse. Again, is he aware that the much-publicized presidential elections in Pakistan were condemned as rigged by no less a person than Miss Fatima Jinnah, the sister of the founder of Pakistan, and popularly known as the "Mother of the Nation"?

The representative of Pakistan then tried to revive the dead and discarded theme of an internal revolt in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. I need not repeat what is universally known and accepted about the role of Pakistani infiltrators, masquerading as freedom fighters, who crossed the cease-fire line on 5 August and thereafter. Of course, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has described them as Sulahuddins or Saladins, and the President of Pakistan has hailed them as freedom fighters, but General Nimmo and the Secretary-General of the United Nations have given them their correct description. I cannot do better than to quote here from The New York Times dated 12 October :

"The Indians charged that the infiltrators included regular Pakistani soldiers, members of the Azad Kashmir battalions, armed civilians called Mujahids (fighters for the faith), and civilian porters.

"Pakistan promptly denied this. She said India had fabricated it to cover up an internal rebellion in Kashmir. The Pakistan Radio broadcast communiques by a so-called 'Revolutionary Council'"-New York Times words -which it said was directing the rebellion.

"However, Lt. General Robert H. Nimmo, the "[then]" United Nations Observer in Kashmir, roughly substantiated the Indian charges in his report to the Secretary-General, U. Thant.

"Reporters who were in Kashmir at the time saw no evidence of an internal rebellion. ..."-New York Times report.

"Some Kashmiris undoubtedly did hide and feed the infiltrators. There is evidence that some also may have helped set up caches of arms in Srinagar, Kashmir's summer capital, but the uprising that Pakistan apparently counted on never occurred."

The position is that it is these very infiltrators who, in the last few days, have once again tried unsuccessfully to cause some trouble in Srinagar. They are being dealt with as they should be; but I must make it clear that, because of this very danger to the peace and security of our State of Jammu and Kashmir, the Government of India has been insisting on the complete withdrawal by Pakistan of its thousands of armed personnel, in civilian disguise, who began to cross the cease,fire line on 5 August.

According to the representative of Pakistan, the entire Batamula suburb of Srinagar was set on fire and razed to the ground. Here, the insinuation is that this had been done by the Indian Army. Evidently, he is not aware of the fact that Radio Pakistan had gleefully announced that these so-called freedom fighters had set fire to an area at Batamula with important government buildings. "The Pakistan Times" reported the incident in headlines : "Government buildings in Srinagar on fire. Mujahids"-the word used by Pakistan for those whom it sent across the cease-fire line : "Mujahids"--active in heart of city. Held State capital cut off from outside. Hundreds of Indians killed in skirmishes". "The Pakistan Times" specifically mentioned the arson committed in this particular case : "The freedom fighters set many government buildings on fire at Batamula about three miles from Srinagar vesterday and for seven hours, according to the AU India Radio". Thus, the suburb of Srinagar was set on fire not by the Indian Army, not by any mythical Revolutionary Council in Kashmir, but according to Pakistan's own admission by its troops in civilian disguise.

There has been no popular revolt in Kashmir; there has only been sabotage, arson, loot, destruction by these infiltrators and, finally, invasion by regular Pakistani troops of our peaceful State of Jammu and Kashmir.

The representative of Pakistan attacked Indies close relationship with other Afro-Asian countries and. in his attempt to sow seeds of discord, he had the temerity to say, and I quote :

"After having sabotaged. the African-Asian Conference in Algiers, India has every need to try to rehabilitate herself in African-Asian esteem." (1362nd meeting, p. 82). This is yet another example of misrepresentation of facts and sometimes blatant lies which are perpetrated in this Assembly by the representatives of Pakistan.

Permit me to quote from the message sent by Col. Boumedienne to the President of India on 7 July 1965 :

"I am particularly pleased to express to Your Excellency my deep appreciation for the relentless efforts that you have made to ensure a full success for the second Afro-Asian Conference. Efficient interventions that you have made before the friendly Chiefs of States and the positive role that the Indian delegation had played at Algiers show the great interest that you give to Afro-Asian solidarity and to the future of developing nations. Hence, I am convinced that your action, which was always positive, will allow the next Algiers meeting to have, by its wide participation, the full success that the peoples attached to the Bandung principles are calling wholeheartedly for."

The representative of Pakistan went on to ask : "Is there any newly independent State from Asia and Africa that holds a country against its declared will ?" The answer to the representative of Pakistan is very simple. Yes : it is Pakistan which holds Baluchistan against the wishes of the people there. Yes : it is Pakistan which holds the people of Pakhtunistan in bondage against their wishes. The reign of terror let loose in Baluchistan and Pakhtunistan by Pakistan has, as my delegation stated on 29 September, exceeded even the limits of a police State. The representative of Pakistan went on to say that if India needed company he could suggest to her the company of colonial Powers. India's record in the freedom struggles of the peoples of Africa and Asia is well known. Pakistan cannot belie history. But her own record of serving the interests of colonial Powers. from Suez to Goa, is notorious. Of course. Pakistan would like her record of subservience to colonial Powers to be forgotten. Unfortunately for her, however, her own friends are not prepared to oblige her. My delegation has heard many references by many countries to the recent Indo-Pakistan conflict, but none has been so blatantly in favour of Pakistan as the statement of the Foreign Minister of a friend and ally of theirs-Portugal. The Foreign Minister of Portugal said in this Assembly on 11 October :

"I mentioned Goa above, and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan also referred to Goa as a

286

glaring example of naked. . . aggression." (1356th meeting, p. 107).

Who keeps the company of colonial Powers?

There have been many denials of the principle of self-determination of people in the world. But there is none so glaring, and none so inhuman, as the denial of the right to self-determination of the people of Baluchistan and Pakhtunistan. Referring to the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in. this Assembly on 28 September, the representative of Afghanistan said yesterday :

"As I have said, we cannot agree with that statement. As an example, the disputed territory of Pakhtunistan, referred to in pre-partitioned India as the Northwest Frontier Province and the tribal territories, where the fate of a much larger population than that of Kashmir is involved, a population which has been continuously demanding its right to selfdetermination, was also deprived of that same right." (1362nd meeting, p. 28-30).

We entirely agree with him that the people of Pakhtunistan have been, and are being, denied the right of self-determination.

The representative of Pakistan threw a challenge to my Foreign Minister to react to his so-called offer concerning the dispatch of an impartial commission to examine the situation in Jammu and Kashmir. As my delegation has stated before. India is the largest democratic State in the world, with a Government responsible to an elected Parliament, an independent judiciary and a free Press. India, in short, is an open book. The representative of Pakistan evidently did not realize the contradiction in which he was landing himself when he compared conditions in Jammu and Kashmir with those created by the Nazis and quoted statements by opposition leaders. Did the Nazis allow opposition groups to exist and operate? I did not know it. Did the Nazis permit them to freely express their views to foreigners ? No, By any standard, India is a free country, but that does not mean that the Government of India will permit any interference in their internal affairs by outsiders. However, there is certainly every justification for constituting such a commission to inquire into the conditions of the down-trodden and sup-, pressed people of East Pakistan, Baluchistan and Pakhtunistan, because it is widely recognized that. while the rulers of Pakistan may be free., the people of Pakistan are not.

The representative of Pakistan referred scornfully to India's attempt to build a multiracial and multireligious society and to base its state, hood upon that foundation. He said :

"In that case, Kashmir or no Kashmir, the Indian State is bound to collapse like a house of cards and no props from abroad will keep it steady for long." (Ibid. p. 83). India has not received any props from abroad. It is Pakistan which, for the last eighteen years, has been subserving the interests of one Power or the other, through military pacts and alliances and otherwise. For us, the preservation of our multiracial and multireligious society is not an excuse. It is the very breath of our life. India not only stands by secular democracy, but is proud of it. India rejects all forms of religious discrimination, for in its eyes religious discrimination is as much a crime against humanity as is racial discrimination. That is why Kashmir occupies such a pivotal position in our democratic setup. It is an inseparable link which unites our different groups and people.

It is easily, and sometimes conveniently, forgotten that the Muslim population of Kashmir is an integral part of the 50 million Muslims who are spread throughout the length and breadth of the Indian Union and is an integral part of the Indian society. More than any other people. they would resist any attempt made in any quarter to disturb the growing integration of our many races, religions and communities into a single, harmonious and integrated unit under the broad umbrella of our Constitution, which guarantees equality of status and opportunity to all citizens, irrespective of race or creed. Most of the Muslims left behind in India had played an active part in the creation of Pakistan, but today none realize better than they do that they could not have committed a greater folly a folly which has settled nothing in the Indian subcontinent due to the "hate India" policy of the Pakistani rulers but, on the contrary, has created a host of insoluble problems, endangering the future of our people. The safeguarding of secular democracy is, therefore, a matter of life and death to Indian minorities, as it is, indeed. to the majority community, and they will be prepared to make any sacrifice to defend it. Eighteen years ago they paid a very heavy price for compromising on it, and they are not willing, to go through the blood bath again.

The conflict between India and Pakistan is a much larger conflict than Pakistan would have this General Assembly believe. It neither begins nor ends. with Kashmir; Kashmir is only one of its eruptions. Pakistan is the child of religious bigotry and intolerance : it believes in giving more and greater rights to members of one particular religion. This is clear from its successive Constitutions, according to which only a Muslim can become the President of Pakistan, and, since the President, under the Pakistani Constitution. is the controller and repository of all executive power in the State, this means that the minorities

287

in Pakistan have been robbed of the substance of political power by the supreme law of the land. It is this attitude of mind which is so pernicious, for it does not consider anyone except a Muslim to be capable of exercising the, full rights of citizenship. It is this attitude which has shaken the faith and confidence of all religious minorities in, Pakistan-Hindus, Christians, Jews and Buddhists.

Pakistan tries to argue that its position is not in any way different from the position in the United Kingdom, for instance, where only a Protestant can be the King or Queen. They conveniently forget that in Britain the Queen is a constitutional head, enjoying no real power. At no time in British history has the office of Prime Minister been restricted to a member of any particular religion or denomination. Much more splendid is the example of the United States of America, which was founded as a revolt against religious persecution and where only a few years ago a Catholic-a member of a religious minority which is hardly 25 per cent of the populationwas chosen by the people of America as their supreme executive head.

For the 50 million Muslims of India, the very fact that at least one of the sixteen States of the Indian Federation, namely, the State of Jammu and Kashmir, has a Muslim majority is a matter of deep satisfaction. They are determined not to allow anyone to rob them of this satisfaction, and in its defence they will consider no sacrifice too great. In the present conflict with Pakistan. the Muslims have yielded to no other community in India in making the supreme sacrifices on the battlefield in the defence of their motherland. As our Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, said :

"It has to be remembered that there are 50 million Muslims in India and they are equal and proud partners in building up a new order in this country. They have fought arm in arm with their comrades in their battle against Pakistan and have won the highest military honours."

For eighteen years, all kinds of pressures have been put on India to make concessions to the aggressor. Let me make it quite clear now that we shall resist every threat to the foundation of our secular State. Let me make it clear, on behalf of the 50 million Muslims of India to which I have the privilege to belong, that we shall fight to the last man any move to disturb the non-communal character of our Republic.

The Pakistani representative mocked at our

cohesion. I am even asked : Why should not the Government of India be able to take care of any such situation or why should it treat the Muslims of India as hostages in order to prevent a plebiscite being held in Kashmir ? We have already had one terrible experience. We conceded partition, fondly believing that it would end all our troubles and difficulties, but we were sadly disillusioned. Millions of our people had to undergo intolerable suffering. Our economic resources were stretched to the breaking-point in order to rehabilitate the millions who were uprooted by man's inhumanity to man. We lost our greatest man-Mahatma Gandhi. We faced enormous difficulties in our efforts to rebuild our society. No, we shall not allow history to repeat itself. Now more than any time before, our unity is at stake.

I only wish that representatives had witnessed the holocaust which followed the partition of India when hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children lost their lives at the hands of demented men who claimed the right to commit murder and rape in the name of God. The India of 1965 is not the India of 1948; it is not prepared to swallow the communal poison again at the bidding of anyone.

It was the Prophet of Islam who said

"O Lord! Lord of my life and of everything in the Universe :

I affirm that all human beings are brothers unto one another."

Thus, in Islam, on which Pakistan bases its claim to Kashmir, there is no room for the twonation theory, which is a blot on the history of mankind. Why do not the rulers of Pakistan, which parades itself as an Islamic State, remodel the lives of their citizens on the basis of this profound truth uttered by the Prophet, instead of trying to disrupt our society.

We live in a dynamic age where the situation changes from day to day. The two United Nations resolutions of 1948 and 1949 on which the Pakistani representative harped, have been killed by the Pakistanis themselves. These resolutions required the vacation of aggression by Pakistan committed in 1947-48. Instead of complying, Pakistan has committed two further aggressions on our territory. Furthermore, they have gifted away more than 2,000 square miles of our territory from that part of Jammu and Kashmir which is still in their illegal occupation, to their Chinese overlords. In the face of these developments, how can anyone think in terms of the same situation as prevailed in 1948. Those two resolutions are dead as dodo, completely killed by further Pakistani aggressions and betrayal and can in no way be revived.

The real problem which divides India and Pakistan is the Pakistani aggression on our territory, an aggression which has been established

288

by the United Nations own agencies. No histrionic effort, no forensic ability, no crocodile tears, no false pleas about the people's right of self-determination can hide this fact. It would be monstrous to suggest that the fortunes of a free People should be dependent on Pakistan, the aggressor.

In earlier statements, my delegation made India's position quite clear. The status of Jammu and Kashmir, which is a constituent state of the Indian Union, is not negotiable. The only honourable course open to Pakistan, as a Member of the United Nations owing allegiance to the Charter, is to discontinue its lawless behaviour and vacate the aggression on our territory. Once this is done, a new atmosphere will be created in which friendly relations and an enduring peace between our two countries would have a chance of becoming a reality.

During his recent address to this Assembly, representatives will remember that His Holiness the Pope said : "If you wish to be brothers, lay down weapons." It was indeed in this spirit that our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, and our Present Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, offered a "no-war" pact to Pakistan. Let Pakistan ponder over the Pope's advice. Even at this late stage, after all the sufferings of the armed conflict to which we have been subjected by the Pakistani aggressors, we are prepared to respond.

After the Pakistan Foreign Minister's reply,

Dr. Zakaria said:

The Assembly heard, a little while ago, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan replying to my statement. It was, however, I submit, no reply, but at best a reiteration of the stand of his Government. But he avoided answering the basic question of aggression against our territory by his country; and therein lies the violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Not once, but three times, in eighteen years Pakistani aggression against India has taken place. However hard Mr. Bhutto may try-and I concede that he has been trying very hard-he cannot get rid of the monster of aggression which pursues him, I submit, like his own shadow.

I was also amused to hear the Pakistani Foreign Minister so full of exuberance and praise of Sheikh Abdullah. But he should go through the past records of his own predecessors in power to know what they thought of the Sheikh until yesterday. The fact is that when Sheikh Abdullah weilded power he was one of the most outspoken champions of Kashmir's integration with India. Today, in opposition, he may say something else. That, as I said in my statement, cannot alter a situation which the Sheikh and the. National Conference, among others, were instrumental in bringing about.

Today, Mr. Bhutto described Sheikh Abdullah to this august Assembly as "the Lion of Kashmir". But until yesterday, when Sheikh Abdullah was with us-and he came here several times on behalf of India to argue the case of Kashmir's accession to India-he was described by the Pakistanis as a "mouse". Can there be greater irony ?

Mr. Bhutto made several other points, but I must humbly submit that they were all points repeated over and over again with full and compike replies by the Indian delegation. The records of the United Nations are full of them.

I have, therefore, no intention of entering into another exchange of abuse on the same old grounds and of prolonging this debate; my delegation has made our position on Kashmir absolutely and completely clear. There can be, and there shall be, no deviation from that position.

INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA UNITED KINGDOM ANGUILLA ALGERIA INDONESIA TUNISIA PORTUGAL AFGHANISTAN

Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in the Political Committee on Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Shri v. C. Trivedi, Member of the Indian Delegation, made the following statement in the First (Political) Committee of the General Assembly on October 26, 1965, on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons :

It is a matter of great satisfaction to my delegation that our discussions on disarmament in the Committee commence on the question of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. India has consistently maintained that the menace posed by nuclear weapons is at the centre of the problem of disarmament. From the early sessions of the General Assembly and even before the United Nations adopted General and Complete Disarmament as its objective, the Indian delegation has urged upon the international community the imperative need to halt, reduce and eliminate the nuclear weapon menace. Long before the present proliferation of nuclear weapons which plagues us today and which, in the opinion of a large number of delegations including that of ours. is the basic problem before us, India advocated the prohibition of the manufacture and

289

use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. The Indian delegation alto inscribed the item of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons on the agenda of the last session of the Assembly. Unfortunately, due to circumstances beyond our control, it was not possible to discuss the item at the 19th Session. We are, therefore, glad that the Soviet Union has taken the initiative in inscribing this item on the agenda of the current session so that we can once again devote special attention to the problem of proliferation.

The Indian position on this problem has been explained in detail in the Disarmament Commission and in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. During the current session of the Assembly, our Foreign Minister summarised it once again in the General Debate. He said : "I would reiterate our firm conviction that the only practical approach to the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is that both the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers should undertake simultaneous obligations through an international instrument that might be agreed upon. It is essential that, while the non-nuclear Powers renounce production, acquisition and control of, and access to, nuclear weapons, the nuclear Powers should also refrain simultaneously from further production of these weapons and their delivery vehicles and reach agreement on a reduction of existing stockpiles. That would really be the essence of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons".

The Indian delegation has all along looked at this problem in its proper perspective and in its real form rather than in its superficial and consequential manifestations. The central fact of the situation is that further proliferation has already taken place as so graphically detailed the other day by our distinguished Vice-Chairman, that this proliferation, which exists, poses a serious menace and that one cannot solve the problem effectively by compromising with this evil and calling it a fait accompli. The Indian approach therefore, is that an adequate or appropriate treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should deal with the problem of present proliferation as well as future proliferation. At the same time, referring to India's national decision, as distinguished from what should constitute a rational, balanced and non-discriminatory international treaty, our Foreign Minister stated : "Even though my country has possessed the capacity for guite some time now to manufacture nuclear weapons, we have refrained from doing so".

The Indian Parliament passed the Atomic Energy Act in 1948 and the Government launched a full-fledged atomic energy programme for peaceful purposes as early as 1954. That was eleven years ago. India has large uranium deposits and extensive thorium rich mineralsthe largest in the world. We started work on our first reactor in 1955 and it became critical in 1956. Besides the four nuclear weapon countries, we are the only country having a plutonium extraction plant in operation. The country which now wishes to be described as a nuclear Power in fact told us a few years ago that we were fifteen years ahead of it in nuclear technology. And yet, we have refrained from manufacturing nuclear weapons. It was only last week that our Prime Minister reiterated India's position on this issue at a press conference in Aurangabad. When we are talking, therefore, of the requirements of a rational and balanced treaty, we are not talking of national decisions but the basic components of a permanent international instrument.

The approach indicated by our Foreign Minister for an adequate and appropriate treaty on non-proliferation is also the basic approach envisaged in the joint Memorandum on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons presented to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee last month by the delegations of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden, and the UAR. These delegations expressed their conviction that "measures to prohibit the spread of nuclear weapons should be coupled with, or followed by, tangible steps to halt the nuclear arms race and to limit, reduce and eliminate the stocks of nuclear weapons, and the means of their delivery". Some of these tangible steps need to be coupled with measures to prohibit the spread of nuclear weapons, while others can follow.

We had an exhaustive debate on this subject in the Disarmament Commission last spring. The Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee went into this problem comprehensively. Many distinguished representatives have referred to it in the General Debate during the current session of the Assembly and we have already had, many illuminating statements from several delegations in this Committee during the last few days.

It appears to us that these discussions have led to the emergence of three broad approaches

towards a solution of the problem and all of them deserve a constructive response from us. We appreciate that there are divergences of different degree even among the various delegations who favour a particular approach, but basically our discussions reveal three general trends.

Firstly, there is the non-aligned, nonnuclear approach. It was enunciated broadly at the Cairo Conference in October last year and I should like to quote the relevant extract in full. "The Conference

290

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 stockpiles of nuclear weapons. As part of these efforts", I repeat, "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."

On the question of the special emphasis placed by the Cairo Conference on the need for the Great Powers and for States possessing nuclear weapons to conclude non-dissemination agreements, the Indian delegation was greatly impressed by the highly noteworthy suggestion made by the distinguished Prime Minister of Malta in the General Debate in the Assembly on the 13th of October. He made a valuable distinction between the concepts of non-dissemination and non-proliferation and defined "dissemination" as the creation by a nuclear Power of a new nuclear entity or Power, either directly by the provision of weapons or technology or indirectly by permitting control of nuclear weapons by a hitherto non-nuclear entity or Power. He then went on to say : "Hence, the present nuclear Powers could immediately agree on a treaty on nondissemination; on the other hand, it is felt that a non-proliferation treaty would need to provide

not only for a freeze in the production of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles by the present nuclear Powers but also for a substantial and agreed measure of nuclear disarmament".

Coming back to the question of the three approaches emerging in our discussions on the subject, the non-aligned non-nuclear approach was, as I said, broadly enunciated in the Cairo Conference. It was also reflected in the Disarmament Commission Resolution D/C 225 adopted on the 15th of June this year. The Disarmament Commission recommended that the ENDC should accord special priority to the consideration of the question of a treaty or convention to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons "giving close attention to the various suggestions that agreement could be facilitated by adopting a programme", I repeat, "a programme of related measures".

The same approach is also envisaged in the memorandum of the Eighth Non-aligned delegations in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, where these delegations expressed their conviction that measures to prohibit, the spread of nuclear weapons should be coupled with, or followed by, tangible steps to halt the nuclear arms race. That is also the approach outlined by a large number of non-aligned non-nuclear delegations in the General Debate during the current session and during the present debate in our Committee. I do not propose to take the time of the Committee by referring in detail to these statements, but I would like to draw particular attention to the powerful and lucid exposition of this approach given to us by the distinguished Representative of Liberia last Friday.

As I said earlier, there are some differences in nuances among the delegations who maintain this broad approach, but generally their view is that an appropriate. or adequate international treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should not isolate the issues of future proliferation and present proliferation. The view that the Indian delegation has consistently maintained is that future proliferation is a consequence of existing proliferation and that one, cannot deal effectively with the consequence without dealing with the cause. That was, in fact, the inescapable import of the scholarly analysis given to us the other day by our distinguished Vice-Chairman.

Then, there is the second approach, the approach underlying the appeal made by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Italy and President of the current session of our Assembly. Addressing the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, Mr. Fanfanj referred to the obstacles facing agreement on an acceptable treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and mentioned the misgivings of non-nuclear nations about renouncing these weapons forever in an international treaty without some progress in nuclear disarmament by the nuclear countries themselves. He then went on to say : "But if it were not possible within a reasonable time to prepare such a draft comprising obligations both for the nuclear countries and for the non-nuclear countries, the Italian delegation would reserve the right to appeal to the non-nuclear countries to take an initiative which, without prejudice to their own points of view, would establish a certain period for a moratorium on the possible dissemination of nuclear weapons. One could imagine that the non-nuclear countries, in particular those close to nuclear capability, might agree to renounce unilaterally equipping themselves with nuclear arms for a pre-determined length of time, it being understood, of course, that if their demands, referred to above, were not met during that time limit, they would resume their freedom of action". The Italian delegation has in fact submitted to the ENDC a draft of such a declaration and the distinguished Representative of Italy

291

referred to it in his intervention in the Committee a few days ago.

This, therefore, is the second approach. It recognises the validity of the non-aligned, nonnuclear approach of dealing with the problems of future and present proliferation together, but seeks to obtain a moratorium on future proliferation for a short agreed period of time, during which the nuclear Powers should agree to cease all further production and agree on a programme of reduction of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles.

Several countries have shown interest in this approach and some have suggested that Fanfani moratorium be linked with other measures. Denmark and Sweden have, for example, suggested that in order to make this proposal more balanced it should be combined with a moratorium on underground tests. The Indian delegation has suggested that the Fanfani appeal be dovetailed into a general scheme of nonproliferation.

Then there is the third approach, which is the approach of the nuclear Powers, of their partners in military alliances and of others who feel that their security is safeguarded by the existing nuclear Powers. This approach seeks to deal only with the limited problem of further proliferation or rather the proliferation of nuclear weapons to countries who have not exploded a nuclear weapons device. It does not deal with the extremely serious and most urgent problem of those who have exploded nuclear devices, whether they have a nuclear weapons stockpile or not, whether they have a' reliable nuclear delivery system or not. In fact, by its act of omission, it permits them to go ahead and proliferate.

The two major nuclear Powers have submitted draft treaties based on this approach. There are, of course, significant variations in these two drafts and divergences on detail among the various countries who support the approach underlying these draft treaties.

The Indian delegation fully recognises the sincerity of this approach and of the genuineness of the objectives underlying the two draft treaties. It appreciates the apprehension of the nuclear Powers and their allies that the nth Power problem is a serious problem and that if it is not tackled effectively. it will make the international objective of disarmament difficult.

References have been made in this context to concepts of nuclear monopoly and of a privileged and exclusive club of nuclear weapon Powers. We would like to emphasize with all the sincerity at our command that we do not for a moment believe that the draft treaties presented by the US and the USSR are designed to perpetuate such a monopoly or exclusiveness. In fact, we are fully convinced that then countries genuinely desire arms control and limitation and disarmament. Whatever may be the views of other countries, expressed here or elsewhere, mostly elsewhere, the non-aligned non-nuclear nations have referred to these, concepts not in the context of the motives of the nuclear Powers but in context of the actual effect an international treaty would have if based only on an approach of this kind. An international instrument has to be examined on an objective assessment of its implications and results and not on what its draftsmen intend it to be. The Moscow Test Ban Treaty was drafted, inter alia, to reduce the arms race and limit the nuclear menace, but its denial by one country has, in fact, led to nuclear proliferation.

As I said earlier, however, these are broad approaches; there are several divergences even among the delegations who favour a particular approach. As fir as the nuclear-Power approach is concerned, the distinguished representatives of the USSR, the US, and others have emphasized these divergences in their frank and illuminating statements before our Committee.

As the Indian delegation has pointed out in Geneva, it adopts a flexible approach to all these well-meaning attempts at a solution of the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons. At the same time, we are convinced that an adequate or appropriate treaty on non-proliferation, to quote the phrase used by the non-aligned Eight in their memorandum, should deal simultaneously with the problems of future and present proliferation, and that it will be necessary to enlarge the drafts before us so as to embrace the essential features of the non-aligned non-nuclear approach. It is only then that we shall have not only a balanced and non-discriminatory treaty, but also real and effective non-proliferation.

Apart from the lack of appropriate provisions dealing with existing proliferation or rather dealing with the problem of ensuring that a would-be nuclear Power does not continue to build up a stockpile and develop a nuclear weapon delivery system while every one else subscribes to an international treaty not to do so, the limited approach envisaged in the drafts submitted by the nuclear Powers has another lacuna. It is based on the presumption of the assurance of security of nations provided by military alliances. It is an approach which appeals to the countries who feel that their security is safeguarded by the military alliances of nuclear Powers. This approach does not, however, take into account the security of the non-aligned non-nuclear countries. These countries do not believe in military

292

alliances. The non-aligned nations proclaimed their views on the subject in an article of faith incorporated in the Cairo declaration of October 19647: "The Conference reiterates its conviction that the existence of military blocs, Great Power alliances and pacts arising therefrom has accentuated the cold war and heightened international tensions. The non-aligned countries are, therefore, opposed to taking part in such pacts and alliances".

I should like to quote in this context what the distinguished representative of Poland said in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Cemmittee in another context. He said : "Members and nonmembers of military alliances must be treated equally. I stress the point because, whilst prohibiting the transfer of control only, the Western Powers leave the door open to various forms of nuclear partnership with their allies through all sorts of collective arrangements, whatever their nature. That would raise the present status of non-nuclear States belonging to military alliances as compared to the status of non-nuclear States which are not aligned. In other words, the nonnuclear NATO countries would be unjustifiably accorded special treatment over other nonnuclear countries. We can ill-afford a new division among countries. The present one, I submit, is hardly tolerable". As a country which is non-aligned and which has always been opposed to proliferation of nuclear weapons in any form whatever, India is in agreement with this sentiment

At the same time, what Mr. Goldblat said in the context of nuclear sharing arrangements aplies equally to the approach underlying the treaties submitted by the nuclear Powers. That approach does not take into account the security of non-aligned non-nuclear States who believe that their security lies not in guarantees or military alliances but in concrete and meaningful steps towards disarmament. In particular, no rational or balanced treaty should permit any country, who would like to call itself a nuclear weapon Power and who would assume no obligations whatever under that treaty, to commence manu facturing nuclear weapons, build up stockpiles perfect delivery systems and proliferate.

We do not propose at this stage to examine in detail, article by article, the two drafts before us. It might be useful however, if the Indian delegation indicated its views on the central content of the drafts, as reflected in Article I in the two texts. We agree with those delegations who have said that on the issue of non-dissemination of weapons and technology, there should be no loopholes and that all doors should be closed to the access of nuclear weapons being provided by nuclear Powers in any manner or form. In the memorandum submitted by India to the ENDC in September last year, which is incorporated in document A/5731, we said There should be a clear understanding, no change should be made by either nuclear side in any arrangement that may exist at present for the control, use, possession or transfer of nuclear weapons, or for the training of nationals of nonnuclear States in the use of such weapons and that all existing arrangements should be frozen on each side". We continue to maintain that position and we trust that when it is possible to Agree upon an adequate and appropriate treaty incorporating the non-aligned non-nuclear approach on the issue, the relevant Article I will be as comprehensive and water-tight as possible. obviating all loopholes, theoretical or otherwise.

I have taken the liberty of analysing the three broad approaches which have emerged during our discussions in Geneva and here. I have also drawn the particular attention of the Committee to the interesting suggestion made by the distinguished Prime Minister of Malta, which is in line with the declaration made by the Cairo Conference. The Indian delegation has no doubt that these various approaches will be studied carefully by all of us and that when the ENDC resumes its detailed negotiations on this subject, it will be able to reach a synthesis of the different ideas and solutions and, to use a phrase used by non-aligned Eight in the memorandum, it will be able "to reconcile the various approaches for an appropriate or adequate treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons". What we need, and I quote again a phrase used by the non-aligned Eight, is a treaty which can receive the support of the entire international community.

INDIA USA RUSSIA BRAZIL BURMA ETHIOPIA MEXICO NIGER NIGERIA SWEDEN EGYPT MALTA LIBERIA ITALY DENMARK SWITZERLAND POLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Letter to the Secretary-General on the financing of U.N. Observer Corps

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, delivered the following letter, dated October 5, 1965 to the UN Secretary-General regarding the attitude of India to the financing of UN Observer Corps:

In continuation of my letter of September 30, 1965, which has been circulated to the Security Council as Document S/6735, I have been instructed by my Government to clarify their position in the matter of financing the expenses

293

arising out of the establishment of the new Observer Corps on the borders between India and Pakistan, as well as the cease-fire line in the Indian State of Jammu & Kashmir :

(I) Resolution 1874 (S-IV) enumerating the principles to serve as guide lines for the sharing of the costs of future peace-keeping operations, in its para 1 (E) affirms:

"Where circumstances warrant, the General Assembly should give special consideration to the situation of any member States which are victims of, and those which are otherwise involved in, the events or actions leading to a peace-keeping operation."

(II) This principle was based upon paragraph 10 of Document A/AC. 113/18 which was submitted to the working group of twenty-one, by some African, Asian and Latin American countries, including India. This paragraph reads as follows :

"The situation of a member State or member States, victims of acts that led to a peace-keeping operation, should be taken into special consideration, including total exemption for them in the apportionment of the expenses."

(III) Your own Report to the Security Council dated 3rd September, 1965; (Document S/6651) contains the following passage which describes the commencement of the violations of the cease-fire line, resulting in the escalation of Pakistani aggression against India, and which makes it clear that India was a victim of this aggression and that this was what resulted in the despatch by you of the new Corps of Observers to India and Pakistan :

"The series of violations that began on August 5, were to a considerable extent, in subsequent days, in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the ceasefire line from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side."

Government of India, therefore, considering that as victim of an aggression, in accordance with the spirit and the letter of Resolution 1874 (S-IV), they cannot be expected to participate in the financing of the expenses arising out of the despatch of this new Corps of Observers to the sub-continent, reserve their position in this behalf.

I request you to circulate this letter as a Document both of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

India's Aide Memoire to the Secretary-General on the Training of Irregulars in Pak-occupied Kashmir

The following is the text of an Aide Memoire dated October 14, 1965 from the Permanent Representative of India to the UN Secretary-General regarding the recruitment and training of irregulars in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir :

The Government of India would like to bring to the notice of the Secretary-General the continued recruitment and training of irregulars in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir and in the tribal areas of Pakistan and the preparations for fresh armed infiltrations across the cease-fire line in Jammu & Kashmir.

In the Secretary-General's report of September 16. 1965 (S/6687), it was stated that "in addition to the regular forces engaged, tribesmen from North-West Frontier are becoming increasingly involved in the conflict, arriving at the front for the most part through Rawalpindi."

Subsequent events have not only confirmed but brought to light the increased tempo of Pakistan's preparations for much more intensified attacks in Kashmir by armed infiltrators from Pakistan. According to Government of India's information, 14,000 raiders from the North-West Frontier have been recruited and despatched to Pakistan-occupied Kashmir by the Pakistan Government. As to preparations in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir, the recruitment drive for infiltrators is in full swing there. Efforts were made by the Pakistan Government at the end of last month to recruit 20 new platoons of irregulars in the Khel Sector alone. About the same time, instructions were issued to the district authorities that all ex-Servicemen living in the territory irrespective of their age and physical fitness should be directed to report to the Officer Commanding, Ojhari Camp, which is the training centre of the Azad Kashmir Units of the Pakistan Army. On October 2, 150 recruits were sent to Shinkiari from the Afzalpur Training Centre in Mirpur Tehsil. On October 7, 400 guerrillas finished training at Durigi. Pakistan authorities are understood to have issued instructions that one thousand additional men under the age of 25 are to be recruited from District

Poonch in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir and sent to the Shrinkiari Training School. The Khel Centre of Pakistani Scows has been informed that infiltrators will have to remain active during the winter and will be issued high altitude scale of rations, if deployed above 7,000 ft.

294

It must be clearly understood that any effort by Pakistan to send fresh waves of armed raiders into Kashmir must be treated by India as violations of the cease-fire and an act of aggression and that in such circumstances India would be free to take suitable action in self-defence.

These developments also underline the imperative necessity of making no distinction between troops and armed personnel not in uniform, in the context of "withdrawal of armed personnel" requested for in the Resolutions of the Security Council.

At the end, it may be pointed out that only two of the major infiltration routes were closed during the last operations, namely those in Tithwal and Uri-Poonch areas and that several other routes still remain open to the infiltrators.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Reply to Pakistan's Request for Security Council Meeting

The following is the text of a letter dated October 24, 1965 from the Permanent Representative of India to the President of the Security Council in reply to Pakistan's request for an urgent Security Council meeting :

In his letter dated October 18, 1965, (Docu-

ment S/6801), to the President of the Security Council, the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has made totally false and baseless allegations regarding the internal situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. In paragraphs 5 and 6 of his letter dated October 22, 1965 (Document S/6821), the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has repeated the allegations. In paragraph 7 of the same letter he has requested that a meeting of the Security Council be called immediately to consider the deteriorating situation in Jammu and Kashmir and to take prompt action to implement the Security Council Resolution of September 20.' In compliance with Pakistan's request I am informed that a meeting of the Security Council is contemplated for tomorrow afternoon.

I am instructed by my Government to make its position clear with regard to this meeting. The Delegation of India is at all times prepared to co-operate with the Council in giving consideration to matters relating to the implementation of paragraph 1 of the Security Council Resolution 211 (1965) of September 20. In this regard India's views have already been communicated by the Prime Minister of India to the Secretary-General on October 18 (Document S/6810). If a meeting of the Council had been called to consider the issues arising in connection with the exchange of correspondence between the Secretary-General and the Prime Minister of India, my delegation would have been willing and ready to participate in the discussions and deliberations of the Council. However, as my Government has made it repeatedly clear before the Council, Kashmir is an integral part of India, and the State of Jammu and Kashmir is a constituent unit of the Indian Union. Pakistan's attempt to get a discussion in the Security Council on the socalled 'grave political developments' and the 'deteriorating situation' within the State of Jammu and Kashmir, amounts to gross interference in the internal affairs of India. Pakistan not only committed aggression in 1947, an aggression which is continuing ever since, but has perpetrated further and fresh acts of aggression since August 5, 1965, when it sent out large numbers of armed personnel generally not in uniform across the cease-fire line, as testified in the Secretary-General's report of September 3 (Document S/6651). Having failed in its aggression and in an attempt to engineer a revolt in Kashmir,

Pakistan is now trying to abuse the forum of the Security Council for propaganda purposes and to compromise the internal sovereignty of India by seeking a discussion of matters which are solely within the sovereign and domestic jurisdiction of India. I am instructed by my Government to inform you that the Delegation of India will be unable to participate in such discussions and deliberations of the Council.

I shall be grateful if this letter is circulated as a Security Council document.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA

Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Protest to the Security Council against Pakistan Foreign Minister's Abuses

The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, addressed the following letter to the President of the Security Council on October 26, 1965 as a protest against the abuses burled at India by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in the Security Council :

The Permanent representative of India in his letter dated October 24, 1965 (Document S/

295

6823), had informed you that the delegation of India was at all times prepared to cooperate with the Council in giving consideration to matters relating to the implementation of paragraph 1 of the Security Council resolution of September 20 and that if a meeting of the Council was called to consider the issues relating to the cease-fire and withdrawal of armed personnel, my delegation would naturally participate in the discussions of the Council. In the same letter we had also stated that if the Council were to take up matters referred to in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the letter of the permanent representative of Pakistan (Document S/ 6821), asking for a Security Council' meeting then we would be unable to participate in such discussions and deliberations, because, the points raised by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan in paragraphs 5 and 6 related to matters which are solely within the domestic and sovereign jurisdiction of India and his reference to them was a gross interference in the internal affairs of India.

When I was informed of your intention to hold a meeting of the Security Council on Monday, October 25, at 4 p.m., I held consultations with you relating to the agenda of the afternoon's meeting. During our discussions, I informed you that we would be willing to attend the meeting of the Security Council if it were to discuss the question of stabilising the cease-fire and withdrawal of armed personnel. I also explained that we could not participate in a discussion of matters which had been raised in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter of October 22, 1965 (Document S/ 6821). These matters were not relevant to the important issue before the Council, namely, the restoration of peace in the sub-continent. You were good enough to appreciate our position.

In your introductory remarks to the Council you stated and I quote from pages 16-17 of document S/PV.1247 : "in view of that request, paragraphs 1, 2 of which refer to the deterioration of the situation, a situation which has already been under consideration by the Security Council and has been the subject of four resolutions of the Council, the President, after consultations with all the members of the Security Council and in full agreement with the Secretary General, set a meeting of the Council for 4 p.m. today. It will be seen that the following was added to the agenda :

"Reports of the Secretary-General on withdrawals (S/6719/ADD.3) and on the observance of the cease-fire (S/6710/ADD.5)".

With regard to both these points the Security Council has already adopted resolutions and the delegation of Pakistan has submitted claims and complaints of deterioration in the situation. Therefore the President considered it appropriate to add those two reports to the agenda for today's meeting.

The President felt that he was not called on to consider or pass judgement on the contents of the letter contained in document S/6821, but paragraphs 1 and 2 of that letter refer to situations which have a bearing on agreements already arrived at in the Security Council and work in which the Secretariat is already engaged. That being the case, the agenda for today's meeting was prepared accordingly." The clarification which you gave on the agenda and on the scope of the discussions on that agenda enabled my delegation to take part in the deliberations of the Council.

We had hoped that the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan would take due note of your statement with reference to the agenda but within a few minutes of commencing his statement Mr. Bhutto referred to matters which were mentioned in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Pakistan permanent representative's letter (Document S/ 6821). You rightly intervened and requested the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to confine his remarks to the items on the agenda. If I may take the liberty of quoting you again, you said : "if the Foreign Minister of Pakistan will permit me, I would draw his attention to the fact that on our agenda for today are matters dealing with implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council of 20 and 27 September on the ceasefire and the withdrawal of troops. I would most respectfully and cordially invite the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to confine his comments to the item that the Council is meeting to discuss today." (Pages 39-40 of S/PV.1247).

Thereafter I myself took the opportunity to respectfully submit to the Council that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan was "raising those matters which refer to the internal situation in the state of Jammu and Kashmir and is mentioning matters which are exclusively within the internal jurisdiction of India. Therefore, these matters are not relevant to our discussions here today."

In your second statement to the Council (pages 47-50 of document S/PV 1247), you

once again said and I quote, "I shall conclude very. respectfully requesting and appealing to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan to be good enough to bear in mind the resolutions of the Security Council and to endeavour to refrain from making any comments which deal with matters of the domestic jurisdiction of another state."

In spite of your repeated appeals the distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan, when he took the floor once again, referred to matter which were the sole concern of my country. At

296

that stage, Mr. President, I made my second statement which can be seen on pages 57-60 of document S/PV 1247). Consistent with our basic stand on the issue as explained in the letter of the permanent representative of India (documents S/6823) and as reiterated by me earlier in the meeting, and in view of the attitude of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, I informed the Council that my delegation had no option but to dissociate itself from this discussion. These were matters exclusively within the sovereign and domestic jurisdiction of my country.

It was our hope that the Security Council would not permit the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to ignore the agenda and to use the forum of the Council to hurl abuse at India and discuss the internal situation of a constituent unit of India i.e. the state of Jammu and Kashmir. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan indulged in diatribes and made series of false allegations straying away from the main subject which was being considered by the Council. It is a matter of regret to my delegation that he was permitted to do so by the Council in such an unbridled manner. Whilst my delegation appreciates that participating member states be permitted to express their views, it cannot agree to the forum of the Security Council being used for the purpose for which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has so often misused it. Having studied the statement of the Pakistan Foreign Minister, my delegation's worst forebodings have been confirmed.

My delegation has at all times been willing to cooperate with the Security Council and we share with the Council the desire for the restoration of peace in our region, we are willing to assist the Council in stabilising the cease-fire and working out acceptable arrangements for the withdrawal of all armed personnel. However, in view of our past experience and in view of the Council's inability to restrain Mr. Bhutto yesterday, I do not see that any useful purpose will be served in our attending the Council's meeting scheduled for 10.30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 27. I would reiterate in all sincerity that the decision which has been forced upon my delegation does not in any way imply disrespect or discourtesy to this august body or to its distinguished President.

I need hardly reiterate that the Government of India will continue to give the fullest cooperation to the Council in its efforts to stabilise the cease-fire and bringing about withdrawal of all armed personnel.

I shall be grateful if this letter is circulated as a Security Council document.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date** : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Joint Communique on President's Visit

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued an October 10, 1965 at the end of the President's four-day visit to Rumania :

In response to the visit paid to India by Rumanian State leaders, His Excellency Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India, paid a visit to the Socialist Republic of Romania, from 7th to 10th of October 1965, as the guest of Mr. Chivu Stoica, President of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania. During his stay in Romania, the President of the Republic of India visited cultural institutions, historical monuments and residential quarters in Bucharest, everywhere he was welcomed with cordiality. He was greatly impressed by the achievements of the Romanian people since his last visit nine years ago.

On the occasion of his visit, Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India, held friendly, open discussions with Chivu Stoica, President of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania, on matters of common interest for the two countries.

The talks were attended, on the Romanian side, by Mrs. Constante Craciun, Vice-President of the State Council, Mr. Grigore Geamanu, Secretary of the State Council, Mr. George Macovescu, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Academician Cristofor Simionescu, member of the State Council, and Mr. Aural Ardeleanu, Ambassador of the Socialist Republic of Romania

297

to India; and on the Indian side, by Shri A. M. Thomas, Minister-in-Waiting on the President, Shri K. R. F. Khilnani, Ambassador of India to the Socialist Republic of Romania, Shri Y. D. Gundevia, Secretary to the President of the Republic of India and Dr. S. Gopal, Director of the Historical Division in the Ministry of External Affairs.

The President of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania and the President of the Republic of India noted with satisfaction that over the past years the relations of friendship and cooperation between Romania and India have been favourably developing on the basis of the principles of the observance of the national independence and sovereignty, of equality of rights, of non-interference in the internal affairs and of mutual advantage. The development of the bilateral relations was reflected in the growth of commercial exchanges, and cultural, technical and scientific cooperation to the benefit of both peoples.

President Radhakrishnan expressed in particular the gratitude of India to Romania for the valuable assistance that was being given in the field of oil industry.

The two Presidents have agreed that there are possibilities for expanding the sphere of the mutually advantageous cooperation between the Socialist Republic of Romania and the Republic of India.

The President of the Republic of India explained to the President of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania the point of view of the Government of India on the causes and developments leading to the recent conflict between India and Pakistan.

Having stressed the necessity to improve the international situation, the President of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania and the President of the Republic of India agreed that all the states should make further efforts for strengthening and consolidating peace, on the basis of the observance of the right of peoples to live freely according to their political, economic and social systems.

The two Presidents expressed their conviction that the visit to Romania of His Excellency Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan would contribute to the strengthening and the expansion of the relations between the Socialist Republic of Romania and the Republic of India in the interest of both peoples and of the cause of peace in the world.

President Radhakrishnan expressed his high appreciation of the warm welcome accorded to him and his party in the Socialist Republic of Romania and extended an invitation to Chivu Stoica, the President of the State Council, to visit India. The invitation was accepted with pleasure.

INDIA OMAN ROMANIA USA PAKISTAN **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

SUDAN

First Indo-Sudanese Trade Agreement Signed

The first Trade Agreement between India and Sudan was signed in New Delhi on October 22, 1965 at the end of the talks between a delegation, led by H. E. Sayed Hussain El Sherif El Hindi, Minister of Finance and Economics of Sudan, and an Indian delegation led by Shri Manubhai Shah, Union Minister of Commerce.

The following is the text of a Press Note issued in this connection on October 22, 1965 :

At the invitation of the Government of India, a high-powered Trade and Economic Delegation led by H. E. Sayed Hussain El Sherif El Hindi, Minister of Finance and Economics, Republic of Sudan, accompanied by the Governor of the Sudan Bank and the permanent Under Secretary of Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Supply and others arrived in Delhi on Monday, the 18th October, 1965.

298

The Sudanese, Delegation called on the President of India, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, the Union Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, the Union Minister of Commerce, Shri Manubhai Shah, and the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission, Shri Asoka Mehta.

The Sudanese Delegation will also be visiting Bombay and other places in India before its departure.

The Indian Delegation was led by Shri Manubhai Shah. The two delegations discussed common problems of trade and economic co-operation between Sudan and India.

From ancient times, commercial, cultural and friendly ties have existed between the two countries. A large number of Indians are settled in Sudan and trade between the two countries has continued over centuries. The Indian Cotton Textiles Industry has been purchasing Sudanese cotton which is appreciated for its high quality and many of the important Indian textile mills consume this cotton. Likewise, a large amount of cotton cloth, tea, jute goods and other products have been sold by Indian exporters to the Sudanese market.

In recent years, trade between the two countries has been of the order of about Rs. 15 crores both ways (œ 12 million sterling). Sometimes the trade has been slightly in favour of Sudan and sometimes in favour of India. It was therefore considered by the two delegations that a long-term Agreement on Trade and Economic Co-operation should be entered into between the two countries. With this end in view, a Trade Agreement was finalised by the two delegations which was concluded and signed this evening by the Sudanese Finance Minister, Ms Excellency Sayed Hussain El Sherif El Hindi and the Indian Commerce Minister, Shri Manubhai Shah. This will be the first Trade Agreement between the two countries through which the future commercial trade and economic relations are expected to expand and get strengthened. Initially, the. Trade Agreement will be for a period of one year and from the experience gained a further long-term Agreement will be negotiated and concluded next year between the two countries.

The Agreement concluded today between the two countries envisages a near-balanced growth of trade between the two countries at a level of Rs. 20 crores (α 16 million sterling) with the possibility to have further sales and purchases between the two countries of about Rs. 3 crores (α 2 million sterling) which would be examined at a later date.

Sudan will sell to India raw cotton, unmanufactured. ivory, natural industrial gums and various other products. Likewise, India will supply to Sudan large quantities of tea, jute goods, cotton textiles, pharmaceuticals, paints, varnishes, light engineering goods, machinery, equipment, etc.

Along with the Trade Agreement, a Protocol was also signed between the two countries providing for a credit assistance by India to Sudan for the establishment of joint ventures in Sudan. The credit extended by India to Sudan of the value of Rs. 5 crores, (œ 4 million sterling), will enable Sudan to purchase Indian machinery, capital goods and equipment from India for the establishment of industries in Sudan including joint ventures, such as, cotton textile mills, sugar factories, cement factories, factories for providing razor blades, pencils, plastics, oil mills, solvent extraction plants, soap manufacturing plants, light engineering industry for the manufacture of airconditioners, water-coolers and steel furniture, power projects, transmission towers, construction of roads, bridges and highways, construction of railway lines, manufacture of pharmaceuticals and drugs, hosiery factories, manufacture of cycles, radios, etc. and various light engineering and consumer goods. The details of the terms of credit will be finalised by an Indian Delegation visiting Sudan shortly.

The Protocol also includes provisions for technical assistance and technical collaboration between the two countries. Both the countries will offer scholarships in different fields of technology, and scientific research and provide facilities in cultural and educational fields to students from either country. As a result of this, it is expected that a number of Sudanese scholars will be coming to India to receive training in higher educational institutions and in industrial factories. Other forms of technical assistance to either country will be worked out in due course by a Joint Governmental Committee consisting of the representatives of the Government of Repubilc of Sudan and Government of India, which will also review the progress of trade and economic cooperation between the two countries. India has offered all facilities for technical and economic cooperation in establishing joint ventures in different fields of industries in Sudan.

299

SUDAN INDIA USA RUSSIA Date : Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

An agreement between the Government of India and USSR for the supply of a 1,000 (2 x 500) kilowatt medium wave transmitter from the Soviet Union was signed in New Delhi on October 26, 1965.

To be installed in the eastern region, it will be the most powerful medium wave transmitter in the country. It will fulfil the need to project India and her policies in the neighbouring countries in South-East Asia.

The agreement was signed by Mr. Besolov, Deputy Counsellor and Mr. Naryshkin of Embassy of USSR on behalf of the Export-Import Corporation, "Prommosh-export", Moscow and Shri Y. N. Varma, Joint Secretary, Ministry of information & Broadcasting, on behalf of the Government of India. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, His Excellency Mr. I. A. Benediktov, Ambassador of USSR, Shri A. N. Jha, Secretary, I & B, and other officers of the USSR Embassy and of the I & B Ministry and AIR were present.

The total cost of the transmitter, antenna system, design and working drawings and the deputation of Soviet specialists amounts to Rs. 8,434,400. The payment for the the equipment will be made in rupees under Five-Year Commercial Credit with interest at 2.5 per cent per annum.

The Soviet oiler for supply of the equipment and for providing technical assistance, for the construction of the transmitter was received in December 1964. Following initial discussions by Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Minister for Information & Broadcasting, in February 1965 during her visit to USSR with Mr. S. A. Skachkov, Chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, detailed discussions and negotiations were held between the officers of the USSR Embassy assisted by Soviet experts and the officers of the I & B Ministry assisted by experts of the AIR.

The delivery of the entire equipment is scheduled to be completed during the second half of 1967. The Indian and Soviet specialists will work out the stage-wise schedule for the erection and commissioning of the transmitter.

The Soviet technical experts who have been in India for nearly two months, have already completed preliminary investigations and assessed technical requirements. A site has been acquired with the assistance of the Government of West Bengal.

The sketch design for the project was supplied by the Russian experts on September 3, 1965. This was followed by a series of discussions between Soviet experts and the engineers of AU India Radio, and various technical details were finalised and approved.

This project would be another step towards strengthening economic cooperation between India and the Soviet Union.

INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Institute of Russian Studies: Agreement Signed

The Institute of Russian Studies, which will be a part of the Jawaharlal Nehru University, will be opened in New Delhi on November 14, 1965.

An agreement was signed between the Governments of India and USSR providing Soviet assistance in the various fields connected with the Institute. The Agreement. which was signed by the Union Education Minister, Shri M. C. Chagla on behalf of the Government of India and by the Russian Ambassador in New Delhi, His Excellency I.A. Benediktov on behalf of the Government of USSR, provides that the Soviet Government will assist in the provision of :

- Professors and teachers, whose number will be determined by mutual consultations between the two Governments from time to time. For 1965-66, the Soviet Government have agreed to provide up to 15 teachers;
- (2) Training facilities in the Soviet Union for 3 to 5 Indian teachers of the Institute every year over the next five years;

300

- (3) Books on Russian language, literature and other subjects for the creation of a library for the Institute; and
- (4) Some scientific and technical equipment for the library of the Institute.

While signing the agreement, Shri Chagla said that it would further strengthen the friendly bonds between the two countries. He was sure that the study of Russian language and literature in the Institute "will not only bring us closer but also make us understand each other much better".

Shri Chagla further said that the Institute would he another instance of collaboration between the two countries, because both Indian and Russian professors would be teaching at the Institution. The fact that over 1,200 applications had been received against 100 seats in the Institution showed the keen desire of Indian people in knowing and understanding Russian language, history an culture.

The Education Minister expressed the hope that Mr. V. P. M. Yelutin, the Soviet Minister for Higher and Secondary Specialised Education, would be able to visit India to be present on the occasion of the inauguration of the Institute. He added that he had already sent an invitation to Mr. Yelutin.

The Soviet Ambassador said, "The establishment of the Institute is a new and important landmark in the strengthening of the bonds of friendship between the peoples of our countries. This is a concrete manifestation of the agreement on the further development of the all-sided Soviet-India cooperation." He further said, "It seems to us that the decision of the Government of India to make the Institute of Russian Studies a constituent part of the future Nehru University is quite understandable and natural. It will be a worth monument to the great son of India, who has done such a great deal for bringing nearer both our countries-"

MAIN FEATURES

The Institute will, to begin with, provide facilities for one year intensive course in Russian language for about 100 students in 1965-66 and will promote translation of books from Russian language into Indian languages and of Indian books into Russian language. From 1966, the Institute will provide facilities for Three Year Honours Course in Russian language and literature. The Institute will provide Post-graduate Courses, in the near future.

The Institute will be managed by the Institute of Russian Studies Society, a Society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860.

Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji will be the President of the Institute of Russian Studies Society and Shri K. P. S. Menon the Chairman of the Governing Body of the Institute.

RUSSIA USA INDIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreement Signed

An agreement for a general purposes loan of œ 10 million (Rs. 13.3 crores) given by Britain to India was signed in New Delhi on October 20, 1965. Mr. John Freeman, British High Commissioner, and Shri P. Govindan Nair. Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, Government of India, signed on behalf of their respective Governments.

This loan granted under the Aid India Consortium Pledge for 1965-66 is, like similar loans in previous years, meant to assist the balance of payments by enabling the import of a wide range of machinery, components and other goods and commodities. It is the second British general purposes loan for this year, the earlier one for œ 5 million having been signed in June last. The present loan is free of interest and is repayable in 25 years including a grace period of seven years during which no payment of principal will be made.

At the Aid India Consortium in April this year, Britain pledged a total of œ 30 million (Rs. 40 crores) for the final year of India's Third Five Year Plan.

Britain has so far given œ 250.5 million (Rs. 334.0 crores) as economic aid to India.

301

INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Joint Communique on Presidents State Visit

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued on October 4, 1965 at the end of President Radhakrishnan's visit to Yugoslavia

At the invitation of the president of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito, the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, paid a State visit to Yugoslavia from September 30 to October 4, 1965.

During his stay in Yugoslavia, the President of India visited Belgrade, Zagreb, Dubrovnik and Brioni and had the opportunity to witness many aspects of the development and achievements of the Yugoslav peoples. He was greatly moved by the warmth and cordiality of the welcome accorded to him and his party by the Yugoslav peoples.

President Radhakrishnan had talks with the President of the Republic, Josip Broz Tito, President of the Federal Assembly, Edvard Kardelj, and Chairman of the Federal Executive Council, Petar Stambolic. Others who participated in the talks on the Yugoslav side were Ivan Krajcic, President of the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Croatia, Miha Marinko, Member of the Executive Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, and the Secretary of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia, Miso Pavicevic, Deputy Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Gustav Vlahov, Federal Secretary for Information, Bogdan Crnobrnja. Secretary General to the President of the Republic, Dr. Radivoj Uvalic, Ambassador of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to India and Nikola Milicevic, Director of the Department in the Secretariat of State for Foreign Affairs.

On the Indian side, there were Shri A. M. Thomas, Minister of Defence Production, Shri R. S. Mani, Ambassador of India in Yugoslavia, Shri Y. D. Gundevia, Secretary to the President and Dr. S. Gopal, Director of the Historical Division in the Ministry of External Affairs.

President Josip Broz Tito and President Radhakrishnan noted with great satisfaction that cooperation between the two countries is developing successfully in all fields. They agreed that efforts towards the further advancement of bilateral cooperation should continue in the interest of the people of the two countries and for the strengthening of freedom, peace and progress in the world.

Reviewing the international situation, President Josip Broz Tito and President Radhakrishnan reaffirmed that the safeguarding of peace and the promotion of equal cooperation among peoples constitute the basic aims of the policies of Yugoslavia and India. The two Presidents consider that in the world today the policy of peaceful coexistence among states is the only alternative to war and general annihilation.

The two Presidents stressed the adherence of their countries to the policy of non-alignment which has made a major contribution towards the preservation of peace in the world. The essence of such a policy is the acceptance of equality among sovereign states and the elimination of the concept of domination of one state by another politically, economically or in any other form.

The two Presidents expressed their deep concern at the extremely dangerous situation in Vietnam and reaffirmed the policies of their Governments on the subject.

President Josip Broz Tito and President Radhakrishnan devoted special attention to the recent conflict between India and Pakistan with regard to Kashmir. The two Presidents agreed that this conflict was brought about as a result of external attempts to impose by force concepts and solutions on the question which constitutes an internal affair of India. They also consider that this conflict has once more demonstrated that every such attempt to impose a solution of conflicts among states by force is also extremely dangerous to peace in the world.

President Josip Broz Tito expressed his sympathy with and support to the efforts of India to have the differences between India and Pakistan settled in a peaceful manner and without interferences from outside.

President Josip Broz Tito considered also as very dangerous both for the relations between India and Pakistan as well as for world peace the attempts of third countries to interfere, especially by creating border disputes, delivering ultimatums and threatening the use of force.

302

The two Presidents expressed the hope that the cessation of hostilities between India and Pakistan, which is being effected at the instance of the Secretary General and the Security Council of the United Nations Organization, will render possible the consolidation of peace.

President Josip Broz Tito and President Radhakrishnan stressed, the role of the United Nations as an irreplaceable instrument for the maintenance of peace and the importance of normalization of its work for the promotion of international understanding. In this respect they attach particular importance to the current session of the General Assembly which marks the twentieth anniversary of United Nations, in the hope that after the difficulties of the last session, the world organization will be enabled to help effectively towards the solution of existing world problems.

Bearing in mind the present situation in the world and the mounting dangers of the arms race and of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the two Presidents stressed the urgency of achieving general and complete disarmament. Both sides favour an early convening of a world conference of all states by the General Assembly as recommended by the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

President Josip Broz Tito and President Radhakrishnan expressed the conviction that the visit of the President of India and the comprehensive exchange of views on this occasion, will contribute to the further strengthening of the friendly relations between the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of India and will enhance greatly the cause of peace in the world.

President Radhakrishnan thanked President Josip Broz Tito and the Government and peoples of Yugoslavia for the warm welcome accorded to him and his party. He renewed the invitations to President Josip Broz Tito and Madame Broz to visit India at a convenient time and President Josip, Broz Tito accepted the invitation with pleasure.

November

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vol. XI NOVEMBER No. 11

CONTENTS

PAGES

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the Security Council on Rhodesia 305

Shri Thirumala, Rao's Statement in the Special Political Committee on Peace-

keeping Operations 308

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha intervening in the Debate on Foreign Affairs 311 Prime Minister's Speech in Rajya Sabha intervening in the Debate on Foreign Affairs 316 Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech in Lok Sabha initiating the Debate on Foreign Affairs 320 Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 326 Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech in Rajya Sabha initiating the Debate on Foreign Affairs 332 Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 332 337

NEPAL a

President's Speech at Dinner in honour of Their Majesties the King and the Quee n 343 Reply by King Mahendra 344 King Mahendra's Speech at Dinner in honour of President Radhakrishnan 345 Reply by President Radhakrishnan 345

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on Indo-Pakistan Conflict 346

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Defence Minister's Statement in Parliament on Chinese Intrusions 349

RHODESIA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Rhodesia 349

SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha 351

TANZANIA

Joint Communique on Visit of Indian Trade Delegation 353

UGANDA

India-Uganda Trade Agreement Signed 355

UNITED KINGDOM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Proposed Establishment of Military Bases by U.K. in the Indian Ocean

356

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA NEPAL PAKISTAN CHINA USA TANZANIA UGANDA UNITED KINGDOM

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the Security Council on Rhodesia

Shri G. Parthasarathi, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Security Council on November 12, 1965, on Rhodesia :

Mr. President,

At the outset I would like to convey to you and the members of the Council my delegation's sincere apreciation for acceding to our request for participating in this debate. The Government and the people of India attach great importance to the question which the Security Council is now considering. It is one of the most serious and grave issues to come up before the Council in its history.

Mr. President, the question of Rhodesia should not be viewed in isolation from other colonial and racial problems in Africa. It is intimately and directly connected with the racist and colonial oppression in South and South West Africa and in Angola, Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea. Nineteen years ago, during the very first session of the General Assembly, the delegation of India had the honour to bring before the United Nations the question of racial discrimination in South Africa. At the same session we also brought before the Assembly the question of the mandated territory of South West Africa. The question of freedom and independence for the peoples under Portuguese colonial domination has been before the United Nations for over a decade now. For the past four years, the United-Nations has been exercised over the problem of Rhodesia. All these years my delegation has been closely associated with the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the establishment of a fully representative government elected on the basis of universal adult suffrage in that colony.

The reactionary forces of racism and fanaticism which committed an act of piracy in Rhodesia yesterday, have been sustained by the assistance and encouragement they have received for so long from powerful quarters in the Western world. More particularly, direct encouragement has been given by South Africa and Portugal. The three forces of colonial and racist domination in Africa, viz. South Africa, Portugal and the Smith clique, are acting in concert to perpetuate white supermacy and economic exploitation. The fate of one is inevitably linked with the other two.

The United Kingdom Government's claim that Rhodesia was a self-governing colony has been categorically rejected not only by the special committee of Twenty-four but also by the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly, Resolution 1747(XVI) clearly stated that Rhodesia is a non-self-governing territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. This is a view shared by almost all the members of the United Nations.

India, along with other African and Asian members of the Special Committee of Twentyfour, has repeatedly drawn the attention of the United Kingdom Government to the deteriorating situation in Rhodesia, and we had ventured to suggest that if strict measures were not taken against the successive minority governments in Rhodesia, the world would be faced with the fait accompli which has now come to pass. In Rhodesia, the Government of the United Kingdom for many years leaned over backwards to condone the undemocratic and racist policies of the minority regimes. Whilst announcing to the General Assembly that the United Kingdom was committed to take into account the wishes of all the people of Rhodesia, the administering power did nothing to redress the grievances of the majority of the people. Lord Home had declared in the General Assembly in 1963 and I quote "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

docks with our heads high". The tragedy of British rule in Rhodesia has been that this "scrupulous care to build societies in which majorities rule" was never seriously pursued. The wishes of the majority were always ignored, reactionary and repressive legislation was adopted and nationalists were imprisoned, flogged exiled and tortured. Even appeals of mercy, on purely humanitarian grounds, were ignored by the administering power.

305

The Afro-Asian delegations have continuously endeavoured to assist the United Kingdom Government in dealing with the question of Rhodesia. We welcomed the forthright statement of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on October 27, 1964. Unfortunately this and subsequent statements were not followed by energetic steps to curb the outrageous behaviour and ambitions of Mr. Smith and his fellow consiprators. We have been aware of the difficulties of the United Kingdom, although these difficulties are largely of their own creation. They have maintained the fiction of Rhodesia being a selfgoverning colony. But who attained self-government in Rhodesia? Not the children of the sod, not the Africans in their millions, but a handful of settlers and racists, who have been oppressing the people and exploiting the resources of Rhodesia for over a century.

The world comunity was shocked by the conditions prevailing in Rhodesia and was endeavouring to establish full democracy in the territory. The Special Committee of 24, the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly persistently invited the United Kingdom to abrogate the 1961 constitution which was unacceptable to the people of Rhodesia and to hold a constitutional conference of all concerned to work out future constitutional arragements, so that measures could be taken for the holding of elections based on the principle of one-man-one-vote and the establishment of a government representing the majority of the people.

My delegation is not convinced by the reasons given here and elsewhere by the United Kingdom delegation for not implementing the resolutions of the General Assembly, which asked for the abrogation of the 1961 constitution. The Government of United Kingdom in 1953 abrogated the constitution in British Guiana and dismissed the Government which had been elected on the basis of adult suffrage. They sent troops to that territory. No regard was paid to the wishes of the majority of the people there. No respect was shown to Ministers of the Government who had been elected by the majority of the people of British Guiana.

Let us take another example, that of Aden. The United Kingdom Government, only the other day, dismissed the Government of Aden and its Ministers and used military force to maintain their hold on the colony. Why then has such consideration been shown to Mr. Smith who had publicly announced his intention to commit an act of rebellion and treason. It is not pertinent to ask that when force has unjustly been used against freedom fighters by the United Kingdom Government in other colonies, why is it that a rebellion of a racist minority government failed to rouse a similar response from the United Kingdom Government? Responsible Ministers of the United Kingdom Government, including the Prime Minister, stated time and again, that force will not be used against the Smith regime if it unilaterally and illegally declared independence. My delegation pointed out a few days ago in the Assembly that such statements must surely encourage Mr. Smith in his intransigence. Sir, one could cite many other examples, some from the sad experience of my country, but this is not the time to open old wounds or refer to the melancholy past. My delegation has only highlighted a few points to bring to the attention of the Council the circumstances of inaction that inevitably led to the present situation. Our main concern now is to put an end to this Act of piracy and to help the United Kingdom Government in enforcing the Rule of Law and thus fulfil the obligations they owe to the people of Rhodesia and to this Organisation.

The action taken by Mr. Smith is a rebellion against the United Kingdom and we earnestly trust the United Kingdom Government will deal with it as such, i.e. not hesitate to use all the means at their disposal to curb this rebellion and put an end to the activities of the Smith Regime. What the racial minority led by Mr. Smith has done, is illegal and rebellious. But that is not the main element in this mad action which makes the so-called independence reprehensible. The U.N. represents the International Community as a whole and Mr. Smith's outrage is a crime against the International Community, a rebellion against the principles of civilised international behaviour, a violation of the political, in fact, human rights of the vast majority of the inhabitants of Zimbabwe. This is the real element in the situation.

Mr. President, in this age of decolonisation, peoples of many territories are fighting for their freedom and independence. The Government of India have expressed their strong moral and material support to the freedom fighters of Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique, the so-called Portuguese Guinea and South and South West Africa. It is absurd to compare the piracy of the Smith Clique to the genuine struggle of the peoples of the Colonies. Mr. Smith does disservice to the people of the United States when he attempts to equate his denial of the birth right of the people of Zimbabwe to the noble war of independence, which the people of America fought against their British Rulers.

Sir, India will render all possible assistance to the United Nations in its efforts to foil the attempts of the Smith racists to perpetuate that illegal rule in Rhodesia. We shall offer all support to the African nationalists of Rhodesia whenever necessary. My Government appeals to all States not to recognise the Smith `Regime'

306

and refrain from giving it any assistance in any sphere.

My delegation has carefully studied the statement of Prime Minister Wilson and we have very carefully listened to the statement of the distinguished Foreign Secretary. Mr. Stewart. We note the measures announced by the United Kingdom Government and hope that these will be vigorously and immediately enforced. We feel, however, that the serious situation demands sterner measures.

The Security Council has taken a momentous step a few minutes ago condemning the so-called unilateral Independence claimed by the racist minority of Rhodesia and calling upon all States to treat it as an illegal regime to which no assistance shall be given. This is of course an interim step, a beginning. It is imperative for the U.N. to take other concrete and effective measures against the usurpers in Salisbury and to take those steps with increasing severity. A few measures of economic sanctions do not meet the requirements of the situation. There should be political, economic and even military measures to deal with the present situation. Our objective is clear and that is to dislodge the usurpers of Salisbury and restore to the people of Zimbabwe their birth right of freedom, of equality and of human dignity.

Mr. President, it is conceivable that the forces of racism, reaction and colonialism in Africa may try to focus all their energies on Rhodesia in order to maintain their position of privilege and supremacy. It appears that the whole citadel of power in Southern Africa rests on the maintenance of their status and position in Rhodesia. The United Nations cannot possibly tolerate a handful of people to exercise control over the lives of millions of people, and every means available to the Council, within the provisions of the Charter, should be utilised to assist the people of Rhodesia in their struggle against racism and tyranny.

Mr. President, the situation is very serious. The time for debate and discussion is over. It is now time for urgent action. The pleas of the United Nations have been ignored. The threat of the unilateral declaration of independence has become a reality. The determination of the international. community not to allow the act of piracy must also become a reality. To the colonial aspect of the question of Rhodesia, a new dimension has been added. The question is now one of threat to the peace. The Council must determine the situation as such, take A necessary steps to reverse the process set in motion by the Smith clique and take steps for the implementation of the Resolutions of the General Assembly.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to quote some extracts from a statement made by my Foreign Minister in our Parliament today :

"The Government of India have been shocked at the illegal seizure of power by the white, minority Government of Mr. Ian Smith in Rhoddesia by a unilateral declaration of independence on the 11th November, 1965. This outrageous action in defiance of world opinion and accepted canons of civilized behaviour will have far-reaching consequences of the most serious nature. The Indian Government condemns this action in the strongest terms and expresses its full solidarity with and support of, the African peoples of Rhodesia.

"The British Government have now taken certain measures to meet the situation created by the unilateral declaration of independence. These are, however, belated measures and if firm action had been taken in earlier stages, this serious situation would not have developed. We consider it the British Government's duty to nullity and checkmate the move by Mr. Smith and his socalled Government and to take necessary measures including the use of force, as enjoined by the General Assembly Resolution of 5th November, not to allow the rebel Government to consolidate their illegal hold on the four million people of Rhodesia.

"We shall not therefore recognise a Government which has unilaterally seized power, and should a provisional Government representing the people of Rhodesia recognized by the O.A.U. be established, the Indian Government would recognise it. I would like to take this opportunity to declare, following severance of diplomatic relations, severance of all economic relations with Rhodesia with immediate effect. until such time that a Government of the people of Rhodesia be established. We express the hope that all other governments would do likewise. The Indian Government has throughout this controversy given full support to the declarations made and the resolutions passed on the future of Rhodesia by the O.A.U. and the African Heads of State Conference and in the Special Committee of Twenty-four and the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Conference of Nonaligned Heads of State, and has co-sponsored all resolutions on Rhodesia, The Indian Government would now, in pursuance of its firm policy, offer full cooperation to the Security Council, the General Assembly and the O.A.U. in whatever steps they may propose to deal with the problems posed by the unilateral declaration of independence. For this purpose, the Indian Government would maintain close touch with the

friendly governments in Africa and of the Commonwealth and others so as to deal with this serious development.

"The situation created by the unilateral declaration of independence is not only explosive but a serious danger to international peace. Here are all the elements of recism, reaction, fanaticism,

307

disunity and exploitation of man by man. Here it is being planned that Angola, Mozambique, South Africa and South-West Africa are to be kept in one form or another in perpetual bondage. The Indian Government, therefore, feels that the issue of the future of Rhodesia is an issue of the greatest importance in the whole process of de-colonisation, because the manner in which the unilateral declaration of independence is now handled will have the most serious consequences for peace, stability and progress of the whole of the African continent and of Asia and the, world."

INDIA USA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA SOUTH AFRICA PORTUGAL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ZIMBABWE

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Thirumala Rao's Statement in the Special Political Committee on Peace-keeping Operations

Shri M. Thirumala Rao, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Special Political Committee on November 25, 1965 on the quesdon of U.N. peace-keeping operations

Mr. Chairman,

I should like to begin by associating myself and my delegation and my country with the sincere condolences that have just been expressed on the sad demise of His Highness, the Emir of Kuwait. My country enjoys the friendliest relations with Kuwait and I recall the visit of His Highness, the Emir to India and the ties of genunine friendship that were forged then and have since developed between India and Kuwait, and I request the delegation from Kuwait to tender our condolences to His majesty's Government and his country and the family of His Highness.

The delegation of India would like to place before the Special Political Committee its views as briefly as possible on agenda item 101. The item is of vast importance for the future of the United Nations. Indeed, the very basis for the effective functioning of the United Nations is under discussion.

As in the past, the question before us has a dual aspect, Through its constitutional and legal manifestations, it encompasses the very fundamentals of the Charter of the United Nations. The financial aspects of the question is one which lent urgency to the problem due to the controversy on the applicability or otherwise of Article 19 of the Charter. However, it would be a mistake to consider that merely because the controversy on the applicability or otherwise of Article 19 has receded into the background, the constitutional aspect has also become somewhat less acute. In the view of my delegation, the constitutional aspect remains of paramount importance and any attempt to take majority decisions would again prove unrealistic.

Let me, at the outset, thank, on behalf of my delegation, the Foreign Minister of Ireland for the sincere and untiring efforts he has made to put some method and order in the subject of authorization and financing of peace-keeping operations on the United Nations. We believe that his efforts serve to emphasize once again that the totality of the membership of the Organization is deeply involved, not only in regard to the financial problems arising out of United Nations peace-keeping operations, but also in regard to the constitutional and legal problem. My delegation also wishes to place on record its appreciation of the, sincere efforts being made by the other co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in documents A/SPC/L.117 and Add. 1 and 2.

India is a member of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. established by the General Assembly through its resolution 2006 (XIX). My delegation has made its position clear on the twin aspects of the question in the Special Committee. I can do no better than to repeat, and thus to re-emphasize for the information of the Committee, the points we made in that Committee.

Firstly, the need for a comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations, which was the task assigned to the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, has arisen because of a conflict in the interpretation of certain provisions of the Charter.

The conflict is not new; in fact, we have lived with it for as long as we have been Members of the United Nations. It is sometimes said that the present conflict is between those who take a restrictive view of the activities of the United Nations and those who believe the Organization to be a living and dynamic institution.

In the view of my delegation, there need not necessarily be a conflict between a dynamic concept of the, Organization and strict observance of the provisions of the Charter. While not denying that there is scope for improvement in the Charter my delegation cannot but point out that the United Nations has grown and become an instrument of peace and progress in the world within the ambit of the Charter.

Much of the difficulty that we faced during the last twelve months, and continue to encounter today is the result of attempts to exend the scope

308

of the provisions of the Charter through resolutions of the General Assembly. My delegation cannot but emphasize that the solution of the problem we are facing must be found within the provisions of the Charter. Past experience has proved beyond doubt that a resolution of the General Assembly not in coformity with the provisions of the Charter cannot solve a problem. This would be true even if such a resolution were to be supported by all the great Powers. The "Uniting for Peace" resolution adopted by the General Assembly, as long ago as at its fifth regular session, was a radical departure from the concept of great Power unanimity which was expected to form the very basis of all efforts of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security. The "Uniting for Peace" resolution sought to substitute a two-thirds majority in the Assembly for the great Power unanimity in the Security Council. The nineteenth session of the General Assembly has again proved that the attempt was unrealistic. Therefore, I wish to repeat that a solution to the problem we are facing must be found within the provisions of the Charter.

If I may quote verbatim from the statement made by my delegation at the fourth meeting of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations on 27 April of this year, we said then:

"As regards the authority for initiation, control, conduct and financing of peace-keeping operations, differences of the views among delegations seem to have been considerably narrowed down. For example, it is now recognized that all enforcement actions or actions of a coercive nature are the exclusive prerogatives of the Security Council. It is also generally agreed that even action which falls short of enforcement action and which is taken with the consent of the parties concerned is primarily the responsibility of the Security Council. At the same time, everyone is now agreed that the General Assembly has also been given considerable powers under Articles 10, 11, 14 and 35 of the Charter. Its powers are, however, limited to discussions of questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security and to making recommendations or recommending measures to States concerned, to the Security Council or to both. The Security Council and the General Assembly have, therefore, been given specific and well-defined duties under the Charter. Their roles were intended to be complementary and should not, given a measure of goodwill, lead to any conflict. There is still a dispute concerning the interpretation of the word 'action' in Article 11, paragraph 2. of the Charter. It is Perhaps not necessary to arrive at a precise definition of the word 'action'. What is now necessary is to come to an agreement as to

where 'measures' that can be recommended by the General Assembly under Article 14 end and 'actions' which can be taken only by the Security Council begin." (A/AC.121/PV.4, P. 11).

My delegation continues to believe that it is not impossible to arrive at a solution of the problem with the unanimous consent of the Members of the Organization, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council. To quote from the same statement again:

"Thus there has been a considerable narrowing of the differences of interpretation. It may not be too difficult now to find a compromise between those two differing views. The cyprus case may perhaps suggest a possible compromise. Without deciding which interpretation of the Charter is the correct one, it may not be impracticable to arrive at an agreement to the effect that the dispatch of armed personnel other than for the mere purpose of observations or investigation should be within the exclusive power of the Security Council. It should then perhaps be possible to establish a convention that where the parties primarily concerned concur the great Powers may agree, save in exceptional circumstances or for special reasons, not to vote against a proposal involving the dispatch of armed personnel even if they are not entirely satisfied about the expediency of such action. The responsibilities of the Security Council and the General Assembly in this field would then be even more clearly defined, without any violence to the Charter. That is what happened in the Cyprus case when it was considered in the Security Council, and it is a possibility which can be further explored with some modifications, if necessary." (Ibid., p. 12).

My delegation is of the view that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations should be asked to continue with its examination of the question, keeping in mind of course the very useful and constructive views that have been mentioned in the Special Political Committee during the present discussions.

As regards future financing also, I would request the Chairman's permission again to quote from the statement made by my delegation in the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations on 27 April :

"As regards future financing, I would invite a reference to the provisions of Article 43 which lays down that all Members of the United Nations undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements. armed forces, assistance. and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the

309

purpose of maintaining international peace and security.'

"When the Security Council makes arrangements for conducting a peace-keeping operation in accordance with Article 43, including such financing as may be necessary, the General Assembly of course does not come into the picture at all in regard to the financing of that operation. When, however, the Security Council considers that the arrangements made under Article 43 do not altogether avoid some payments being levied on the entire membership of the United Nations, it should ask the General Assembly to apportion the cost involved. If it were possible for members of the Security Council, either all of them or some of them, to apportion all costs among themselves, other Members of the United Nations would no doubt be very happy. If, however, the costs beyond those which may be taken care of under an agreement or agreements contemplated in Article 43 have to be apportioned among all Members of the Organization, the apportionment of such costs can be done only by the General Assembly. There is no provision in the Charter other than Article 43 under which the Security Council can ask Member States to pay or make an apportionment to that end. Nor has there been one example so far of the Security Council's having asked Member States to pay. What has happened in the past is that the Security Council approved of certain actions and the cost involved was automatically provided for in the budget by the General Assembly under Article 17. In other words, once a decision has been taken by the Security Council on a peace-keeping operation

and it has failed to make any financial arrangements under Article 43 or otherwise, it is obligatory for the General Assembly to find the means for financing those operations but the method of financing and the apportionment thereof should be the responsibility of the General Assembly. It will be difficult for the 103 Member States who are not members of the Security Council to accept an assessment in which they have had no say." (Ibid., pp. 13, 15 and 16)

The draft resolution contained in document A/ SPC/L.117 has suggested in operative paragraph 2, a formula for the future financing of peace-keening operations to be assessed by the General Assembly.

In the case of the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Operation in the Congo, all kinds of ad hoc arrangements were tried, one after the other. Some Members, on the basis of their capacity to pay, were given rebates of up to 85 per cent on their regular share, arrived at according to the regular scale of contributions. Other Members were given a 50 Per cent rebate. For the period 1 July 1962 to 30 June 1963, these two operations were financed out of a special bond issue, which is now being amortized on the basis of the normal scale of assessments-in other words, all Member States, developed and developing, whether permanent members of the Security Council or not, are being made to pay at their normal rate of contribution. In the course of the Fourth Special Session, according to resolutions 1875 (S.IV) and 1876 (S.IV), dealing with the costs of UNEF and ONUC respectively, were adopted and they embody a variation of the principles suggested to the Working Group of Twenty-One, in a document which has come to be known as document R-18.

The effect of these two resolutions was to give a rebate of 55 per cent to developing States. This was so because the formula set out in document A/AC.113/18, popularly known as R-18, was based on a sliding-scale according to which, while the peace-keeping expenses of the Organisation were at a low level, the participation of developing States came to a higher percentage in the cost quantam, and, as the expenses mounted, their capacity to pay was, quite naturally, considered to have been reduced. In document R-18, the three categories were maintained: permanent members of the Security Council, developed States and developing States. The only anomaly in this was the fact that China is a permanent member of the Security Council and, at the same time, a developing State.

The financing formula contained in the draft resolution under discussion puts slightly less of a burden-if we calculate on the basis of \$ 100 million per annum expenditure on peace-keeping on the permanent members of the Security Council and on the developing States. However, it is a shortcoming of the draft that it does not take into account the possibility of a peace-keeping operation like that in Korea, where, although the expenses were met by a few Member States only. the actual quantum of expenditure was at a level of billions, of dollar, per annum. We feel bound to say that the formula that we presented in document R-18. Which was submitted jointly by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Cameroon, Nigeria, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic and my own, continues to deserve consideration. We are not sure that a case exists for changes in the basic ideas underlying this formula.

Finally, my delegation would like to emphasize that, in the case of any future peace-keeping operation, the fund should result either from voluntary contributions or an assessment which would be compulsory in nature. It would be impractical to combine the two methods for any particular operation by giving only a few Members--even if they are permanent members of the

310

Security Council--the Option of not making any payment, at the same time as obligating the rest of the Members of the Organization.

This criticism of the draft resolution under discussion is not made lightly. The very basis of the draft resolution is the authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations by a majority vote-a majority of three fourths of the Members present and voting in the Assembly, but nevertheless a majority. Whereas a majority vote would not obligate the dissenting permanent members of the Security Council, it would obligate the other dissenting Members of the Organization to pay. This is a clear indication of the fact that no permanent member can be forced to pay against its will. But the Charter makes no distinction between permanent members and others as far as financial obligations are concerned, and I am afraid my delegation cannot subscribe to such a method of financing future peacekeeping operations.

I think it is quite clear from what I have said that it would be impractical to attempt to solve the problem with which we are faced simply by a resolution of the General Assembly. It would be far better to arrive at a consensus of views.

For that reason, it is necessary to proceed with caution, and I would recommend such caution to the representatives assembled here. Speaking on 19 November 1965, the Foreign minister of Ireland said that any committee which was asked to devote its time and energy to a comprehensive review of peace-keeping should know how the Assembly stands on the financial aspects. My delegation is in full agreement with that statement. However, it is one thing for the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to be aware of the views of the members of the Assembly on the financial aspects of the matter and quite another to be faced with a General Assembly resolution which in fact prejudges, and in great measure performs, the task assigned to the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. The last preambular paragraph of the draft resolutions stipulates "pending the adoption of a comprehensive solution". But, in the view of my delegation, the adoption of the draft resolution would amount to the adoption of a comprehensive soluion which would make it quite unnecessary, if not infructuous, for the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to continue its comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all, their aspects.

INDIA USA KUWAIT IRELAND CYPRUS CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CONGO CHINA KOREA ARGENTINA BRAZIL NIGER NIGERIA PAKISTAN

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha intervening in the Debate on Foreign Affairs

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following speech in the Lok Sabha on November 16, 1965 intervening in the debate on Foreign Affairs :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened to many of the speeches made in the House. I do not propose to cover all the points, but I shall refer to some of them only. My colleague, the Foreign Minister, while replying to the debate, might be able to cover the rest of the points.

Sir, in the very beginning, I would like to say that when I took over this office my first attention was drawn towards our neighbouring countries and it was my feeling that we had many problems to face in this country, tremendous problems, and they had to be faced and they had to be tackled. I wanted that there should be peace in India and, as far as possible, we should build up better relationship with the neighbouring States.

INDO-CEYLON AGREEMENT

The Ceylon Prime Minister came here in the very beginning, about a year before, almost when this new Government came into office. There was a problem hanging for a long time between Ceylon and India. I do not say that whatever we agreed to between Ceylon and India, the agreement entered into, was wholly satisfactory or it satisfied all the people concerned. Yet, our effort was that, if possible, we should try to tackle it and resolve it. We had a long discussion here in Delhi for about a week or perhaps a little more than that, and ultimately we entered into an agreement. That agreement is yet to be implemented, and I am glad that the new Prime Minister of Ceylon is rather keen to implement

311

it. He is, if I might say so, taking a very wholesome view, a liberal view in regard to this agreement. I greatly welcome it. In any case, the relations between India and Ceylon hid improved and we do have friendly relations between the two countries.

INDIAN NATIONALS IN BURMA

There were difficulties in Burma and our people were coming away from Burma. That was a situation which created a good deal of suffering amongst our people. I requested our Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, to visit Burma. He went there and had talks with the Burmese Government. Though I do not say that all the problems have been solved yet some improvements were made. Previously our people were coming from Burma after completely leaving their assets behind. Some change took place in that position and, at least for the time being, the tension that was prevalent at that time was considerably reduced. Soon after that the President of Burma, Gen. Ne Win visited India. He came to Delhi and we had useful talks. I have no doubt that it has definitely improved our relations; while there may be some hitches, our relationship with Burma is exceedingly good at the present moment.

NEPAL

I went to Kathmandu in Nepal myself and I had talks there. I would not like to go into that matter further. I would merely like to say that the relationship between Nepal and India is very good.

Of course, the relationship has always to be improved upon and we have to do as much as we can in that direction. I may say that we did try to tackle these three important neighbouring countries in the beginning and, on the whole, some good effects were produced.

INDO-PAK RELATIONS

I might also add that in the beginning it was my desire that we should have better relations with Pakistan also. I felt that it would be good for India if Pakistan and India lived peacefully and in a friendly way, It is for this reason that I decided to visit Karachi. While returning from Cairo I went to Karachi and I had talks with President Ayub. I must say that it did create some impression on me. Because, when we talked amongst ourselves, we felt that some of the burning problems between India and Pakistan should be resolved and should be settled. For example, we felt that the skirmishes that were occurring frequently on the borders should come to an end. Then there was the question of refugees. I said that millions of refugees have conic from East Pakistan to India He also referred to some of the Muslims who are being sent out. He said that Indian Muslims are being sent out. I said that we are prepared to look into that matter. He suggested that there should be a meeting for discussing this matter. He was very particular that the conflicts or skirmishes which occur on the border should be stopped. So, he himself suggested that the military authorities of the two countries might meet, discuss and evolve a formula. Similarly, he suggested that there should be a meeting of the Home Ministers of both the countries to discuss the question of refugees and evictees, as he described it. I said that these proposals are most welcome to me and that we will be only too glad to have talks with them.

On my return here we sent up proposals to Pakistan. We said that a meeting of the Home Ministers might be fixed. A date was actually fixed. It was later on postponed by Pakistan. Then, another date was fixed and even that was also postponed. Ultimately nothing happened. When we reminded the Pakistan Government that the meeting did not materialise and what they proposed to do, of course, then they said, "Conditions are rather at the present moment difficult" or there were elections etc., and, therefore, they said, this meeting could not be held. This happened in the case of Pakistan.

As I said, our desire was to live peacefully amongst ourselves. Between ourselves we wanted that we should develop better relationship. Of course, it was far from my imagination that Pakistan was preparing entirely for something else. On the one hand, President Ayub talked of these things and talked of having mutual talks and discussions; on the other, it seems that Pakistan was making preparations for forcing our hands to concede certain matters to them, to surrender on certain points-whether it was in regard to the Rann of Kutch or it was in regard to Jammu and Kashmir.

PAKISTANI AGGRESSION

After a while-I need not go into that again; but, as the House is aware-Pakistan made an aggression on the Rann of Kutch and it was a sudden attack; it was an attack made with full strength. Even then we felt that in case this matter could be settled peacefully we should try to do so. We, had said that in case Pakistan would vacate the Rann of Kutch, we would be prepared to meet and discuss. But Pakistan took some time. Ultimately, we came to an agreement. However, even with this agreement Pakistan, it is clear, was not satisfied. They felt that this was a means to achieve something. Even this agreement on the Rann of Kutch provoked them to further aggression. They thought that they could compel us or force us to agree either to the separation of Jammu and Kashmir or to the merger

312

of Jammu and Kashmir with Pakistan or whatever they may have had in their mind. However, they felt that through force they could compel us to agree to their demands and, therefore, even of course before the ink, was dry, as it is said, on the Rann of Kutch agreement, Pakistan made a further attack on Kashmir and this time first it was through infiltrators. As the House is aware, thousands of infiltrators came into Jammu and Kashmir territory with deadly arms and weapons. There is--I would not deny-fairly dangerous potential; there are enough of mischievous people in Jammu and Kashmir and it was expected, perhaps by Pakistan, that they would be helpful to these infiltrators who had come into the territory in large numbers. Of course, these infiltrators tried their level best to create some kind of disorder and chaos in Jammu and Kashmir. It has been the practice and habit of Pakistan to create such situations, specially when a meeting of the United Nations or of the Security Council is held. They had been doing it for the last two years. This year also this was one of their plans to show to the world that Jammu and Kashmir is, in chaos, there is complete confusion and disorder, and that India had practically no control over Jammu and Kashmir. Of course, they did not succeed in it.

Again, they made an aggression on the Chhamb area. Of course, this was a regular attack. For-

merly, whereas it was a disguised attack, the attack on Chhamb was a regular attack with full strength of their armour and weapons-they had come there-and there was, of course, a regular fight. When Pakistan sent infiltrators, we raised our voice of protest. We did say that a large number of infiltrators were coming into Jammu and Kashmir and that it was an attack from Pakistan. When they made an attack on Chhamb, we again made it clear that they had not only crossed the cease-fire line but they had also crossed the international border. Even then, no country in the world, practically no one, said anything about it. They all kept quiet. But as soon as we moved towards Lahore, there were statements made and there were writings in the newspapers and the Press that India had made an aggression on Pakistan. I would not like to say much on this. I would only say that this was the most unfortunate and the most unfair and unjust attitude taken by some of the countries with which we are friendly.

SECURITY COUNCIL'S FAILURE TO IDENTIFY AGGRESSOR

However, this matter was ultimately referred to the Security Council and the Security Council considered this. We said that it was necessary that the aggressor should be identified first. Although it was said, as I have said just now, that India had aggressed or made an aggression on Pakistan, I think, now perhaps the whole world fully realises at knows the fact as to who the real aggressor was, We said in, the very beginning that the Security Council should first identify the aggressor. I am exceedingly sorry to say that the Security Council did not do so. If the Security Council had done it, some of the problems would have been solved automatically. They had done it earlier in the case of some countries. They had done so in the case of Korea. In two or three cases definitely the Security Council had identified the aggressor. We said so because Ave felt that in case you do not identify the aggressor, you give encouragement to the aggressor to make further attacks and further aggression.

CEASE-FIRE VIOLATIONS

Therefore, it was important that the Security Council should have considered over this matter carefully and seriously. But it seems that the Security Council is not willing to do so. However, the result is obvious. The result now is that Pakistan is committing violations of ceasefire almost everyday. There are serious incidents, there are minor incidents and more than a thousand incidents have taken place so far. So it is. As I said, because of the attitude adopted by the Security Council, Pakistan, if I might say so, feels encouraged to indulge in these things.

I do not know what their intentions are. But on the one hand it seems that they want to show to their people that Pakistan is still fighting. To create a wrong impression they have set their people in a particular way. In fact, they have set them with the news or reports that they have driven away India, India has been defeated and something of that kind. But I need not go into that at all. I think at least the intelligentsia of Pakistan know well as to what is the position and what happened during this conflict between India and Pakistan. A large tract of Pakistan is under occupation of our Army. This question of cease-fire violations might continue; still it has been suggested that we should consider the proposal of withdrawals. I had written to the Secretary-General that it would be advisable that the question of cease-fire is settled first or if the cease-fire stabilises, then perhaps it might be better to proceed further to consider the next step of withdrawals. But anyhow the Security Council has decided and they have laid the utmost stress on cease-fire and withdrawals to be considered more or less simultaneously. We are prepared to consider it; we are prepared to discuss it, but I would like to make two things clear: one is that, insofar as cease-fire violations are concerned, if Pakistan infiltrates into our territory now, we cannot afford to tolerate it, we will never tolerate it and we will hit them back. (interruptions).

313

Secondly, about the withdrawal, as I said, I have made our position categorically clear. In fact, in the very first letter to the Secretary-General, when he was here, I had said:

"Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Secretary-General, that when consequent upon cease-fire becoming effective, further details are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open for further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with the infiltrations that have taken place. I would also like to state categorically that no pressures or attacks will deflect us from our firm resolve to maintain the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country, of which the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part."

This was what I had said in the very beginning, and I had made it clear to the Secretary-General. I had laid this letter on the Table of the House and I had made a statement also then, and, therefore, I can only assure the House that we cannot deviate from this position and we will never do so.

SHASTRI-AYUB MEETING IN TASHKENT

There has been some talk about my meeting with President Ayub. As the House is aware, this suggestion was made in the very beginning by the Soviet Government. I do not know what the attitude of Pakistan would be. In any case, we had agreed that we would be prepared to accept the good offices of Mr. Kosygin in this matter. But there is one thing that. I would like to make clear. If this talk is going to be held with a view to discuss Kashmir and settle Kashmir, this talk will never bear any fruit; nor will it bear any fruit if it is about the present position of Jammu and Kashmir, as I have said; I am not going to deviate from that position at all. But one thing is clear. If it is suggestedof course, there should be an appropriate time for it, but still even if it is suggested-that we should have some talks on the total relationship between India and Pakistan, that India and Pakistan should live as good neighbours and there are many points on which we could discuss between ourselves, then, of course, as I have said, although I do not think that this is the right or the appropriate time, yet I will not like to say 'No' to it. Of course, we cannot ignore the history and the geography of Pakistan as it is placed and as it has developed. We have to live as neighbours. If we can live peacefully, so much the better for us, and for both the countries. If they want to discuss the border skirmishes, if they want to discuss about the better utilisation of river waters, if they want to discuss about the

refugees, if they want to discuss other matters, well, certainly, we would be prepared to discuss it with them, but as far as I am aware, President Ayub or at least his Foreign Minister has only one thing in mind and he thinks that the real solution of. amity and of better relationship between India and Pakistan is for India to discuss Kashmir, in fact, not discuss but perhaps part with it and hand it over to Pakistan, a proposition which is wholly impossible and absolutely unacceptable to us.

SINO-PAKISTAN COLLUSION

I have nothing much to say about China, but I must say that what had happened the other day was not a good omen. It is difficult to say what China and Pakistan are preparing for. But if there is a joint attack on us later on, sooner or later, of course, we would be faced with a serious situation. It would be wrong to think that we can just throw them out. It is always difficult to fight on two fronts. So we have to realise the difficulties and the gravity of the situation. As I said, it would mean a lot for us; it would be a heavy burden, a heavy cost both in life. and in arms, ammunition, in everything.

Therefore, we will have to face a difficult situation. But I know that the country will have to steel itself to fight that might with all its strength, with all the strength that it commands. In fact, the real strength is our own strength, the strength of the country; and we get the help of other countries also when we are really strong.

Therefore, it is most important that we build up our strength, our defence strength, our economic strength, our industrial strength. All that is essential if we have to face the challenge of these two countries if they come up with a joint purpose and a joint effort.

NON-ALIGNMENT

On the question of non-alignment, I would not like to say much. But I am glad that Shri Masani has at least somewhat subscribed to it for the first time, because I have never beard him before saying that we should have the best of relationship with the USSR. This time at least he said that India should build up good relationship with the Soviet Republic. So to that extent, I think the principle of non-alignment does not require putting forward any other argument. Shri Masani is there and no better argument is required than that he agrees with this proposition. I think it is essential and good that we have the best of relationship with the Soviet Republic. I need not add that it would be impossible for us to forget the way they have helped us during a difficult period. We have good relationship and we will build it up, and I have no doubt that our bonds of friendship, will further get stronger day by day.

314

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

I might also to say that we know that the United States does not see eye to eye with us on the Indo-Pakistan issue. We have our differences with them, but it would not be advisable for us not to have good relationship with the United States also. We have many things in common with the United States also. We nave also our differences with them. It is these two powers, the USA and the USSR which to a very large extent 'can maintain peace in this world. It will be good if these two countries, holding entirely different ideologies and having different patterns of Government altogether, live in peace so that the world lives in peace. After all, it is peace that the world is ultimately thirsting for. Every man in the world at least desires it, barring Governments' attitudes--Governments' attitudes are different. But the people as such are tired of wars and they know the sufferings they have to undergo. Therefore, it is good-I do not say that India can play a very important role in that, but if we can do a bit, we will be most happyit is good that these two countries live in peaceful co-existence-there is co-existence between them-so that all the developing countries could get help and assistance from them and the world lives in happiness and peace.

I would only like to say one thing more, that it is true that we have friends as such who Will come out and openly support us. It is true that there are not many. Some Member had said that even Pakistan had not many friends, but I do not want to compete with them in this matter. The point is that whenever there is a conflict, most of the countries do not want to take sides, do not want to express themselves openly and frankly. These days, whenever there is a conflict, every one tries to bring about peace, to bring about a settlement, and all statements are made more or less in the same direction. We have also done it, and we also do it. Whenever there is a conflict, India has always tried that it should be settled peacefully. Therefore, there is nothing new. We should not feel that there is something absolutely new happening in which we do not get direct support from different countries.

There were certain countries in the Middle East, among the Arab countries also, which were wholly opposed to us, and yet it must be admitted, at least it gives me some satisfaction to say, that the Arab summit, when it met, did not take sides at all and they appealed for peace.

An Hon. Member: Except Jordan.

Prime Minister: The Arab summit unanimously passed a resolution, and Jordan, of course, said something in the Security Council which was wholly opposed to us. Therefore I said it gives us some satisfaction at least that the Arab summit did not take sides, and they expressed the view that the matter should be settled peacefully.

COLONIALISM

Of course, our attitude against colonialism has been there from the very beginning, from Gandhiji's time. In fact, he was the man who took the leadership and fought the first battle against colonialism, and when he fought it, of course India became free, and after that most of the Asian countries also got their freedom. And something unique has happened in the history of the world that in the last few years almost the whole of the African continent is free and has become independent. It is unfortunate that there are still some countries left which are under colonial rule-whether it is Angola or Mozambique, and now has come Rhodesia.

RHODESIA

As I said, Southern Rhodesia has declared independence unilaterally which is something monstrous. We have always said that we believe in the rule of the majority, we believe in the one-man one-vote principle, and therefore we do not recognise Rhodesia at all. We would very much like to give our full support to the majority Africans living in Rhodesia. They should get the earliest opportunity to rule over their own country.

P.M's. PROPOSED VISIT TO USA

I am sorry I have taken more of your time. I would only like to say a word about my visit to the United States of America.... Well, I have never said that I shall not visit the United States of America. Even at that time, even in the beginning when this was cancelled, even then I had said, and the Foreign Minister had replied that it will depend on the convenience of the Prime Minister--he had said "to visit America." Therefore. I would like to make it clear that there is no such refusal as such on my part. And I might also add and say that it is not necessary to wrangle for any invitation. Mr. Patil did not go there for that purpose at all. The invitation is very much there, and if necessary, of course, it can come again. But that is not a matter for which a particular person has to be sent to wrangle about it. But the timing of it, when I should go, it is entirely for me to decide, of course, subject to the convenience of the President also. But it is entirely for me to decide when I should go and when I should not.

There is one thing I would like to make clear. There are some doubts perhaps in the minds of some hon. Members about that. I cannot be pressurised into accepting anything which would go against the stand we have taken in this House and outside.

315

USA INDIA BURMA NEPAL PAKISTAN EGYPT KOREA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UZBEKISTAN CHINA JORDAN ANGOLA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Ministers Speech in Rajya Sabha intervening in the Debate on Foreign Affairs

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following speech in the Rajya Sabha on November 23, 1965, while intervening in the Debate on Foreign Affairs :

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have always considered it most unfortunate that Pakistan should have decided to make aggression of India. They had done so, not as a regular attack, but in, the year 1947-48 they had sent raiders in Kashmir and there was a good deal of fight. It was, as an Hon. Member says, an attack. But, as I said, it was resisted and ultimately there was peace and a cease-fire line drawn up. I must say that we did not expect that Pakistan would think in terms of making another attack and a bigger attack than the earlier one on Jammu and Kashmir, and not only on Jammu and Kashmir but on other areas also of our country.

PAKISTAN AGGRESSION

This attack was not only confined to infiltrations or sending infiltrators. Soon after, when it was found that the infiltrators did not succeed in their effort, a regular attack was made in Chhamb in Jammu. There were other attacks also made a day or two later in Rajasthan in the Barmer area and in Gujarat in the Port of Dwarka. It was thus to be seen that Pakistan had every intention of not only annexing Kashmir but they had also in their mind to occupy as much area as they could in other parts of India specially in Rajasthan.

Sir, it is unfortunate that Pakistan should have decided to take these steps in spite of the fact that we from our side had always tried to have as good relations as possible with Pakistan. I need not remind the House that only six months or seven months before we had made an agreement on the Rann of Kutch before the attack and invasion by Pakistan. We felt that even in that difficult and most unfortunate situation if it was possible to settle the matter peacefully we should do so and we did it although I know that the feelings in the country ran high. Soon after that agreement, about a month later this serious and severe attack was made on our territory. This attempt, I would not go into details, was thwarted. And when we found that Pakistan was determined to attack other parts of India and also was trying to cut the Akhnoor lifeline with a view to annexing Kashmir or to occupying very large parts of Kashmir, isolate it completely, we felt that there was a danger to the integrity and sovereignty of our country. It was in these circumstances that we decided and there was no alternative for us except, to move forward towards the Lahore sector and the Sialkot sector.

The fighting has been of a very serious nature in these areas. But in spite of the fact that sometimes different versions are given in foreign newspapers about the achievements of our Armed Forces, there is no doubt about it that our Armed Forces did splendidly well.

CEASE-FIRE VIOLATIONS

It does not give me any special satisfaction to say that but there is no doubt that a large part of Pakistani territory is under the occupation of our Armed Forces. It is regrettable that this situation should have arisen. However this went on for some time and when a proposal came to us that there should be a cease-fire, we agreed to it immediately. The House knows that the first day when I met the Secretary-General and he put up this proposal I replied to him the very next morning that we were willing to accept a simple cease-fire. Pakistan took a pretty long time in answering to that call but anyhow ultimately it also agreed almost the last day or if I might say so, the last moment. In fact the time of the declaration of the cease-fire had to be postponed, I think for about twenty-four hours because of the delay which took place in Pakistan giving its reply to the proposals of the Secretary-General. The cease-fire has come but it is an uneasy cease-fire and I have only to say that Pakistan is indulging in violations almost every day. It may be said that we have also retaliated at some places. We have done so but only in those places where Pakistan has tried to usurp some posts or occupied some posts after 23rd September, that is, after the date of the declaration of the cease-fire. It is indeed a very unfortunate and very difficult situation. What are

we to do? We have been telling and informing the Secretary-General about the violations being committed by Pakistan. We have also told them how they have tried to come and occupy some of the posts in the Rajasthan area, It has been trying to do it in other areas also but the most important area is that of Rajasthan and I had made it quite clear that in case there is an aggression or there is an attempt an the part of Pakistan to intrude into our territories after 23rd September. we have no alternative but to resist it and try to overthrow it or send it back. We have done it in three or four places but still Pakistan is still occupying some posts in Rajasthan. Of course it makes all kinds of claims about it. Really the area it occupies is exceedingly small. If in that large desert, it sits at five or six places miles away it does not mean that it is occupying the whole territory and it cannot do it because in the desert it can only sit at places where you have water and the water is in restricted places and in

316

exceedingly small areas. So of course it might claim all that but ultimately it is confined to a few small places but our position and attitude has been made clear in that regard that we cannot accept it. This continuing violation is not a good indication at all and I do not know what Pakistan really means by doing it. If it is trying to give an impression to its people and to its countrymen that it is still fighting, it leads to, or if I can say so, duping or trying to dupe the people of the country. It is misleading them completely because there is no fighting as such going on at the present moment. Pakistan has been doing it all these years. In the last 10 or 12 years there have been firings, there have been infiltrations. They have indulged in sabotage in our different borders, whether it was Kashmir or Bengal border or the Tripura border and through these means they have tried to create a hatred against India which has been a most unfortunate feature of the whole situation. Pakistan was formed in the hope that the communal problem would be solved once for all. In spite of our resistance, in spite of the feeling which especially Gandhiji had at that moment that there should be no partition of India, this was agreed to and as I said, in the belief that at least the communal frenzy which had prevailed then in the country and the attitude of the Muslim League, would

change it was felt that the formation of Pakistan would help in relieving the situation or at least in reducing the tension. We hoped that Pakistan will try to live peacefully and India will also be her friendly neighbour. But, as I said, from the very beginning, there has been a hate campaign going on in Pakistan and all these attacks and firings on the borders and other places created a different impression altogether in the minds of the people of Pakistan. They must have given an impression to them that it is India which is compelling them to resort to firings to defend their borders but the truth is otherwise and I can say with confidence that except for instances here and there, by and large India has kept peace. India has not tried to create disturbances on the borders or create troubles there. If the cease-fire has to be properly stabilised, it is essential that Pakistan should give up indulging in these violations. It would be advisable for the Secretary-General and for the U.N. Observers to advise Pakistan that if withdrawals have to take place and if any further effort is to be made, it is essential that the cease-fire should be fully stabilised. I do hope that Pakistan will give full consideration to it.

About withdrawals we have agreed that we are prepared to discuss withdrawal of Armed Forces and armed personnel. There may be difficulties in the way of withdrawals. I know that it is not going to be an easy process. It would be a difficult process. There may be complications in that regard and yet I am prepared to say that India will be prepared fully to co-operate in the matter of withdrawals and be as helpful as possible.

POLITICAL QUESTION OF KASHMIR

On the political question of Kashmir we had made it clear, and I am glad that the Security Council also fully appreciated it that the question of cease-fire and withdrawals are most important, that they have to be tackled first. In regard to the political issues of Jammu and Kashmir India had made her position absolutely clear. We have always said it, that Jammu and Kashmir belonged to India, that they are part and parcel of India and it would not be possible for us to negotiate, insofar as the question of Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, with Pakistan. So on that issue out position is quite clear.

SHASTRI-AYUB MEETING IN TASHKENT

Yet, an approach was made by the Soviet Union-I might say that we had it also recently; a couple of days before a fresh approach was made by the Wet Union whether I would be willing to meet President Ayub in Tashkent-this suggestion was made some time back also and perhaps, as the House is aware, I have informed the House earlier that we had agreed to using the good offices of Prime Minister Kosygin in this regard. As I said, a couple of days before, I got a message from the Soviet Union, and to that of course I have replied. I have said that I have no objection to meeting President Ayub. I shall certainly meet and talk to him. But what I have stressed is that the points to be discussed are not only of Jammu and Kashmir, as perhaps the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has said, If it is suggested that better relationship between India and Pakistan could come only if the question of Jammu and Kashmir is settled first, well, I would only say that that proposal. from our point of view, is fantastic; I mean it is something which can never be acceptable to us. However, if it relates to our relations in totality, I am always prepared to consider it. As I said what is important is that India and Pakistan should live as good neighbours, and for that we have many other problems to consider. But Pakistan has to forget once for all that there can be no territorial claims on India. Pakistan, as it is formed and constituted, and India. as it is formed and constituted. have to remain intact. This is a position which has to be clearly understood by Pakistan, and by us also. We have no claims on and we do not desire to have even an inch of territory of Pakistan. We have never conceived of it. Similarly Pakistan has to understand the fact that these two countries, as they are constituted, have to remain intact, and there can be no claim from either side on the territory of either

317

country. So, if Pakistan will realise this fact and understand it fully, then we can certainly discuss any other matter. There are many matters, say, border matters. where there are differences; there are demarcations to be made. Then there is the question of the better utilisation of the river waters. There is the question of refugees. There is the question of evictees. There are many other matters on which we could meet and discuss, and I think it will be good that these matters are discussed and we come to some agreement. So in this wider context of things I am certainly prepared to meet President Ayub for a talk with him. I do not know as to what would be the time for it. However, in principle we have agreed and we have intimated to the Soviet Union that I would be willing to go to Tashkent and have a talk with President Ayub.

NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Something was said about our policy of nonalignment. We are truly non-aligned and we think that this policy has paid dividends. We are friends both of the Eastern countries as well as of the Western countries, and it is desirable because our non-alignment policy leads us to that. It would be wrong for us to be inimical or opposed to any country even if they don't agree with us. But non-alignment means that the sphere of friendship is extended and if possible-I do not say that India is in a position to do it today, but as and when it becomes possible, we would be happy if we can be helpful in any way in strengthening the relationship between the East and the West. it is good that we have received friendship, help and assistance from different parts of the world. The Soviet Union has been of great help and assistance to us. It has consistently supported us on the question of Kashmir, and we are indeed grateful for it. The United States of America, they do not see eye to eye with us on the question of Kashmir, but I must say that there is, perhaps now, a slightly better appreciation on the part of the United States of America insofar as our stand on Kashmir is concerned. I shall not give examples, but recently, their writings and talks have indicated that they are clear that the guestion of plebiscite now does not arise insofar as Kashmir is concerned, and it is definitely a great advance, We have tried and we will try to be as friendly as possible with the United States of America. It is quite clear that there are differences amongst us, and whatever the differences, well, they can take their own stand, but we cannot also deviate from our position. So this has to be made clear. But non-alignment is really useful especially for those countries which are still developing, and I must pay my sincere compliments to Panditji who laid down this policy.

sometimes these policies are formulated in the light of the conditions and environments prevailing within and without. It was at a time when India had become free and independent and Jawaharlalji knew that other countries in Asia would also soon become free, and of course later on came the turn of the African continent.

And it was in that context that he formulated this policy of non-alignment with which some of his colleagues in countries like Yugoslavia and UAR agreed and they wholeheartedly supported and endorsed it. So as I said, for us in developing countries it is essential that we should not be tagged on either to one bloc or to the other bloc. We must have some freedom. We must have our independence in thinking and in our course of action. Thus, for example, in India, we may not be a capitalist country. Similarly we may not be a communist country. Yet we will try to build up our own social order and we may be a socialist society of our own genius. So it is important that in this world if there is some kind of regimentation, human civilization will not grow. There will be stunted growth. Therefore, it is important that human beings and countries should be left free to carve out their course of action and their way of life. That is why I feet that for all the developing countries at least, and especially I am referring to the countries of Asia and Africa, if they will adopt a policy of non-alignment, they will on the one hand be trying to reduce tension as it exists in the world today-and it would certainly help to reduce tension-and on the other, every country will have the freedom to function as it thinks best.

It is unfortunate that in spite of China being a communist country, it seems to be totally and wholly opposed to the Soviet Union at the present moment. I do not know what the differences are. There might be minute differences or major differences between the two countries. I am talking about ideologies, although apparently it does not seem to me that there are major differences, in so far as the principle and philosophy of communism is concerned, between the two countries. But the ambition of China seems to be very high. China is not prepared either to accept non-alignment or to accept peaceful coexistence. China talks of anti-colonialism, but in different ways China is trying to establish her sphere of influence on various countries. What is happening in Tibet? Of course, the suzerainty of Tibet was agreed to by us. But the autonomy of Tibet. of course, is a matter which is in danger. Anyhow, I do not want to go into that. I do not want to go into the question of colonialism. I am specially referring to the policy of peaceful coexistence and the effort on the part of China to try to expand not through peaceful ways but by the use of force. So it is that I said that in the present day world even the USA and the USSR to some extent have come closer with a view to keeping peace in the world.

318

They differ widely on ideological matters, on administrative matters, on various matters, on practically many matter, on all matters, it I may say so. And yet, these two countries, they do not want that there should be another war in this world, and therefore, they have come to at least some kind of an understanding, not a formal understanding, in their approach, in order to avert war, in order to avert a major conflagration, they have come somewhat nearer.

SINO-PAK COLLUSION

It is only one country, if I may say so, Pakistan unfortunately, that has joined hands with China for selfish interests, it is just antipathy and antagonism against India which has led Pakistan to join hands with China. China also although it knows what Pakistan's philosophy is, yet it has joined hands with Pakistan, perhaps only because both are opposed to India. They are hostile to India. But as I said, China is one country which in the present-day world is the cause of great irritation. One does not know, I mean, the way they behave; it may lead to some kind of a confiagration as well. So it is China which is adopting a philosophy almost singlehanded, which is not generally acceptable in the world at the present moment. We do not know, Sir, what is going to happen in our country. Symptoms are not very good. Even on the Sikkim frontier and on the Ladakh border, incidents are taking place. These, incidents had stopped for some time, but they have started recently. I do not say that they are serious incidents; but yet why should they happen? It does cause us worry and anxiety. Therefore, we do not know what the attitude of China is, I mean what they propose to do. It is clear that they are hostile to us, they are very

much against us and it seems that they are not in a mood to settle matters at all. We had made offers. While those offers have now become very old and practically they are rejected, yet it seems clear that there is no indication on the part of China to reduce its hostility. In fact, it is on the increase.

Therefore, we are faced with a very difficult situation. On the one hand on the border there is Pakistan, and on the other there is China, and I would not say that this is a situation which we can meet very easily. After all, China especially and Pakistan too, are powerful countries. Both of them have specialised, I mean, they have built up their war machines, terrible war machines. They have concentrated in building up their defence strength whereas we did not do it at all. In fact, for the last ten or 12 years, we practically concentrated all our attention on something else. So in the fare of that war machine, we have to be prepared and we have to meet that challenge. I have no doubt that our Armed Forces, they are confident. I am especially talking of the Chinese frontier. it has been Possible for us to make some preparations on these borders also. They may be much stronger than us. Yet it is courage, it is the determination of our people, of our Armed Forces, which counts. Sometimes armies in large numbers, they do not matter so much as small armies with courage and with the determination to advance further and to be prepared to make any sacrifice, and I have no doubt that in case there is trouble on the Chinese frontier, our Armed Forces will try to meet that challenge and will go ahead and march forward with the utmost courage.

SUPPORT FOR INDIA

It is said, Sir, that we have no friends. It may be true in the sense perhaps in which that term is used by the hon. Members in the Opposition but I can say that there are a large number of countries in the world which have all their sympathies for us, for India and for the cause we stand for. It is a different matter that when there is a conflict countries may not come forward to express their opinion one way or the other categorically. Generally, when there is a conflict, and especially these days, all the countries start saying that the conflict should not be intensified further, the conflict should not increase further and if they speak on behalf of one country, they think that they might not be so useful and so effective. However, that is a different matter. Perhaps, the kind of friendship that some hon. Members suggest comes up with military alliances. I think that some hon. Members feel that way. Just as we have got the SEATO, the CENTO, the NATO and other alliances, they perhaps think that when countries enter into military alliances then they become real friends. Unfortunately, Sir, we do not propose to have that kind of friendship and we do not want to enter into any kind of military alliances with any country, with any power bloc. I might also add, Sir, that during this conflict, it has also been seen that even those who had entered into military alliances did not come forward to help one of their friends or one of the members of the alliances. So it is not always essential that these alliances pay or that they are exceedingly useful. It is clear that it is useful to be non-aligned, it is good and, in spite of the fact that we have not joined any power bloc, we got the support and sympathy of a large number of African, Asian and European countries. As I said in the beginning, the Soviet Union has been exceedingly helpful to us and its stand has been consistent. The same is the case with Yugoslavia, Malaysia, Cyprus. I need not name the many countries but there are many others which have openly supported our cause. Their attitude has been just and fair and it is a good thing to know what Malaysia has done. At least, on the basis of religion, Malaysia said that

319

purely because she happens to be a Muslim country, she could not lend her support to Pakistan. She said that this was a purely political issue and, therefore, Malaysia went all out in support of India (interruptions).

The United Arab Republic has been very friendly to us and it remains friendly with India. I do not know if I should say it but in the Casablanca Conference, it was the United Arab Republic which gave a special lead and a big support to India and for the cause we stood for. So, we are grateful, Sir, to Yugoslavia, to Malaysia, to Cyprus, to Laos, to Singapore and to so many other countries. What we want is that we do not want their blind support but if we are right, we hope that they will continue to lend their support to us.

P.M.'s PROPOSED VISIT TO USA

There was some talk that I would be going to the United States. I have made it quite clear that I do propose to go to the, United States of America. As to when, I shall decide about it soon but it would be wrong to suggest that I go there with a special purpose, that is, for getting economic aid or for getting cereals or foodgrains. It would not be so at all. Of course, I do not deny that these matters might come up and we might have a general discussion in regard to both these matters and there may be many other matters for discussion among national and international matters. Certainly, we will have a discussion about them but it would be entirely left to the United States of America to act as they thought best. From my side, there will be no insistence or no demand as such. However, I shall put my Point of view and we will have an exchange of views. I think it would be good both for India and America and perhaps, to some extent, for the world also.

I would not take more of your time, Mr. Chairman, but I would only say that this is a situation which might-although I would not like it-not be shortlived. Therefore, we have to take a long-range view of things and it is essential that we try to build up our economy whether it is industry or agriculture or exports. These are all exceedingly important for us and for this we do require resources. I have often said that I would not like the country to be further burdened with taxes but I cannot be quite sure of it. It is, therefore, that the Government of India has introduced some schemes, whether it is the scheme of savings or the scheme of Defence Loans or the Gold Bond Scheme. These are exceedingly important for us and, both from the internal point of view, rupee resources, and from the point of view of foreign exchange, these schemes can be of immense help. I hope Hon. Members know what those schemes are. I would beg of them to lend their support to them. This has got to be converted into a campaign and each and every house has to be approached, whether it is for Defence Loans or for savings or for the Gold Bonds and if we can get them in adequate quantities, as I said, this would lessen the burden on the country as a whole. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that when I was in Madras the other day I was struck by the response especially of the women. They had collected in thousands in one meeting. I think there were about ten or fifteen thousand or perhaps more and the way they came forward, took out their ornaments and gave them to me there and then was indeed a moving sight. I got about ninetyseven thousand grams in Madras city alone. It is not that the people are not prepared to come forward and make sacrifices. The people are willing to make sacrifices. It is for us to approach them, it is for us to contact them, it is for the Government, for the political organisations, for the different non-official organisations to go to them and try to collect as much as they can. I would only say that I want the help and co-operation of each and every political party. Indeed, it is a national emergency and I would like all the political parties to function on that national basis and national scale. We would be most happy to get the co-operation of each and every member of each and every political party. I have only to say, Sir, that we have to pledge that we will build up-our defence strength and we will build up our economy so that we can march forward with dignity and with our heads high.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA UZBEKISTAN YUGOSLAVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA CYPRUS MALAYSIA LAOS REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech in Lok Sabha initiating the Debate on Foreign Affairs

Initiating the debate in the Lok Sabha on November 15, 1965 on Foreign Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following speech :

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."

PAKISTANI AGGRESSION

Since the last debate on international affairs, we have passed through the most serious crisis which our country has had to face during the

320

18 years of our independence. An unprovoked war of aggression was launched against us by Pakistan. The Peoples Republic of China, in conspiracy or collusion with Pakistan--call it whatever you will, gave us an ultimatum and was ready to strike us at a moment when our armies were locked in combat with Pakistani forces to repel Pakistani aggression.

Those have been traumatic experiences through which our nation has passed. It is a matter of the utmost pride to us that our entire nation -the armed forces, the police, the civil servants and, above all, the people of India--have emerged out of the crisis with flying colours. They have been a great disappointment to Pakistan and China and to many others who, influenced by the vicious propaganda conducted by these nations against us or for other reasons, had led themselves to believe that India was weak and disunited.

I do not wish to say much about the facts about the conflict with Pakistan. We had to fight and repel Pakistani aggression in the months of August and September during which period the Parliament was in session.

The Prime Minister, the Defence Minister and myself have kept this House fully informed of all developments that took place at that time. It was on the last day of the previous session that we were able to announce that a cease-fire had been agreed to by Pakistan and would be effective from the early hours of the morning of the 23rd September, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to inform the House about developments after the cease-fire

and also about the posture that Pakistan has adopted and the attitudes that Pakistan has projected with regard to this matter at various stages and then I will say something about the Security Council discussions that were recently concluded.

It is necessary, in this connection, to keep in our mind the objectives that Pakistan put before them when they launched this aggression against India. As the House is already aware, the aggression, the creeping aggression, which had all the elements of armed aggression except that the aggressors were not in uniforms started on the 5th of August, 1965. Then, there was the massive aggression--I would put it as naked aggression--by Pakistan when the patton tanks, the air force and the full-scale armed forces of Pakistan were used. This took place on the 1st September. 1965. What did President Ayub say when he embarked upon this? At that time, he said :

"Who could accuse Pakistan who was going to the assistance of the people of Jammu and Kashmir who were locked in a struggle against Indian forces?"

So, the massive aggression by marching armies into Indian territory in the Jaurian-Chhamb sector was with this objective that the President Ayub talked of, that is, going to the assistance of the People of Jammu and Kashmir who were engaged, according to him, in the so-called struggle for freedom against Indian forces. It is necessary to keep this in mind because this will explain the subsequent Postures that Pakistan has been adopting at various stages in the international spheres before the Secretary-General and also in the Security Council and in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Then, Sir, we know that there was a meeting of the Security Council after the report of the Secretary-General which is dated 3rd September and on 5th September the Security Council met and passed a general resolution calling upon both the parties to cease hostilities and to effect withdrawals to original positions. It was a general resolution in which no political element of any type was introduced. Even at that stage, it is important to notice as to what was the response of President Ayub to the telegram of 5th September which was issued by the Secretary-General after the adoption of the resolution of the 5th September by the Security Council. The Secretary-General's appeal was of a general character that there should be immediate cessation of hostilities. But this is what President Ayub replied in his telegram of 5th September to the Secretary-General. He said :

"The concern of the United Nations must extend to the implementation of U.N.C.I.P. resolution as well as to the observance of the cease-fire agreement. The cease-fire was only the first part to inter-related and integral whole and, therefore, insistence on a cease-fire can only be meaningful if there is a self-implementing agreement to follow it."

Even when the fight was at its height, Pakistan had marched their massive armament acquired from Western powers on the pretext of fighting communism.

At that time also in response to a call for peace, this was the attitude that President Ayub took and he talked of a cease-fire being meaningful only if there was a self-implementing agreement to follow it, namely, at each stage, while starting the aggression, while responding to any call for cessation of hostilities. There was this persistent attitude taken by Pakistan to link it with a solution of the, so-called political problem of Kashmir.

Hereafter, i.e., after the adoption of the Resolution of 5th September by the Security

321

Council, the Secretary-General paid a visit to Pakistan and India and he made an appeal to both the countries calling for cease-fire and immediate cessation of hostilities. This was a call for cease-fire without any conditions and to this President Ayub replied in his letter dated the 13th September, 1965, as follows :-

"We would, therefore, urge that, if the conflict is to be resolved and this sub-continent spared the horrors of even a wider war, the cease-fire must be accompanied by action which should resolve the Teal cause of this conflict. This would be possible if the ceasefire is followed immediately by complete withdrawal of the Indian and Pakistani forces from the State of Jammu & Kashmir, the induction of the United Nations' sponsored Afro-Asian force to maintain order in the State and holding of a plebiscite in the State within three months."

At that time also, as a condition precedent for accepting any cease-fire he talked of three things, namely, (i) complete withdrawal of Indian and Pakistani forces; (ii) induction of the Afro-Asian force; and (iii) plebiscite within a certain time Emit, I am bringing all these facts to the notice of the House in a chronological order, so that it may be able to judge as to what have been the motives of Pakistani leaders throughout this conflict and even when approaches were made for bringing about the cessation of hostilities.

Therefore, as you all know, the Security Council adopted the Resolution of September 20. There are two paragraphs in that Resolution which are important, namely, paragraph 1 and paragraph 4. Paragraph 1 is the paragraph where call is made. for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal to original positions. Paragraph 4 says that, after these withdrawals are completed, the Security Council will consider as to what other steps they could take for resolving the causes of the underlying conflict between the two countries. But Pakistan never got reconciled to that proposition, to that Resolution which was adopted by the Security Council. It is interesting to note how Pakistan has been changing its attitude to the Security Council Resolution at different stages of the controversy. When this Resolution of September 20 was being adopted, the Jordanian representative, who in all these discussions had been taking a completely pro-Pakistan attitude, abstained from voting in support of the Resolution. That shows how Pakistan viewed this Resolution. Pakistan was not accepting the Resolution of September 20 and the Law Minister of Pakistan. who happened to be representing Pakistan at the final stages of the discussion in the Security Council, made a statement to this effect :

"I would, therefore, request the members

of the Council to consider these aspects again and not to accept and adopt this draft Resolution."

So, Pakistan's representative had very clearly registered his opposition to the adoption of that resolution, and as I had mentioned just a moment ago, the Jordanian representative for the reason, namely that he wanted to help the Pakistani viewpoint, did not vote in favour of the adoption of this resolution;

What happened thereafter ? It is quite interesting to know that even thereafter, that is, after the adoption of this resolution, towards the end of September, the General Assembly of the United Nations started their meetings. In the course of the meetings of the General Assembly, again, the Pakistan delegation tried very bard to raise these political issues in the General Assembly. They also talked of the internal situation in Jammu and Kashmir, and they made even a proposal at one stage that some sort of commission might be sent on behalf of the UN to investigate and find out the actual state of affairs in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. But I might inform the House that there was very little response to these moves on behalf of Pakistan. The number of countries which actually supported the Pakistan viewpoint in varying degrees was small; not more Than about half a dozen countries made statements in support of this plea of Pakistan; and Pakistan at the end of the debate in the General Assembly, came obviously to the conclusion that she had not been able to bustle the General Assembly of the United Nations into accepting her viewpoint. Thereafter, the Pakistani Delegation and their Foreign Minister tried to see that a meeting of the Security Council might be convened.

The Pakistan Delegation then tried to involve the Security Council in the discussion of the socalled political aspect of the Kashmir problem and they sounded various members of the Security Council for convening a meeting,

Here, I would like to inform the House of one thing. I think most hon. Members would no doubt be aware of it, but still there is not a full understanding of the functioning of these organs of the United Nations. A great deal of talk continues behind the scenes before a meeting is convened, Members are sounded, and the parties are sounded about the holding of a meeting, and if there is a general consensus of opinion in favour of convening a meeting, then a meeting is convened. Then, a meeting can also be convened at any time by a member of the Security Council. The Parties to a dispute can also make a move for calling a meeting, and then the President of the Security Council decides this. In most of these informal meetings there

322

was a realisation particularly after noticing the trend of discussions in the General Assembly and the very clear stand that India had taken in the General Assembly, that there was nothing like a so-called political question of Kashmir and that this was a matter which was not a subject of negotiation or a subject of discussion. So the members of the Security Council were disinclined to convene a meeting of the Council. In fact, at one stage, the President of the Security Council for that month. mentioned. to the press that there appeared to be unanimity amongst the members of the Security Council on one matter, namely, that a meeting of the Security Council at this time was not likely to yield any result and none of them was in favour of convening a meeting of the Council.

Seeing this atmosphere, Pakistan made a formal application, a formal complaint, to the Security Council and called for the convening of a meeting of the Security Council. In this complaint, several matters which related to the internal law and order situation in Kashmir were mentioned, about demonstrations by students, about the action taken by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir to cope with the situation and also about the imaginary rebellion Which, according to Pakistan, was going on.

So they mentioned all that and wanted to raise all these matters before the Security Council. We on our side made the position clear to individual members and also to the President of the Security Council : that whereas India is willing to co-operate and is willing to discuss matters relating to stabilisation of the ceasefire, whereas we are prepared also to co-operate in drawing up plans for withdrawal of at, armed personnel, including the infiltrators into the Valley, whose infiltration was the starting point of aggression on 5 August, and whereas we are prepared to co-operate in these efforts for restoration and stabilisation of peace, the steps that the Government of Jammu and Kashmir take in order to cope with the situation are nothing but a chain reaction resulting from aggression resorted to by Pakistan, and India would refuse to discuss that matter before the Security Council. I also made it clear that we are anxious that all countries, all people in the world and international public opinion, should understand our viewpoint and we are prepared to explain to them in detail that what we are doing in Jammu and Kashmir is quite normal, and there is a Government there which is functioning under the leadership of an outstanding Kashmir Muslim leader who is responsible to his own Legislature which is elected on adult franchise. We told them very clearly that whereas we are anxious to explain to everyone in order that they may not carry a wrong impression of the state of affairs in Jammu and Kashmir, about the functioning of the Government here, we do not accept that we are answerable to any international community of accountable to the Security Council or to the United Nations about what we do internally, which is purely a law and order problem.

So we made that position absolutely clear in our various talks with all the members of the Security council. And I took the precaution of informing the President of the Security Council by a letter also to that effect.

Having taken up that position we also said beforehand that if the Security Council, notwithstanding this very clear attitude taken by us, kept on its agenda an item based on the letter sent by the Pakistan Foreign Minister, we would not participate in the discussion because we regard that as an internal matter outside its scope and jurisdiction and not relevant to the restoration and stabilisation of peace which Was the only thing which was relevant at that stage under paragraph (1) of the Security Council Resolution of September 20.

Having made the position clear, we were told by the President of the Security Council that he agreed with our view; he said that the only thing relevant at that stage was the stabilisation of the cease-fire and withdrawals, that the internal, domestic problems, which were the concern of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, were not relevant, that the discussion about that was not at all germane to the point before the Security Council.

I further told the President of the Security Council that in these matters we were taking a basic stand, and that we did not want to quibble over the procedural aspect. So I advised him at a personal level that it would be good for him to informally ascertain the views of his other colleagues who were members of the Security Council, so that his interpretation might be acceptable to the other members of the Security Council also. We said we would find it difficult to participate in the discussions unless we had an assurance of that type.

The President of the Security Council did consult informally the other colleagues and then we were told, about 15 minutes or half an hour before the starting of the meeting I think, that the President of the Security Council would ensure that the discussion would be confined only to the stabilisation of the cease-fire and of withdrawals, and that when any other things were talked about, he would call the Pakistan Foreign Minister to order. On this assurance we participated in the discussion.

To be fair to the President of the Security Council, I should say that as soon as other matters were referred to, he did call the Pakistan

323

Foreign Minister to order, saying that that meeting of the Security Council had been convened to discuss the questions relating to cease-fire and withdrawal, that restoration of peace was the important matter to which the Security Council should direct its attention, but the Pakistan Foreign Minister continued. When we found that, notwithstanding his efforts, the Pakistan delegation was talking about matters which were entirely relating to the internal jurisdiction and law and order matters of Jammu and Kashmir, we had no option but to withdraw from the Security Council.

This was a step which was appreciated by all members of the Security Council as not directed

either against the Security Council or against any of its members. It might interest the House to know that none of the members of the Security Council in the course of their speeches made any adverse reference to our having left the Security Council meeting. In fact, in several informal talks with the Indian delegation, members of other delegations did say that, situated as we were, the course adopted by India appeared to be not only the correct course, but the only honourable course. I am, therefore, happy that we took this decision which was not a very pleasant decision, but in retrospect I am fully satisfied that if we had not adopted this attitude, we would always be drawn into the Security Council, that motivated by the temptation to contradict all the allegations that might be made against us, we would always irretrievably be drawn into the vortex more and more, into a discussion of matters which are entirely internal. Therefore, it is in this background that we have to view the Security Council proceedings and the Security Council resolution.

What happened then in the Security Council? General statements were made, and thereafter the Security Council adopted a resolution on 5th November. The resolution of 5th November emerged after several drafts were informally put forward by Jordan and by Netherlands. They were trying to telescope the various stages which were mentioned in the Security Council resolution of 20th September; they, friends of Pakistan, were all the time endeavouring to bring in a discussion in the Security Council about the political aspects of the Kashmir problem. But the hon. Members will find from the resolution that has been adopted on 5th November that para (1) reaffirms its resolution of 20th September in all its parts, and para (2) requests the Government of India and Pakistan to cooperate towards a full implementation of para (1) of the resolution of 20th September etc. These are the only two parts of this resolution which were finally adopted on 5th November.

It is in this background that we have to weigh the various statements that have been made by Pakistani leaders to which I made reference a little earlier when I read out extracts from the various communications and speeches which were made by the Pakistani leaders in response to various calls for peace. It is in this context that we have to view President Ayub's statement of 1st September, his reply to the Secretary-General of 5th September, his letter to the Security Council of 13th September from which I have already read out extracts, and the statement of the Law Minister of Pakistan at the time of the adoption of the resolution. What has happened now for the Pakistan Foreign Minister suddenly to say that he is satisfied with the adoption of the resolution of 5th November, which is nothing but a reiteration of the resolution of 20th September? This shows how when the strong and aggressive postures taken in a thoughtless manner by Pakistani leaders, in an attempt to browbeat the international community, in an effort to hustle the international community, when the high and mighty attitude adopted by them that they would not talk of Peace, that they would not accept the resolution, that they would not respond to appeals unless self-executing arrangements to secure their objective of a plebiscite were accepted, when these efforts failed completely either to hustle the Security Council or the General Assembly into accepting their viewpoint, they appear to be reconciled to accept the resolution as it is. I do not want them to go back to their original hard stand. That is not the point I am urging, but this only shows that, whither in the battle field, where we showed that we would not stand any nonsense and would meet force with force as we actually did, or in the diplomatic field, we adopt a certain consistent attitude and we steadfastly take steps one by one sticking firmly to the decision that we take. We, calculate and take every possible precaution when we take an attitude and having taken an attitude, we stick to it. This is the difference between a country like India and a country like Pakistan. You have seen how in each stage they were sticking to a particular position, and then they suddenly say they are satisfied with the resolution as it has emerged now, which is nothing but the 20th September resolution about which they were making such heavy weather, and for altering which they had taken up such an offensive in the various capitals of the world, in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. So, there is this conclusion which emerges from all this that we have to take very careful and firm steps in adopting our attitude and then we will have to supplement and reinforce cur attitudes by taking a consistent position. If that

is done then I am sure that any pressures which other countries might think that they can build against India either by creating any wrong appreciation of our stand or by building any

324

other pressures will diminish. If they once realise that India has taken a clear and firm and correct attitude all these pressures will disappear. But if any amount of wavering is there or if two voices go from this country and there is an assessment that on these issues probably there is some scope for difference, then our objective will not be realised and the pressures will also continue to be used against us in the hope that perhaps we may give in to these pressures. I have no doubt that the valiant success achieved by our armed forces and our security forces in the battle field backed by a clear but persistant attitude taken on this issue will receive increasing recognition if we continue to stick on to this line. We do not want to criticise anybody or annoy anybody. We want to explain to everybody. But we have to make it absolutely clear that these are matters about which there could not be any give and that there is nothing which we can negotiate on these basic points. If that is once put across by us clearly and firmly, I have no doubt that our position will be very clearly understood by everyone in the international community.

SINO-PAK COLLUSION

There are some other matters about which I would like to say a few words. During this period when we were facing this trouble we know the part that China played in this respect and bow they acted in a most reprehensible manner, when our armies were locked with Pakistan to meet the Pakistani aggression. The fact is that Pakistan has found in China a common enemy against India.

The Sino-Pak collusion has been maturing over a number of years and has now reached the climax. Beginning as a marriage of convenience it was nourished by a common hatred for India and seems to have now become an integral part of the foreign policies of China and Pakistan. The ultimatum which China served on India on 16 September when India was engaged in repulsing Pakistani aggression was the most naked demonstration of Sino-Pak collusion. This ultimatum was intended to help Pakistan to attain its objectives in Kashmir and also subserve Chinese aims against India. So, we have in our preparations and in our attitude to keep always this in mind and all our future actions will have to be carefully taken keeping this dual danger always before us.

It is true that our principal pre-occupation quite naturally has been about our conflict with Pakistan but we should always at the same time continue to look ahead and also to take our traditional position on other important issues that face the world.

RHODESIA

There is one important event, about which I might make a mention. Hon. Members are aware of the grave developments that took place on November 11 when the white minority and racist government of Rhodesia made a unilateral declaration of independence. I have already made a statement before the House. I wish to repeat that this move by the white leaders of Rhodesia is a challenge to all that we in Asia and Africa have stood for and for which we have laboured over the years. It is the worst manifestation of racialism.

It is likely to throw the whole of Africa into turmoil with far-reaching consequences not only for the future peace of Africa but of the whole World. We are entirely with the African peoples and governments and are prepared to join with them in any effort and move to meet this challenge and to secure the vindication of the just rights of 4 million African people of Rhodesia. In saying this I know I am voicing the sentiments of each and every Member of this House as well as entire public opinion in our country.

COLONIALISM

An extraordinary phenomenon during the last few years is the tenacity with which colonial powers are waging a last ditch struggle before the final liquidation of colonialism and foreign domination. We all know that they are fighting a losing battle. The tide of history is against them and there is no doubt that very soon the memory of that vicious and corrosive system will be a thing of the past. Colonialism in Asia and Africa-and here I would like to mention Angola, Mozambigue and Aden in particularwe are confident, is bound to disappear in the near future. About Aden, I would like to make the position more explicit, because in Aden, a grave situation has developed and it is necessary that this Parliament should be apprised of the unfortunate state of affairs in Aden. The Government of India have viewed with much concern the violence which has erupted in Aden after the suspension of the Aden Constitution an the 25th September, 1965 and the assumption of all authority by the British High Commissioner. During these disturbances, there has been considerable loss of life and property. Indians in Aden have also suffered much material loss though fortunately there was no loss of life. As the House is aware, India supported the United Nations General Assembly resolutions of December 1960 and 1963, and the various resolutions passed by the committee of 24 of which India is a member, calling for the liquidation of the British base in Aden and an early grant of independence to the territory. India was one of the 11 member-countries which

325

sponsored a resolution on the 17th May, 1965 in the special committee of 24 which reaffirmed the right of the people of Aden to self-determination and independence. India is a cosponsor of the latest resolution on Aden approved on the 5th November, 1965 in the 20th session of the UN General Assembly. We continue to follow the same policy of support to all moves for the independence of Aden and the protectorates in Arabia. Those are the colonial territories where the situation calls for our consideration and our support to the freedomfighters in both these areas.

NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENT

Sir, points have been raised about the continuing of our policy. I would like to say very clearly that during the period which we have passed through, the last few months, there has been some criticism, some suggestions have been made sometimes in a vague manner and sometimes certain concrete suggestions have been made. I will not try to deal with all of them, but I would like to state very clearly our continued adoption and our continued adherence to the policies of peaceful co-existence and nonalignment which we have always pursued. There has been talk about the need for a new look and a new orientation and a new direction and a new dimension which is necessary in foreign policy. Such criticism is of course healthy and in essence emphasises the desirability of adapting our basic policies in the light of our recent experiences. I can assure the House that that is a process which is going on all the time. The international situation, as events in Asia and Africa amply show, is a fluid one. This decade is a decade of change and transition. Many forces are at work in the world today and the resultant equilibrium is not yet clear. While we must take into account the changes of the new forces in the formulation and execution of our foreign policy-and that is being done--there is no need for any fundamental change in our basic foreign policy of non-alignment and peace and peaceful co-existence. Within the confines of our broad approach to international affairs, we of course make whatever adjustments are required in our national interests.

During the last few months, we have had the severest test over to our policy of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence. I venture to think that we stood our ground and faced that test without fear and without deviating from our basic principle.

I am fully conscious that there are several other important matters of international importance about which I could make a useful reference even in the opening remarks. But some of those important, immediate issues, I have tried to touch in the opening remarks, and when I wind up the debate, if I have your permission at that time, I will touch upon certain other aspects of the international situation and also venture to give my comments upon the observations made and the views expressed by the hon. Members.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CHINA JORDAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU ANGOLA **Date :** Nov 01, 1965

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following Speech in the Lok Sabha on November 17, 1965, while winding up the Debate on Foreign Affairs :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate has lasted two days and distinguished Members belonging to different groups have participated in the debate and have given their views on some urgent problems that face our country; they have also reviewed the broader perspective and made several suggestions that should be adopted.

Yesterday, we had the privilege and benefit of hearing the Prime Minister who intervened in the debate. In a major policy statement, he has enunciated the Government's position with regard to some matters which are naturally engaging the attention of the House and are the concern of the country. My task now has been very greatly lightened. I will confine myself only to other aspects, and won't take much time of the House either.

The Prime Minister yesterday made a reference to our relations with our neighbouring countries. In that connection, he referred to the friendly relations that exist between us and our neighbours, Ceylon, Burma and Nepal, and the steps that have been taken, and are continuously being taken, to strengthen those relations.

INDO-AFGHAN RELATIONS

In this connection, I would also like to refer to a few other countries. Our relations with Afghanistan have always been friendly and close. There has been a great deal of understanding of our position, not only with regard to our conflict with Pakistan, but also with respect to several other issues of international importance.

The Prime Minister of Afghanistan, along with his colleagues, visited our country, and he not only had very useful talks with Government leaders here in Delhi, but also visited several

326

other parts, of our country, and that visit strengthened our relations with Afghanistan still further.

Mention has been made of the presence of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan in Afghanistan. We have the highest respect, the greatest regard and affection for Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. He was the most outstanding amongst the leaders who won freedom for us and freed this subcontinent from colonial rule, and therefore our regard for that great leader and valiant fighter continues unabated. We have suggested to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan that he would be a most welcome visitor to India, and we will, when he is here, afford him all opportunities to carry on Whatever work he wants to carry on.

With regard to the Pakhtoonistan issue, we are fully aware that the fundamental freedoms and the natural aspirations of the brave Pakhtoons have been consistently denied to them, and their struggle has got our greatest sympathy, and we will certainly support the efforts that Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan might undertake in that direction.

MALAYSIA

When we look at other countries in South-East Asia, our thoughts go to a very friendly country, Malaysia. Reference had been made to Malaysia by several Hon. Members from all parts of the House. As you, know, Sir, Malaysia has shown a great deal of understanding for our position and objectively has come to understand the correct situation of our conflict with Pakistan and of our conflict with China. They have put across their viewpoint without fear, but it is sad, and I would say highly regrettable, that even when Malaysia adopted this objective attitude and understanding of the real facts of the situation, Pakistan thought it fit to sever diplomatic relations with Malaysia, simply because their representative in the Security Council presented

what appeared to be the correct situation. We should view it in that light, and that shows to what extent Pakistan can go in her international behaviour, and how she cannot tolerate the opinion of those countries who, after understanding the facts correctly, give their opinion. They have not got even this much of international conduct and behaviour, which is the minimum that is expected from any member of the United Nations. That, on merely coming to the conclusion that another country does not agree with them, they should resort to this rather unusual step of severing diplomatic relations is something which cannot be too strongly condemned.

It is Pakistan's loss, and no one is sorry for Pakistan's loss, but at the same time, all countries, including Pakistan, should from time to time be reminded that all of us have got certain obligations to the international community. Any slipping away from that is a matter which should be noticed and condemned, should be taken note of. We should not gloss over these things. Malaysia is unfortunately facing confrontation with Indonesia and that confrontation still continues. We have always extended our lull sympathy and support in this confrontation and it is our earnest hope that the normal adherence to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs of other countries which is expected from all countries would be respected by Indonesia. Indonesia itself is going through a turmoil and I will not say much about it. It is earnestly hoped that in this confrontation Malaysia whose cause is just and right will come out of these difficulties and play its rightful role in South-East Asia and in the comity of nations. Singapore has emerged as a free country and we had the privilege of welcoming the Deputy Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and the Minister of Education of that government. We have from the very beginning taken a very friendly interest in the welfare and strengthening of these new States. We sponsored their admission into the Afro-Asian conference and we will continue to take interest in a friendly manner in strengthening the new State of Singapore. Both these countries have special significance from our point of view and both of them are following democratic methods; besides they are also both multiracial and multireligious societies....Yes. multi-lingual also as my hon. friend opposite points out. This experience of working a democracy successfully and of a society which is multi-racial, multi-lingual and multi-religious is a great experience and great objective that we have set before us in our own country. This identity of views, apart from our close relationship and understanding are other factors that hind us and we wish them all well.

SOUTH-EAST ASIA

Mention had been made by some hon. Members that we should develop closer relations with other countries of Asia and in this regon. That has always been our endeavour. Two countries were specifically mentioned in this connection besides others, namely, Japan and Australia. I am talking of South-East Asia. Let us have some level of importance while bracketing these countries. Japan and Australia are important countries of this region and we have very friendly relations with both these countries. We have strong economic ties and we are trying to develop even more strongly our relations with these two countries. There are other countries also in the region, countries in the former Indo-China region, We are functioning there as the Chairman of the International Control Commission and the Laotian representatives in all the international gatherings including the United

327

Nations have always been showing a great deal of understanding about our conflict with both China and Pakistan.

MILITARY PACTS

Sir, it is one thing to develop friendly relations, close relations, relations of understanding, in the economic field and the rest. But a suggestion had also been made, perhaps indirectly, that some sort of security arrangements might also be worked out. In that connection, let us not forget that the pattern of military pacts which was very much in vogue about 10 or 11 years ago itself has miserably failed at the present moment, and there are distinct signs of the pacts crumbling not only in South-East Asia but also the European pacts known as the NATO pact and even the Warsaw Pact. I do not want to go into the details; these, pacts had already been mentioned on earlier occasions, but in the present situation, both amongst the NATO countries, the latest attitude of the various NATO countries in several respects, the attitude of France in several respects, the relationship between Turkey and Greece over Cyprus-both of them being NATO countries--all these are factors which point the direction in which the world is moving in respect of these pacts. Members of the pact countries themselves are trying to find some way of either formally getting out of those pacts or taking attitudes which are obviously inconsistent with those pacts. Take the case of Turkey, Iran or even Pakistan. They have of late been taking such attitudes, trying at any rate to publicly take postures although we know as to, what value should be attached to those postures. We know that most of these postures by Pakistan are meant to delude and deceive others, at present, just as in retrospect, when they entered into those pacts, they were trying to deceive those others with whom they had entered into the pacts; now, when they are thinking of leaving those pacts and are wooing others, they are trying to deceive another group of people. We know it because we know Pakistan a little more than many other countries. But at this stage, what I am referring to is that even those countries who started these pacts, who remained actually the signatories to those pacts, themselves are having second thoughts both about the effectiveness of the pacts and also about the responsibility in relation to those pacts.

In South-East Asia or NATO itself, Pakistan is a member of both these pacts, and in this conflict, bilaterally Pakistan may have got some help from some countries on a bilateral basis, but in Pakistan's conflict, Pakistan could not take any advantage of any pact. So, we have to view the whole situation in this context. We have always taken the view that any formal entry into any military pact of this nature creates a situation which detracts from the freedom of action in the developing situation which might be available, to a country. India, on account of her importance, her historical role, her urge for freedom and the great desire to keep a consensus even in our own country, because there should be some national purpose when we pursue these policies--we had taken a decision that we should not enter into any pact but should retain our freedom of action by remaining nonaligned. And in retrospect, whether in peace or even in time of conflict, our adherence to this policy of nonalignment has not only enabled us to keep our head high and enabled us to demonstrate to the world that we can stand on our own legs. But even for an enlightened selfinterest, there could not be any other arrangement which would have yielded results that had actually been achieved even at the time of this conflict. I would like to remind the House that when we were engaged in this conflict with Pakistan, resulting from Pakistan's aggression on our territory, and China threatened us by issuing high] provocative notes, both the United States of America and the Soviet Union gave a clear warning to China that any country intervening in this conflict between Pakistan and India would be adding fuel to the fire and, that warning to a large extent, must have acted as a deterrent besides the unity and the determination that our country showed at that time. We could not expect this type of action, this type of very clear attitude by the two main superpowers-the United States of America and the Soviet Union-if we were members of any military pact or this bloc or that bloc.

Then again, even in the matter of increasing our defence potential, in the matter of our going ahead with our manufacturing programme of various materials that are required to strengthen our defence and also in the acquisition of the armaments or military hardware, the fact that we were not aligned really helped us a great deal, and we were therefore not placed in any position in which our sources of supply were linked only to one country or to one source. I would only request the hon. Members-I am not quoting that as something which should be accepted but something which should indicate-to glance through certain parts of the speech of President Avub which he delivered in this connection, where be himself has said that even for Pakistan, according to him, it was a mistake to depend on only one source for the supply of his military hardware. Whatever may be the correctness or incorrectness of that, this is the whole situation that we should view and not jump to hasty conclusions. While we find ourselves in a difficult position, sometimes easy solutions occur, bright ideas occur, but we should resist the temptation

of accepting those ideas or these new things just at their face value, but should try to scrutinise and go to the basic situation that we will face, if we, were to align ourselves with one or the other group. We have to take all possible steps to strengthen ourselves, and in this, there is the unanimous opinion of all sections of the House. That is the one burning thing which is uppermost in the minds of all our countrymen today. And in pursuit of that policy, we should take the maximum advantage from all possible sources to strengthen our economy, to strengthen our defence potential and internally also to become strong and united. Those are the real things that are of the highest importance and howsoever we might feel that others might save usmarginally they might-let us not forget that essentially this is a burden that we will have to bear and we will have to defend our freedom ourselves. For that we should be prepared to undergo both difficulties and sacrifices.

It is in that context that we have to view whatever attitudes we take and it will not be wise, if I may say so without entering into any controversy on this issue, to tie ourselves down, at this present stage of our situation in this very complicated world, to any security arrangements of the type which had been suggested by some hon. Members.

PRESIDENT'S TOUR ABROAD

While referring to the countries which have shown, a great deal of understanding about our view-point, I would like to make mention of the recent tour of our President when he visited some friendly countries. He was good enough to visit certain countries after our conflict with Pakistan. He visited Yugoslavia. Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Ethiopia. I am sure I am voicing the feelings of our countrymen and of all sections of the House in extending our thanks and appreciation to the people of those countries who extended a very warm welcome to our President. The visits were very useful and the talks he had with the leaders showed that there was a great deal of understanding of our problems, specifically about our attitude on Kashmir. The joint communiques that had been issued at the ends of the visits, particularly after the visits to Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Ethiopia

clearly show that those countries understood our position on Kashmir and extended all sympathy and support to India.

I would also like to mention in this connection the support that we have been receiving from Cyprus on our attitude. I am mentioning this because sometimes when we find ourselves in a difficult position, we fall into a rather unfortunate mood of saying that the whole world is opposed to us and we have no friends. That is not correct and we should not view our position in that perspective at all.

ARAB COUNTRIES ATTITUDE TO INDO-PAK CON-FLICT

A large number of Hon. Members made mention about the Arab world. I have no intention to say much on that, because the Prime Minister did make a reference to this very briefly in his speech vesterday. But hon. Members are again reminding me of that, I would like to take this opportunity of clarifying the factual position and give my appreciation of the situation. It will not be correct to say that the Arab countries have not understood our position correctly or to say that in our attitude to Arab countries, we have depended on any one country. We have not diplomatic relations with all Arab countries. I am sorry one of the Hon. Members said-I do not know wherefrom he got this informationthat all the ambassadors we send to Arab countries are Muslims. That is not correct. We have got more than 11 or 12 ambassadors in Arab countries and only four are Muslims, although we have never considered it from that point of view at all. It is the suitability of the ambassador for any particular country that has been the guiding factor. It is unfortunate that any such suggestions should have been made on the floor of the House.

There are certain Arab countries which have not shown an understanding of our case. I myself when I spoke at the commencement of this debate made a reference to Jordan and their attitude in the Security Council. We have some information that another Arab country has either extended or is likely to extend sizeable foreign exchange credit to Pakistan to enable them to purchase certain armaments. That cannot be regarded as a friendly act. But to say that Arab countries as such do not understand our position is not correct. I would appeal to the Hon. Members that while we are discussing the attitudes taken by sovereign countries, even though we may not be quite happy about their attitudes, we should resist the temptation of clubbing all of them together. unless, of course, there is some definite evidence to that effect. Some Hon. Members have replied to that criticism, but I would like to supplement it. There are several Arab countries which understand our position. For one thing, they know fully wellalthough appeals have been made to certain Arab countries in the name of religion-that Kashmir question is not a religious question from that point of view. They are fully aware that there are only 2 1/2 million Muslims in Kashmir out of a total population of over 50 million Muslims in the country, i.e. only 5 per cent of the total Muslim population in India. Therefore, to take an attitude on Kashmir on the basis of religion

329

is not factually correct nor is it in their (Muslims) interest even if it is looked at from a religious angle. This is known to the Arab countries and I myself had an opportunity of discussing this with several foreign ministers from Arab countries who happened to be in the UN. They understood our position quite correctly.

On earlier occasions, whether it is the question of Palestine refugees or the question of equitable division of Jordanian river waters or the Suez crisis, India took a line which was the correct line to take. It will not be correct to say that in our relationship with Arab countries, we have depended upon one country or we have adopted an attitude which is not appreciated and understood by the Arab countries. I am sorry some Hon. Members made special mention about President Nasser. It is no secret that in Casablanca, it was mainly his efforts that resulted in the Arab Conference taking an impartial attitude on this question. Even in the Security Council, UAR's position has always been that this is a matter essentially between Pakistan and India-the question of Kashmir-and anything that is not mutually acceptable to the two countries is not acceptable to UAR and any interference from outside will not lead to any settlement. So, let us not try to misrepresent the

situation. Our efforts for the freedom of certain Arab countries from colonialism and all those things are not forgotten. We should continue to pursue our policy of friendship with the Arab countries.

In certain Arab countries themselves, there are some extreme reactionary movements, based purely on religion, who think that the Governments there are not according to the criteria of those extremist parties. Those countries are facing the same type of problems which we in a secular democracy face from certain extreme sections of opinion in our country. We should appreciate this position and try to encourage liberal forces rather be swept away into taking attitudes on extreme positions.

PRINCIPLE OF SELF-DETERMINATION

Amongst the Afro-Asian countries, it is no doubt correct that in certain African countries, Pakistan has been able to create confusion on the basis of the principle of self-determination and certain countries have easily, without close scrutiny of the facts of the situation, felt attracted to this principle of self-determination, which is essentially a principle for liberation from colonial rule. But the extension of this principle to parts of a country is something which is not accepted by anybody. Otherwise, there would be chaos in many countries. When this position is explained to them, it is bound to change their attitude. It has already changed and it is likely to change the attitude of several other countries. We have to continue our efforts in this respect. We have to take persistent and patient steps... (interruptions). Our Missions are doing a good work and it will now be supplemented by the visits of special envoys and Members of Parliament from all sections of the House.

EXTERNAL PUBLICITY

Sir, a mention has been made, in this connection, that our publicity arrangements are not adequate. Now, it is true that publicity arrangements do require strengthening both here as well as abroad, and I would like to assure the House that we ourselves are very conscious of this. There is the complaint of certain foreign correspondents also, which was mentioned sometime back here in the House that adequate facilities are not given. I hope that we will be able to make proper arrangements to straighten this all out. We have already taken some steps. We have, increased and improved our communication with several of our missions. We have installed teleprinters so that important news and publicity material are sent to them immediately. Then, the material is produced in the languages of those countries. Now we are producing material in more than a dozen languages; more, could be done and should be done.

There are teleprinters in several of them, in a very large number of countries, We are now extending this to several other countries. Therefore, we ourselves are conscious of making better arrangements for publicity, but I would like to support some of the observations that were made by some Hon. Members, both the Opposition as well as from this side, because this is not a controversial subject, I hope. It is no doubt correct that we have to intensify our efforts to improve our publicity and do everything possible, but let us not forget that publicity will play a marginal role and the attitude of the countries will not be capable of alteration just by producing good publicity material. Certain wrong ideas or wrong information they may have can be corrected, but it has been our unfortunate experience that certain countries who cannot say that they are not well informed about the conditions in our country or that they are not aware of what is happening in the country or what are the broad facts of the situation, they have taken an attitude, which they thought they wanted to take. Any amount of publicity in those countries, probably, will not alter the facts of the situation. That we have to deal with in some other way; publicity alone perhaps will not do, and with all the publicity there will be certain spheres where simply by reading a fine presentation of any case we will not convince the people

330

just as we do not always react very favourably if we have got a particular attitude on a particular subject, merely because we find something which is presented to us in any fine form or good form. Fublicity is important but publicity is not the full answer, and it will be wrong, therefore, to argue in reverse that those countries whose attitude is not favourable to us show a lack of understanding on account of lack of publicity. There may be other reasons. We have to go into those other reasons, which is also our duty and responsibility, and do our best to clarify our position and make those countries see our viewpoint. If in spite of that they do not agree, we should get reconciled to it and try to take other steps.

Something has been said about our representation at the diplomatic level and the functioning of the Ministry. I would like to say that, by an large, we have diplomatic representatives who have done their jobs reasonably well. But what should be the best way of strengthening this either at the headquarters or in the Missions is a matter which receives constant attention. We have appointed, as the House is aware, a committee which is going into all this organisational aspect. What should be the best way of strengthening the foreign service, their training programmes, their sources of recruitment and all that is being gone into by that committee.

The committee is not likely to take very long and I would like to say that the committee is not one which would like to unnecessarily prolong it because the members are not getting any allowance. We are not spending any money on that. That is a general temptation which, probably some members have, that when the work is not finished they generally say that the members want to prolong the work because they are getting allowances and salaries.

That is not an inhibiting factor, fortunately, in this case, and perhaps the Hon. Member is deprived of one argument which he generally puts forward in such cases. We are hoping that the committee, which is very earnestly devoting its attention to this problem, will make a worthwhile report, and we intend to derive benefit from this. In the meantime, I would earnestly appeal that the work that is being undertaken by our diplomatic missions in countries abroad and also at the headquarters is not an easy work, particularly in view of the very complicated situation that faces our country, and while we are perfectly Justified in pointing out the shortcomings and in suggesting improvements let us be careful in making our observations lest we shake the morale of the services and try to create a situation in which they may have certain hesitation or certain reluctance to take decisions and to go ahead with their programme and line of action.

COMMONWEALTH

I would now refer to one or two specific, points which have been urged in the course of the debate. Some Hon. Members have suggested about the position of the Commonwealth and our membership of the Commonwealth. Sir, an Hon. Member in a very remarkable speech yesterday gave the Indian public reaction to what has been appearing in the newspapers in U.K. and the general attitude that has been adopted there. Several other Hon. Members also have spoken in the same strain. But we should always keep in mind that the Commonwealth is not essentially or principally a British concept. If we look at the composition of the Commonwealth today, there are a large number of African countries and there are Asian countries. Even our friendly countries like Malaysia and Singapore are members of this. We have got several African countries who are members of this. We had very useful discussions at the time of the last Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference about the Rhodesian issue and about several other issues. So, whatever final decision or attitude we take, whereas we should continue to express concern at the lack of understanding-to express it very mildly--shown by the U.K. Government on this occasion of conflict between India and Pakistan, on this issue of continuance in Commonwealth it is a matter which is not bilateral between us and U.K., there are several friendly member countries from Africa and Asia and any attitude that we take on this should be based on those wider considerations rather than that we should take a decision in a huff on account of these, bilateral relations that, unfortunately, are not too good at the present moment. It is also hoped that this strong feeling voiced in the Parliament and voieed in the country, will induce the rightthinking people even in U.K. to correctly appraise and appreciate the situation. Already there are some signs that there is some change in their attitude.

Therefore, we should look at the Commonwealth from that point of view rather than on this bilateral basis. Regarding our neighbours Pakistan and China, the Prime Minister has covered the entire ground. So it is not my intention to say anything more about them.

I would like to finish by referring only to one other matter. The question of suppression of freedom and fundamental rights of Tibetans is a matter in which we are extending full support in the United Nations when this subject is likely to come up there. We had expressed great concern at the situation that prevails there.

331

USA BURMA NEPAL AFGHANISTAN PAKISTAN INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALAYSIA CHINA INDONESIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE JAPAN AUSTRALIA POLAND FRANCE CYPRUS GREECE TURKEY IRAN RUSSIA NORWAY YUGOSLAVIA ETHIOPIA SLOVAKIA JORDAN UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech in Rajya Sabha initiating the Debate on Foreign Affairs

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following speech in the Rajya Sabha on November 22, 1965, while initiating the debate on Foreign Affairs :

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration.

PAKISTANI AGGRESSION

Sir, after the Rajya Sabha adjourned for recess, there have been many developments on the ground and also in the international sphere. It is not my intention to go into the details of the acts of aggression indulged in by Pakistan commencing from 5th of August. During the last session and also at the beginning of this session, this hon .: House has been kept fully informed about the situation by the many statements that have been made by the Prime Minister of India and by the Defence Minister of India. Briefly, this massive aggression started on 5th of August when large numbers of armed personnel from Pakistan crossed into the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It was a regular aggression although the persons who committed aggression were not in uniform. It was an act of aggression undertaken after a great deal of preparation, a great deal of training, which was imparted to these groups in Pakistan's territory and in Pakistan occupied part of Kashmir. These persons who crossed over came well armed with modern automatic weapons and other communication equipment and several other facilities which are the normal concomitants of aggression by regular forces.

We approached Pakistan through our High Commissioner. But it is interesting that the President of Pakistan, notwithstanding the fact that the High Commissioner mentioned to him that he had a message from our Prime Minister, did not find it necessary to see our High Commissioner. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan and its Foreign Secretary did see our High Commissioner. But they said that Pakistan had nothing to do with these armed aggressors and that it was some local revolution. The whole world knows by now that this story, this fiction, of armed revolution in the State of Jammu and Kashmir exists only in the imagination of Pakistani leaders but there is no such thing in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. When Pakistan did not accept the responsibility for this aggression. India had to take limited defensive action to deal with these infiltrators in our territory and it also had to take some preventive action and moved into the main points of ingress which were used by these infiltrators because. we had definite information that several other groups in hundreds and thousands were poised for further aggression into our territory.

After this, the massive aggression by Pakistani forces started on the 1st of September, when Pakistani forces fully armed with modern tanks, with air support and in regular formations, crossed into the State of Jammu and Kashmir, crossing over not only the Cease-fire Line but also the international boundary, and for several days they were committing aggression advancing into our territory and were threatening the only lines of communication between the rest of India and the several parts of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. When we were faced with that position, we had to take defensive action in moving into the territory of West Pakistan on 6th of September when our armed forces crossed over into the Sialkot and Lahore areas. I am mentioning these dates because some supporters of Pakistan always pick up the thread relating to this aggression from 6th of September when the Indian forces in the exercise of their right of defending our country moved into Pakistan's territory when our own lines of communication and our territory in Jammu and Kashmir were seriously threatened by a full-scale aggression by Pakistan which had commenced on 1st September

It is significant that Pakistan always talks of this conflict as having started on 6th of September and all that happened from 5th of August to 5th of September is conveniently forgotten. The world knows that Pakistan started this aggression starting from 5th of August, with all the facts which I have narrated a moment ago.

Then, Sir, we have to see as to what were the objectives before the Pakistani leaders when they started this aggression and moved their forces into the State of Jammu and Kashmir on 1st of September and what were the postures of Pakistani leaders even subsequent to the 1st of September. It is important to note this because unless we, know what were the particular objectives with which they had embarked upon this aggression, we will not be able to find out their subsequent postures correctly and we will not be able to make a full assessment of their designs.

Mr. Chairman, on 1st of September when the Pakistani armies advanced into the Chhamb-Jaurian Sector, President Ayub Khan of Pakistan made a statement saying that Pakistan was going to the assistance of the people of Jammu and Kashmir who were locked in a struggle against Indian armed forces. This was the object with winch President Ayub khan had embarked upon this aggression. Then, afterwards when the Secretary-General made an appeal to both the countries in the mouth of September calling upon them to observe cease-tire immediately, in reply to that appeal, the President of Pakistan replied to the following effect; he said---

"The concern at the United Nations must extend to the implementation of UNCIP Resolutions as well as to the observance of the Cease-fire Agreement. The cease-fire was only the first part to interrelated and integral whole and, therefore, insistence on a ceaselire can only be meaningful if there is a selfimplementing agreement to follow it."

At each stage, while embarking upon aggression, in response to any overtures or appeals made for restoration of peace, Pakistan was always linking the political objective with the startingot, or with any subsequent steps, in relation to this conflict.

U THANT MISSION

Then, Sir, after these earlier resolutions of the Security Council in the beginning of September, the Secretary-General paid a visit to the sub-continent and visited both India and Pakistan and in we course of his talks with President Ayub and Prime Minister Shastri he, discussed the various aspects and thereafter addressed an appeal to both Heads of Governments to observe immediate cease-fire without any pre-conditions. President Ayub in his response, which is contained in a written letter dated the 13th September again linked political conditions to the following effect. In his reply he said :

"We would, therefore, urge that if the conflict is to be resolved and this sub-continent spared the horrors of even wider war, the cease-fire must be accompanied by action which should resolve the real cause of this conflict. This would be possible if the ceasefire is followed immediately by a complete withdrawal of the Indian and Pakistani Forces from the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the induction of the United Nations sponsored Afro-Asian Forces to maintain order in the State, and the holding of a plebiscite in the State within three months."

So this was the response to the call for peace. Whereas the whole world was anxious, that the shooting war should come to an end, here was President Ayub who was trying to link it with impossible conditions, conditions which he knew would never be acceptable to India. To suggest that India should withdraw Indian Forces from the State of Jammu and Kashmir is something which is preposterous and totally unacceptable to us. And still that was the condition, along with several others, that President Ayub put forward to the Secretary-General's appeal.

SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION OF SEPTEMBER 20

Then, Mr. Chairman, the Security Council met and adopted the Resolution of the 20th September. I will not go into detail because that matter was discussed in great detail on an earlier occasion, I would not go into these details at all. I would, however, like to point out one thing, namely, that the Resolution of 20th September, even when it was being adopted by the Security Council, was not acceptable to Pakistan because the Pakistan's representative made a statement towards the end of the Security Council discussions on the 20th September and said:--

"I would, therefore, request the members of the Council to consider these aspects again and not to accept and adopt this draft Resolution."

This was a very clear stand that Pakistan had taken with regard to the Resolution of the 20th September.

Sir, I would also like to mention that the representative of Jordan, who during the Security Council meetings, from the very beginning had taken an attitude which was not an objective attitude but was heavily loaded in favour of Pakistan, abstained from supporting this Resolution of the 20th September presumably on the ground that it did not meet the Pakistani viewpoint. This is the Resolution that was adopted on the 20th September. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, towards the conclusion of the last Rajya Sabha session, the Government was able to announce that ceasefire effective from the 23rd September was being accepted. We have now to take into consideration the events that took place after the cease-fire.

VIOLATIONS OF CEASFIRE

Sir, after a lapse of about two months, the position on the ground is fully known to this honourable House. Unfortunately violations of the cease-fire agreement by Pakistani troops still continue. Till today over a thousand of these violations have been reported by the Indian side through their representative and also through the armed forces, to the United Nations Military Observers and to the United Nations. So, Mr. Chairman, the position on the ground, particularly in the Rajasthan sector, has been particularly disquieting. It appears that Pakistani leaders during the continuance of the hostilities had fed their people on exaggerated accounts of the Pakistani success on the battle-field, and when the actual cease-fire came about, then they knew that the Teal truth, the physical presence of the Indian

333

Forces in the Sialkot and Lahore sectors would be there for anybody to see. They started thereafter we persistent effort to take possession by committing further aggression of large areas in the Rajasthan area because in that area, as the hon. Members are no doubt aware, there is not much population, and just by taking a few handful of troops they can demonstrate that they have taken possession of large areas. Just by taking a jeep round, they can tell their own people that they nave taken possession of large areas in the Rajasthan territory.

I am mentioning all these facts because this attitude has to be weighed in the light of the various postures that had been consistently adopted by the Pakistani leaders. They had embarked upon this aggression with particular objective. At every stage they were trying to bring in efforts for peace with the realisation of their objective, and even alter the cease-fire was brought about, they still continued to persist in pursuing their objectives.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the original rather bellicose statements when the Pakistan Foreign Minister talked of war of thousand years are now no longer heard, still the thousand-year war now is put forward as a continuous confrontation till the Kashmir problem is solved, not on merits or on facts, but in accordance with the way Pakistan desires that it should be solved. So, if this is the type of attitude, we have to very seriously consider as to whether Pakistan is serious in maintaining peace and in co-operating in a purposeful manner in working out plans for withdrawal of armed forces. We on our side have made the position clear that this war had been forced upon us by Pakistani aggression. That is the real fact, the central fact of this India-Pakistan conflict, namely, Pakistan's aggression and Pakistan's aggression which they had started to realise certain objectives.

We are preared to observe peace. We are prepared to work out plans for withdrawals also. But such plans must include all armed personnel, and we must be assured that there will not be further repetitions of the state of affairs that we had to face starting from the 5th August.

But an attempt to link these peace efforts with any so-called political issues is something which is totally unacceptable to India. We have made the position firmly clear in the U.N., in the international community and to all members of the Security Council and all other States that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and no amount of pressurisation will deflect India from this firm stand. This is the clear position that we want to be understood and let there be no ambiguity on that score. In this light we have to view the meeting of the last Security Council or the series of the Security Council meetings.

At the time of the last Security Council meet ing, Pakistan had made a complaint that certain things were happening in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, particularly in the Valley which she wanted to raise in the Security Council. These related to arrests of the leaders, students' agitation and several other law and order matters watch are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir. India made the position clear that India is prepared to co-operate with the efforts that might be made by the Security Council to restore peace and also to engage in working out plans for the withdrawal of all armed personnel but the internal situation in Jammu and Kashmir is a matter which is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, a Government elected on adult franchise. and responsible to the local legislature. Any dragging of India into any international forum and to make India answerable to what happens in the valley is something which is totally unacceptable to us. So it was on that basis that we took the stand and when Pakistan persisted and the Security Council actually brought on the agenda the Pakistani complaint, we made the position clear and we said.

We are not prepared to participate in these discussions'. We dissociated ourselves from any discussions of a like description. In retrospect, I am fully convinced that the steps that we took was the correct one, the right one and it did impress all members of the Security Council by the stand of the Government of India and also by the seriousness that India attaches to this problem, it is true that in the past sometimes discussions about this purely internal situation not only in Kashmir but in several other parts of India did come up for a sort of mention by one party and contradiction by the other in earlier meetings of the Security Council but let us not forget that these meetings were held in a different context altogether. In the present stage when Pakistan resorted to acts of aggression, when she sent these armed people in thousands and created a situation there which had to be tackled by the local Government, by the State Government, as a law and order situation, we cannot accept that position. Pakistan on the one hand continues to commit this surreptitious creeping aggression and at the same time drags us to the international forum and asks us to explain the various things which she herself had initiated by resorting to that act of aggression.

This is a position, which is a completely changed one and we cannot permit Pakistan to have it both ways--to continue this type of aggression and create difficulties and when a local Government established by law tackles it in a proper manner, in a manner which they think proper, they are not answerable to any international community. I want to make the position clear. I

334

do not want other countries to have any misunderstanding about our position. We are anxious to explain to everyone that what is being. done in Jammu and Kashmir is something normal, something usual and is the handling of a law and order situation but we are certainly not answerable or accountable to any international forum, not even the Security Council, about the manner in which we run our affairs or the Government of Jammu and Kashmir run their affairs in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This was a basic point and we stuck to it and it had the desired effect. In the Security Council discussions members were careful not to adopt anything which might go beyond the earlier resolutions and they reiterated only the earlier resolution of September 20. Suddenly this repetition or reiteration of 20th September resolution which was unacceptable to the Chief delegate of Pakistan when it was adopted on 20th September, when is reiterated now, is described by Pakistani leaders as something acceptable to them. Well, I welcome this change and I hope that this change of attitude is genuine and they are genuinely interested in restoring peace but I am sorry that at the same time although they have come down a great deal from their original talk of a thousand years' war and are now talking of confrontation, even this talk of confrontation is nothing but bellicosity and the sooner they give up this bellicose attitude the better for them and they can view the whole situation in the proper perspective and may not continue to cling to shadows and some imaglinary ideas about this.

PAKISTAN'S ILLTREATMENT TO INDIAN STAFF

During this conflict, Pakistan committed several other acts of a highly reprehensible character. The manner in which they treated our High Commission staff and the High Commissioner himself in Karachi and elsewhere is something which is unheard of in diplomatic history anywhere in the world. Hostilities had broken out in other parts of the world but that the residence of the High Commissioner should be searched and that members of the High Commission should be subjected to all indignities including searches is something which is unheard of in the international relations anywhere, in any part of the world.

Then these illegal acts like seizure of several cargoes and ships and the like is something which is absolutely unjustified. I do not want to go into all these details. There is one other thing which I would like to mention about this before I pass on to other matters.

SINO-PAK COLLUSION

The collusion between Pakistan and China of which we were aware for several years and some idea of which was available when the Pakistan and Indian Foreign Ministers' conference started in Rawalpindi in December 1962, appears to have become much deeper in the course of these years. I would like to recall this House that in 1962 also when the two Ministers myself and Mr. Bhutto, were to talk about an equitable settlement between the two countries. about Kashmir and other matters, and I visited Rawalpindi for those discussions, when I reached there, (the next day the discussions were to start), on the previous evening, Pakistan and China had announced that an agreement had been arrived at between China and Pakistan about the settlement of the boundary between the Sinkiang Province of China and the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It was very, striking that they were discussing the question of Jammu and Kashmir with India and when the discussions were to start and these discussions were initiated as a result of the Chinese aggression in India and when the talks were to start on the next day, on the day before that they announced an agreement in principle between Pakistan and China about a part of Kashmir which was the subject matter of discussion. Over these years this thing which was exhibited at that time, developed and it appears it became very thick. When the two forces-the Armed Forces of India and Pakistan-were interlocked and fierce battles were going on and the Pakistani forces were retreating at several of these fronts, in the month of September, China came to Pakistan's rescue and gave India an ultimatum on the 16th of September completely toeing the Pakistani line on the issue of Jammu and Kashmir, and also hurling accusations against India, which were so trivial, and the language was highly offensive and highly provocative. There could not be a clearer proof of collusion and working together between Pakistan and China than the timing of that ultimatum to India and also, if we look at the contents of that ultimatum, then no doubt is left about this sinister collusion.

Mr. Chairman, we have to face both these dangers, from China as well as from Pakistan, and in that respect I am sure that the great unity shown by the people in India, the valour of our armed forces, the vigilance of our police and the very hard and sustained work put in by all people who were entrusted with this task of defending the honour and integrity of India at that crucial time will always be there to meet any challenge that India may have to face again. We have to be in this state of preparedness and we cannot relax our efforts in this connection.

SUPPORT FOR INDIA

During this period, Mr. Chairman, we have had experiences of many kinds. We had, on the one

335

hand, the support and understanding and objective appreciation of our position in this India-Pakistan conflict from several countries, and we were also surprised and Pained to find that certain countries did not bring in the requisite objectivity in understanding our viewpoint, and took attitudes which were not based on facts, which were partial to Pakistan and loaded against us. It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, at any rate in my opening remarks to go into any great deal about all that, but there are some countries which I would like to mention even at this stage, and I would reserve my remarks for reply with regard to others. Amongst the non-aligned countries we had great understanding of our position by Yugoslavia and also by the United Arab Republic. Yugoslavia is an important non-aligned country, and we have always had the best of relations and co-operation with Yugoslavia. Our Prime Minister visited Yugoslavia a few months back, and our President visited Yugoslavia after the present conflict. On both these occasions our Prime Minister and our President were received with great warmth by the people and the Government of Yugoslavia, and there was a complete understanding of our position in this conflict and our position in Kashmir. We greatly value this friendship, and this shows that, amongst the non-aligned countries, those countries, which have kept themselves informed appreciate our position, and they know that India's stand in relation to Kashmir and also in this conflict is a just one and a correct one. All this is refleced in the communique also, which was issued at the end of our President's visit to Yugoslavia. We have also other very close relation, economic and the like, with Yugoslavia-trade, commerce, technological association and collaboration. U.A.R. President Nasser has always shown a great deal of understanding about all matters concerning this part, and he knows fully well the relationship between India and Pakistan, and India's position in Kashmir. and it is no secret if I were to say that it was the efforts of President Nasser and some of his other colleagues at the time of the meeting of the Arab summit leaders at Casablanca that the resolution that was adopted at Casablanca was a resolution in general terms, and notwithstanding the efforts of several other countries which were represented in that conference, Pakistan's viewpoint either about the plebiscite or about the earlier resolutions of the U.N. Security Council of 1948 and 1949 were not mentioned in that resolution. Otherwise also the attitude of the U.A.R. President has been one of understanding. There are several other Arab countries which have been appealed to by Pakistan in the name of religion, but they have consistently turned down that appeal, and they are conscious of the fact that the problem of Kashmir in relation to India is not a religious question. And even on the basis of the number of Muslims in Jammu and Kashmir, it is only five percent of the total number of Muslim in India, and therefore to treat this as a religious issue in the name of any religion is something which is not accepted by a large number of Arab countries. And we have therefore to continue our efforts to explain our viewpoint and to cultivate our friendship with non-aligned countries.

MALAYSIA AND SINGAPORE

About the countries in South-East Asia I would venture to mention Malaysia and Singapore. Singapore, as you know, became a separate State only a few months back. We wish Singapore all success in stabilising their position and in their development programmes. We had the, honour of welcoming the Deputy Prime Minister of Singapore, and also the Foreign Minister and the Education Minister there, and there is full understanding between us and Singapore, and we will continue to take a friendly interest in their welfare and development.

With Malaysia we have hid very friendly relations, and I am happy that Malaysia, on an objective assessment of the situation, has understood our viewpoint completely, and in relation to the conflict as also on the question of Kashmir Malaysia has lent the Indian viewpoint full support in the United Nations and also in the Security Council, and this is based on their understanding of the situation and of our friendship with them. We ourselves are very much interested in their development and progress. Malaysia and Singapore are countries where democratic institutions, like ours, are flourishing, where they have got multi-racial and multi-religious societies just as we have multi-religious and multi-lingual societies here in India, and therefore their success and out success are more or less on the same lines with the same objectives and this binds us still further in bonds of friendship and in bonds of understanding.

RHODESIA

There is one thing, however, which I would like to say before I conclude. It is true that we have been very gravely concerned with our own affairs, because we were involved in very major conflict with Pakistan. Our first thoughts, our first attention, naturally got all the time concentrated on dealing With this problem. But let us not forget that we. have to function in a wide world, a world in which we have always played a significant role in combating the forces of reaction, in combating the forces of medieval colonialism, and our fight on that front continues unabated. The happenings in Rhodesia about which I made a statement in this House some days ago have created a situation which has caused the gravest concern to us. Here is a racist minority government which has

336

usurped illegally the power of Government and has unilaterally declared independence. We have always taken the view that there must be a government elected on the basis of one man one vote, before any transfer of power can take place and it is the responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom to ensure that this illegal declaration of independence is thwarted. Otherwise the situation may take a highly explosive turn. This is a very, very vital issue and we must fully understand the implications of this. Any racist conflict taking a violent shape in Rhodesia is bound to have repercussions and ramifications which will be much wider and these will be very very farflung, and this might really involve a major part of the world in this conflict. Therefore the strongest terms that we can think of in condemning what has happened in Rhodesia are not strong enough. We will have to continue our efforts in consultation with the African countries and we will lend all possible support to any action which may be initiated by the Organisation of African Unity to deal with the situation. There have already been some consultations and we are anxiously awaiting the outcome of those consultations. In the meantime, the conscience of the whole world has been roused about this. The enforcement of sanctions, I hope, will have sonic effect and the situation may be capable of being retrieved, although the situation would not have taken an ugly turn if the British Government had taken timely steps and taken strong and determined action much earlier.

SUPPORT FOR FREEDOM OF COLONIAL PEOPLE

The situation in Aden is another situation which causes all of us much concern. Whatever little Constitution they had there, has been abrogated and a reign of terror obtains there. We have always had our sympathies and support for the freedom fighters who are struggling there to establish their independence and we lend full support to them in the establishment of their freedom and their independence. The areas still under colonial domination and racist regimes are the areas where the peoples of the world, particularly those of Africa, Asia and Latin America, have to concentrate their efforts to liberate themselves Angola, Mozambique and South Africa are the regions where there is the greatest need for concentrated effort and action to end the racist and colonial regimes there. We will continue to take the maximum of interest in their early liberation and freedom and we will lend full and solid support to all efforts that are directed for bringing the peoples of those countries nearer the cherished goal of their freedom and independence.

NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL Co-EXISTENCE

Mr. Chairman, I would not like to say more on this occasion. But before concluding I would like to say that suggestions have been made in the course of several weeks that we should change our basic policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. I want to make this position categorically clear, that our adherence to the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence is not only a policy which enables us to have independence of action in any given situation-it is a necessary symbol of our freedom and independence-but even in the interest of our enlightened self-interest, this is the correct policy and we should continue to adhere to this in a steadfast and firm manner. Let us not forget that it was the call of a large number of non-aligned countries, the call by the two super powers, the two big powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, that was raised when we were threatened by the Chinese ultimatum during this conflict with Pakistan. If we had not been pursuing the independent policy that we had pursued all these years, we would not have got this support in this complicated situation when we faced two dangers one from Pakistan and the other from China. If we had not been pursuing the policy of non-alignment we would not have got support in facing both these dangers that we had to face, namely, from China and from Pakistan. Sometimes, when we isolate one from the other, or when our minds are obsessed by our difficulties, when we feel harassed, we think of easy solutions and we think of some bright ideas that we could line up with this group or that group. But that would be a short-sighed step. We will have to stand on our own legs, get strength from whatever source we can and continue to adhere strongly and steadily to the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, for that is the only policy which gives us honour and which gives us freedom of action.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA JORDAN ANGUILLA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA YUGOSLAVIA MALAYSIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following Statement in the Rajya Sabha on November 24, 1965, while winding up the debate on Foreign Affairs :

Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing in this House for the last two days the international situation and a fairly large number of hon. Members have participated in the debate. Sir, if I may

337

say so, this has been one of the longest debates on international affairs ever since the Rajya Sabha came into existence. We have devoted as many as three working day hours discussing this subject by sitting through the lunch hour wholly on one day anti part of the lunch hour on the other day. As many as twentysix Members have participated in the debate and this is a record for the Rajya Sabha because on the earlier occasions, I have looked into the record, we have seldom spent more than a day or a day and another hour or so on a discussion of the international situation.

It is quite natural, Mr. Chairman, that this august House should devote so much attention to international affairs. We have had our own immediate problems, problems with which we grappled and in retrospect one can say that we succeeded in tackling those problems with reasonably good success. I agree with several hon. Members who said that the credit for this goes to the bravery and valour of our Armed Forces, our Security Forces, our public services and above all to the people of our country who, in this moment of crisis, brought about a sense, of unity and a sense of purpose which has galvanised the people and has created new hopes and new inspirations for us as well. I would like to add that this had a very significant effect upon the attitude of other countries also. Their evaluation of these strength and determination of our country has now been very well demonstrated and those who had doubts either about our policies or about our determination to back those policies are themselves having second thoughts and are looking at India and India's problems from a different point of view. That is, Mr. Chairman, a good development. At the same time, this has also placed a greater responsibility on us and we will have to bring about the same attitude, the same

determination and the same vigilance to deal with the problems that face us. That those problems are serious and may be of a duration longer than some of us imagine was the keynote of the Prime Minister's speech yesterday and, if I may add, his intervention has greatly lightened my task. He has touched upon the most important matters which are a matter of concern for the country and naturally a matter of anxiety and concern for this House and I would refrain from touching those matters which have been handled by the Prime Miniser in his speech. I will endeavour, Mr. Chairman, to make reference, in the course of my reply, to some of the specific points that have been raised and I would also like to be very brief in my reply.

NEPAL

Sir, mention was made by some hon. Members about our relationship with our neighbouring countries. I did make mention about some countries in my opening speech and the Prime Minister, in his intervention yesterday, has referred to the attitude of several other countries and also has given his assessment of the latest thinking amongst certain big Powers. I would Like to mention in this connection our neighbouring countries. Our relations with Nepal have, over the last two or three years, shown a significant turn towards improvement and strengthening. Soon after assuming this responsibility last year, Mr. Chairman, I myself went to Nepal and this was my first visit abroad in my new office. That shows the importance that we attach to our neighbours. This was followed by the visit of the Foreign Minister of Nepal who toured this country and spent some days here. Our Prime Minister visited Nepal and he and His Majesty the King of Nepal, were present at a function to inaugurate one of the very important projects which have been commissioned as a result of Indo-Nepalese collaboration and which are likely to benefit both Nepal and Bihar in regard to irrigation and the production of electric energy. We have always associated ourselves with the economic development, the cultural development and the educational and technological advance of our friendly neighbour, Nepal, and we have participated in every development programme. It is our intention to take even greater interest in these development programmes. We wilt be honoured by His Majesty the King's visit. He is due to arrive

here tomorrow and thereafter he will spend quite sonic days here and visit different parts of the country. This shows the close relationship and understanding between India and Nepal.

BURMA

The relations with Burma have also shown considerable improvement over the last year and a half. I myself visited Burma and had a very frank discussion with the Burmese leaders, including the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council, Gen. Ne Win. We discussed matters of international importance and also the problems that face the South-East Asian region. We also discussed, quite naturally, the problems that face persons of Indian origin. I cannot say that the problem has been solved. A great deal has to be done both by us and by the Government of Burma to bring relief and to decrease the difficulties that are being experienced by persons of Indian origin who are either seeking migration to India or who find that they could no longer stay on in Burma on account of the changes that have been effected there in their economy and in their several ways of life. These discussions are going on at the official level and given goodwill and understanding on both the sides, I hope that this problem which is a difficult problem, a human problem, will also be solved. We had the honour, a few months back, to welcome the Head

338

of the Government and the Head of the State of Burma and that visit also was a very welcome event.

CEYLON

There has been an exchange of visits between the Indian leaders and Ceylonese leaders over the last year. The Prime Minister of Ceylon visited us. Myself and my colleague, Shri Dinesh Singh, visited Ceylon and we have had several discuss ions. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the problem of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon was assuming very serious proportions and it had remained unsolved for a large number of years.

The problem was tackled in a spirit of give and take, of mutual understanding and co-operation, and an agreement was arrived at. Followup action has to be undertaken and the Government of Ceylon are fully aware of the difficulties and intricacies of the problem and I am sure that in the implementation of the agreement necessary goodwill would be available in both countries so that this long-standing problem may find a satisfactory solution and should be out of the way in the development of normal. friendly and close relations between India and her close neighbour, Ceylon. We have always watched the progress of Ceylon in a spirit of understanding and we will be very happy to participate in their development programmes. There has been a change in the Government there and the new Government is now engaged in the task of serving the people of Ceylon according to their policy. So far as our relations are concerned. our relations are very friendly with the new Government as they were with the Government that preceded it. Internal changes of Government as a result of the normal democratic process is a matter which is the concern of that country and we want to have the best of relations, friendly relations, whichever may be the Government that might be in power in Ceylon. I would like to say that there has been very close consultation between the Delegation of Ceylon and our Delegation in the United Nations and I felt surprised when I read Press reports of Pakistan Foreign Minister to the effect that in this Indo-Pakistan conflict the present Government of Cevlon had given support to the Pakistan case. I know, through our High Commissioner, from the contacts that my colleague, Shri Dinesh Singh, had and as a result of my talks with the Leader of the Ceylonese Delegation in the United Naitons, that there is complete understanding of the India position by the Cevlon Government. These types of statements of Pakistani leaders not only about Ceylon but about several other countries are the devices, crude devices I would like to say, which are adopted in order to embarrass other countries and no serious notice should be taken thereof.

AFGHANISTAN

There is one other thing, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to mention in this connection. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan in his speech in the General Assembly said that His Majesty the King of Afghanistan had assured Pakistan of Afghanistan's sympathy in this conflict. Now we naturally made enquiries from the Afghan Government and they totally denied it. Their Permanent Representative with U.N. immediately got in touch with Afghanistan and conveyed to me that this statement is something which is unfounded and which is baseless and Tie conveyed the same to the Pakistan Delegation. So we should not take such statements made by Pakistani leaders at their face value and should not try to evaluate the attitude of countries friendly to us merely on assertions that might be made by the leaders of Pakistan. Sir our relations with Afghanistan have always been very cordial and the Prime Minister of Afghanistan paid us a visit. He went round the country and he was greatly impressed by the reception that he received wherever he went in the country. There has been traditional friendship between Afghans and Indians; over the years this has grown stronger and stronger and we have always worked in close collaboration and consultation in all international conferences and our attitudes on important international issues are identical.

PRESIDENT'S TOUR ABROAD

At this stage I would like also to make a reference to our President's visit to some countries which he was good enough to undertake soon after the cease-fire. He visited Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Ethiopia and I am sure I am voicing the feelings of this House as also of our countrymen when I say that we greatly appreciate and are beholden to the people of those countries for extending such warm and such enthusiastic reception to our President as Head of our State. It is significant that he undertook this tour soon after the cessation of hostilities, soon after this conflict, and it was very heartening for us that in three out of the four communiques which were issued jointly by the President and the Heads of State of those countries there was specific mention of this question of Kashmir and the Indian viewpoint received full support in those communiques. So this is a matter which we should appreciate in its proper perspective and in our moments of difficulties we should not try to read into the attitude of other countries something which may not be there. We should appreciate and we should value the friendship and understanding shown by those countries and I would like to mention that in Yugoslavia about which a reference has already been made by me and by

the Prime Minister, in Czechoslovakia and in Ethiopia there was complete understanding of our

339

case on this question of Kashmir which is reflected in the joint communiques which were issued at the end of the tours.

ARAB COUNTRIES ATTITUDE TO INDO-PAK CONFLICT

Sir, a reference was made briefly by me and also by the Prime Minister to the Casablanca Conference of the Arab Heads of States. I would like to say that some suggestions which have been directly and indirectly made by some hon. Members in this House. that the Arab world has not understood our case property are suggestions which are not based on a correct appreciation of the situation and the attitude of the Arab countries. The Arab countries, by and large, are fully convinced that the Pakistan attempt to give the question of Jammu and Kashmir a communal colour is something which is completely untenable. Arab countries are firmly of the view that the Muslims of Kashmir are only less than five per cent, or: may be four per cent, of the total Muslim population of India and as such they know fully well that they cannot, even taking a communal view, adopt an attitude about Kashmir which might be seemingly in the interests of thosefour per cent Muslims and ignore the feelings, sentiments and the firm stand taken by the 9.5 or 96 per cent of Muslims. In their general attitude also I am very happy that the Arab States do not take a communal view of international affairs. Now maybe that some countries out of them may not fully understand our viewpoint and they may not be completely with us but it will be doing injustice to the Arab world if we were to say or to suggest that they look at this problem or in fact at the several other problems that face the international community from a communal angle. I know it for a fact that some Arab countries, some important Arab Press people actually questioned Jordan when she made the statement which was pro-Pakistani and against the Indian viewpoint and they urged on the Jordanian representative that his statements which are not objective may embarrass the Arab world also.

So far that is the general attitude that is taken

by the Arab countries. I carefully scrutinised the statements that were made by their representatives in the General Assembly and I can say that besides the UAR, about which I made a reference in my opening speech the day before vesterday, four or five other Arab countries also made statements which were objective. They did not take sides and we should not try to misunderstand. Whenever there is any conflict or any fight going on, the immediate objective and the immediate urge before everybody is to ask both sides to stop fighting and to return to normal conditions of peace. I would like to mention in this connection the names of Lebanon, Kuwait, Algeria and Iraq. The representatives of these countries made statements which cannot be construed as against our interests. Sometimes we are very sensitive and whenever there is any mention of United Nations Resolutions, we get a little upset. We should not have that attitude. After all we are there in the United Nations and the latest United Nations Resolution is the 20th September Resolution. It does not talk of the earlier Resolution of 1948 and 1949. So, any general statement that is made about settlement of the difference between India and Pakistan on the basis of UN Resolutions should not frighten us and we should not read into it something which is not meant or which is not intended to be read. When we are facing a conflict with another country, we should be quite objective.

I agree with the hon. Member opposite, who was repeating again and again, that we should not be complacent. Certainly we are not complacent. We would be failing in our duty if we showed complacency. I am modest and I do not say many things, but I do not think there can be any charge of complacency against us either in the handling of the internal situation, or in the handling of defence, or in the handling of our relations, in this complicated situation, with the other countries of the world. That is the last thing that we can be accused of. We know that vigilance and very keen vigilance is the price which we must pay to safeguard and defend our freedom. That is the determination that we have to bring to bear whether it is on the home front or in the management of our affairs internally, to which the leader of the DMK made such a pointed reference. Several other hon. Members also made that reference. In the matter of our defence and in the matter of our relations with other countries, we have constantly to be, on our guard because the moment is such. It is a grave occasion in our history, as the Prime Minister said yesterday, when we are faced with danger not from one but from two sides and on such an occasion to talk of complacency, I think, is not fair. I know that all of us are fully conscious of our responsibilities. Not only the Government, but also the Opposition Parties have fully co-operated in bringing about that atmosphere and I am sure that the appeal of the Prime Minister yesterday was quite in consonance with the suggestions that had been made by several hon. Members on this important question.

COMMONWEALTH

Mr. Chairman, a reference was made to the attitude of the U.K.-the U.K. press, the U.K. Government and the U.K. leaders--and in that connection some hon. Members said that we might quit the Commonwealth. There were several other hon. Members. both from this side as well as from the Opposition Benches, who said

340

that this is a matter which has to be viewed with caution. I am of opinion that our attitude on our continuance or non-continuance in the Commonwealth should not be linked too much with the attitude which was shown by the British during this conflict. Now that is unfortunate and we have a just cause for feeling aggrieved that Were was not just lack of understanding, but on several occasions a twist against us and in favour of Pakistan in the presentation of facts, in press reporting and even in the statements that were made at authoritative levels. That is a matter which has caused great disappointment to us. Some hon. Members have asked why we should feel disappointed because we should know that they have followed a particular policy, a policy which showed a lack of understanding of our position on Kashmir. Whereas we were, more or less, reconciled to seeing the British opposed to us in their attitude on Kashmir, I think the matter which caused great disappointment to our people and also resentment was the absolutely incorrect presentation of the facts of aggression, which has to be distinguished from their attitude on Kashmir. That attitude is there. I do not like it. I think it is not based on the facts of the situation or

even on the justice of the case, but then there was absolutely no justfication for not trying to understand and appreciate correctly the facts as they unfolded themselves relating to the Pakistani aggression on Jammu and Kashmir and other parts of India and it is that which has really annoved the people more than their more or less consistent of repetitive attitude on the question of Kashmir. Now, in this case it is an easy way to explain that they did not have enough facts or we did not supply them with enough facts. Well, no responsible organ of public opinion and no responsible leaders make pronouncements based on insufficient data. Insufficient material is seldom accepted as a cause for making incorrect statements and even if any incorrect statement was made based on insufficient data, no opportunity has been availed of, so far, to correct the earlier erroneous impression. I do not see any forthright statement that the earlier statements Were made based on an incomplete understanding or insufficient data and now this is the correct state of affairs. I do not see any such frank admission, because that also alters the situation. So, the resentment of our people in that respect is justified and I do not go counter to that. As to whether that should by itself be enough reason for us to quit the Commonwealth is an issue which we should examine in all its aspects, including this aspect. I do not say that this aspect is not relevant, but what I do strongly urge is that it is not conclusive. There are other relevant factors which we have to take into consideration. As has been pointed out by many hon. Members, there is the African component of the Commonwealth and there is the Asian component of the Commonwealth. At the present moment, the Commonwealth is faced with a grave problem.

The problem of Rhodesia is something which may have serious repercussions on the future of the Commonwealth. Already I have seen some statements where some African leaders have given indications that the future of the Commonwealth itself may be on trial. We will have, therefore, to take careful note of all these considerations and we should take a decision after weighing all these things in their proper perspective. Our bilateral relationship between India and the U.K. will be one factor. On this bilateral relationship also, I do see some signs of change, although the reversion to normal relations is not as rapid or as full as the situation warranted. It is my hope that these signs of change stabilise and the correct position is appreciated by the United Kingdom. Some right-thinking persons there inside and outside the Government are conscious of the strength of feeling on this issue in India, and I am sure that they will take note of it and will adopt an attitude which would be one of understanding and not one based upon either incorrect data or wrong appreciation of the situation or on other extraneous considerations.

SINO-PAK COLLUSION

Sir, I would like to take this opportunity of explaining one thing which cropped up yesterday about the attitude of the Chinese on the question of Kashmir. This point was briefly touched upon at the time of the question hour and I would like to complete that picture so that the House may be aware of the changing attitude of the Chinese Government on the question of Kashmir. I made a brief reference to it while I was replying to supplementary questions, but lest in isolation that might create a wrong impression, I would like, to take the House through the various stages of change of attitude adopted by the Chinese in this connection. As is known to all of us, in their latest pronouncements particularly after the outbreak of this armed conflict between India and Pakistan, the Chinese leaders have been making statements which are even more in favour of the Pakistani view than Pakistan itself. They are talking now of the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir and of India having committed aggression and having gone back upon the pledges to the people. These are extreme statemerits that are made by the Chinese leaders in their present postures. In that connection a joint statement issued by the Pakistan Foreign Minister and the Chinese Foreign Minister on the 7th of March 1965 went a little further towards the Pakistani side as compared to the earlier statement. The statement again, six months later, on 7th September 1965 is a complete going over to

341

the Pakistani side, and the 7th September, as the House is aware, is the second day of-our defensive action against Pakistan. These dates are important. This is a very clear proof of this collusion and conspiracy between Pakistan and China. On 7th September they talked of India having gone back on pledges given to the Kashmiri people and to Pakistan about self-determination and the like. Even six months earlier they were talking or Settlement of this question in accordance with the wishes of the people in a broad way. Our case is that we have already settled it in accordance with the. wishes of the people. There was a Constituent Assembly, there have been three elections, and the wishes of the people have been demonstrated in the resistance that they have shown to the aggression by Pakistan in 1947-48 and again in 1905. So it has already been settled in accordance with the wishes of the peo-Ple. Even in six months in their accent, in their emphasis, they have completely changed over to the Pakistan side. Before that they were either quiet or made statements at some stages which appreciated me Indian viewpoint.

In that connection I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, that on March 16, 1950, when our Ambassador in Peking saw Premier Chou En-lai, the latter while discussing the communique issued in Karachi by the SEAIO Council expressed the view: "India had now more reason to state that not only SEAIO but the United States had no reason to intervene in the Kashmir question. Moreover the Kashmir people had already expressed their will". This was the position of premier Chou En-lai on 16th March, 1956. Then again a similar impression was gained at the meeting between the secretry General Indian Ministry of external affairs, and the Chinese Premier in July 1961. Thus the Chinese Government had made us believe that they had accepted the Indian position on Kashmir without any reservation. However, in May 1962 when China started this collusion with Pakistan-and you might recall, Sir, that Pakistan and China had entered into an agreement to demarcate the boundary between Jammu and Kashmir and Sinkiang-and on that occasion when we protested to the Chinese that they had no business to enter into this agreement with Pakistan, then again they went back upon the earlier statements made by Premier Chou En-lai in 1956 and also in 1961 and said that their statements must have been misunderstood. This is the familiar Chinese pattern of going back upon their earlier statements. It will be seen from what I have said that the Chinese have been constantly changing from one position to the other on the question of

Kashmir, depending upon their closeness of collusion and conspiracy with Pakistan born out of the common enmity which unfortunately is entertained by the Chinese and the Pakistanis against India. I will not touch upon the other aspects of the present relationship-with China and their aggressive postures because this matter has been dealt with at great length by the Prime Minister, and I have no intention to add anything to what the Prime Minister has already said-on this issue.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Some hon. Members have made reference to the reorganisation of the Foreign Service. In that connection we have already informed the House from this side that we have constituted a Committee which is going into all these details, and I hope that a report of that Committee would be available within a few months' time, and it is our intention to have a good look at the functioning of our headquarters set-up and also at the functioning of our Missions abroad. I would like to say that during this emergency when we were faced with this very grave Situation in our country over the last four months or so, three, or four months, our missions have done their best to keep the Governments informed, and I would like to say that they have taken all possible steps to inform the Governments and others, and this has produced results. In the initial stages whenever there is any conflict, the general attitude or the Governments and people in other countries is to take a sort of impersonal attitude and no one has got either the patience or the time to go into all details. But when the matter came up before the U.N. and the reports of the secretary General and the U.N. Observers were available to the international community which clearly made out the case that the whole trouble started with Pakistan starting aggression on the 5th August by sending across armed people into the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the situation was definitely being more realistically understood by the other countries.

PUBLICITY ABROAD

And in this our representatives abroad have done a good job. This is now being suppremented by the delegations that are being sent abroad consisting of Members of both Houses of Parliament, belonging to the various parties in the Houses. And although some criticism has appeared in the Press-it has been voiced here also --about the utility of these missions, I have no doubt in my mind that the handling of this matter at the Parliamentary level by experienced public men is a matter which is likely to yield very good results because they will, have an opportunity of explaining not only to those Governments but also to the parties and to the non-officials there at various levels. And we should have confidence in our own colleagues' capacity as public men of experience to project India's viewpoint and the facts of the situation in a proper manner to the Governments and peoples of those countries.

342

POLICY OF NON-ALIGNMENT

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted in the course of this reply to touch upon some of the specific issues that were raised in the course of the debate. On the philosophy or the utility of the policy of non-alignment, I have nothing more to add to what I have already said in my opening speech and this was also very well put by the Prime Minister yesterday. We should treasure our pursuit of an independent policy, a policy that gives us satisfaction and great relief that we are not already committed to any given situation. And when any situation arises, then we take a decision on merits, which is something which enhances the prestige of our country amongst the international community and also enables us to take decisions on merits in the best interests of the country. If a proper systhesis of the various suggestions that have been made by hon. Members is put together, then the irresistible conclusion is that there has been overwhelming support to the pursuit of this policy, pursued in a sustained manner, and it is only by adherence to certain principles that even our national interests can be best advanced because our interest is closly intertwined and interlinked with the interest, progress and welfare of the world. It is true that when we face our own problems, our own problems are uppermost in our mind and there can be an over-emphasis that we should devote attention only to those problems. We should pay attention to those problems because those problems threaten our very existence and integrity and we have given the maximum attention to them. But to be able to give attention, and purposeful attention, to the safeguarding of our integrity and our independence, it is necessary also to have a took at the world and to modulate our programmes and to adopt postures which must be consistent and should fit in in that bigger picture. Let us not forget that we are living in a dangerous would, a thermo-nuclear world, a world where distance has been annihilated by rapid means of communications, and no one can live in isolation. Pursuit of the general policy of our fight against colonialism,--our urge to bring about disarmament and our adherence to the principles of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, control of nuclear weapons-these are the things which should continue to be the guide-lines of our objectives. It is only by adherence to those principles and by having that broader picture before us that we can serve our country best.

USA INDIA NEPAL LATVIA BURMA PAKISTAN AFGHANISTAN YUGOSLAVIA ETHIOPIA NORWAY SLOVAKIA JORDAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ALGERIA KUWAIT LEBANON IRAQ UNITED KINGDOM CHINA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

President's Speech at Dinner in honour of Their Majesties the King and the Queen

Their Majesties King Mahendra and Queen Ratna of Nepal arrived in New Delhi on November 25, 1965 on a 24-day State Visit to India. On November 25, the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, gave a dinner in honour of Their Majesties the King and the Queen, at Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Speaking on the occasion, President Radhakrishnan said :

Your Majesties, Your Excellencies, Distinguished guests-

I should like to express to Your Majesties and

the members of your party a most cordial welcome on behalf of my Government and the people and express to you our best wishes for a happy, pleasant, comfortable stay in our country.

You are our neighbours, good and friendly neighbours. The geographical situation has led to the strengthening of friendship between our two countries. You are trying to develop the economy of your country and raise the standards of your people. In that we should like to be of some little assistance to you as a mere illustration of economic co-operation between growing countries.

Historically we have had centuries of relationship, and the two great religions--Hinduism and Buddhism-have many sacred centres in the territory of Nepal, and most of the Hindus and Buddhists look upon those things as their own. They do not feel any kind of difference at all. And you are also trying to have a tirtha yatra, go to all the sacred places of this country in your trip. That shows that you are not merely His Majesty the, King but also a lover of art and religion.

Many of you perhaps do not know that His Majesty the King is a poet of considerable importance, and whenever he has a spare moment,

343

he draws himself away from the affairs of the world and the State and concentrates on some aspect of beauty or some aspect of truth, and puts forth his poetic adventure; and he is well known in Nepal as a great poet. I have heard his poems sung by the Nepalese boys and girls. But most of all, what impresses me is the stress he lays on religion.

I am not talking about religion in the dogmatic, sectarian sense of the term, but religion as a deepening of your own awareness and extending the objects of your compassion. The inward and the outward expressions of religion are inward wisdom and outward love. Whatever other things may be there or may not be there, they are not aspects of religion. All other things are subsidiaries, ancillaries, so to say, instruments which you adopt for the purpose of gaining this fundamental insight. One of our great poets travelled in the East and went over the roof of the world, the Himalayas, and reminisced with himself: Why is it that people are not able to enjoy the country and beauty of nature? Why are they wasting their time in petty quarrels and other things? The answer to that is that a large amount of inward growth is still expected.

The earth, according to astronomers, is still young. Humanity is still in its infancy. If you want to establish a world order free from wars, free from disease, free from poverty and free from hunger, the human being himself has to be changed. A qualitative change will have to take place in the nature of man. And that qualitative change can be brought about only by what is called the discipline of religion, not religion as you and I practise it, but true religion.

I remember Dr. Schweitzer giving his Hibbert lectures in Oxford, was asked the question : What is the role of religion in modem life ? His answer was `I speak on your behalf and of mine: It is none. Proof-War, and the kind of life which we live. They are expressions of the greasy hypocritical kind of religion which we adopt, which is not truly sincere and which is not truly inward.'

If we have truly inward kind of religion, we will not have these troubles. But as I said, we are still in our infancy, the earth is still young, and there are prospects ahead of us, and your nation and our nation can both co-operate to bring about a better social order, a better world order, where we may be able all to get rid of all these impediments which now stand in our way.

It, therefore, struck me as something significant that you should pay a visit not so much to modem temples like river projects, etc., but to the ancient temples, not that there is anything very much in the ancient temples unless there are people who realise that life. In the Mahabharata, Yudhisthira tells Vidura that places become sacred not because once upon a time there lived great spirits but because even now people like you whose natures are crystal clear like water still live there.

Bhavad vidhah bhagavatah tirtha-bhutah svayam prabhoh tirthi-kurvanti tirthani swantasthena gadabhrta.

I remember an occasion when I was in Salt Lake City. There was a Norman Church Service, and in that Church Service, two hymns were chanted. One of them I remember, "Were you there when they crucified my Lord? Were you there when they laid him in the tomb?" And the Master of the Church asked me to say a few words. I said 'Why do you raise hypothetical questions whether you were there two thousand years ago or not?' We are today crucifying the Lord on the altar of racial bigotry, national pride. It is not quite necessary for us to think of what happened two thousand years ago. Let us think of what we are doing. The Lord is in agony. He suffers for the sake of our sins.' That is what SANKARA himself says. The Lord is suffering for your sake and my sake. It is that kind of thing which asks us to treat reverence for life as the highest principle of a truly religious man. That we are lacking in.

I know militant atheism is the only answer to hypocritical religion. Many people, if they are not understanding the meaning of religion today, it is because they feel that the so-called religious people are indulging in activities which are against the very spirit of religion.

It is my earnest endeavour and hope that Your Majesty and the members of your party, when you visit those great centres will not only appreciate architecture and the art, but feel the solemnity and the seriousness of people who are truly religious. With these few words I wish to propose the toast to Their Majesties and the members of his party, and wish them well and to develop friendship between India and Nepal.

NEPAL INDIA USA TURKEY **Date** : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Replying to the toast, King Mahendra said: We are all delighted to have the opportunity to day to meet you all on this happy occasion.

I am very grateful to His Excellency the President of India for giving us this opportunity. I hope, nay I am certain, that the present friendly

344

relations between our two countries will be further consolidated by this get-together.

We also firmly believe that ceaseless efforts should be made to strengthen the friendly ties between Nepal and India by both the countries. Ties between the two nations can be maintained only through the ways of friendship and cooperation.

In the world today, progress and development of all is possible only when there is peace everywhere. Hence the grave concern was shown by Nepal and the Nepalese at the sudden news of fighting between her two close neighbours, India and Pakistan.

Although peacefulness has its limits, we also believe no lasting solution to any problem can be achieved by way of war alone. In comparison with it, the ideals of peace and friendliness are far more lofty.

When there is a conflict between two neighbouring States, Nepal is of the opinion that, instead of taking sides, the realities of the situation should be borne in mind and greater stress should be laid on re-establishing friendship between the two.

If we are unable to live as peaceful neighbours, we shall have no moral justification to speak for peace in other parts of the world. This is a point worth careful consideration by all today. I believe that we should all pay more attention to the maintenance of a peaceful atmosphere in this region, so that every country may be enabled to expedite its progress and development. Nepalese people always desire the progress and development of India. Nepal has respect for the peace-loving tradition of India and does not like to see it broken at any inopportune moment.

This time also we are scheduled to visit some other parts of India. We are proud of the progress made by India in the spheres of Industry and other development works. We always dosire that all the people of India should be educated and prosperous.

In conclusion, with cordial thanks for the kind words of goodwill expressed by Your Excellency, I now request all the ladies and gentlemen to join me in toasting for the health and long life of His Excellency the President of India.

NEPAL INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

King Mahendra's Speech at Dinner in honour of President Radhakrishnan

His Majesty the King of Nepal gave a dinner in honour of the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, in New Delhi on November 27, 1965.

Proposing a toast to the health of the President, His Majesty King Mahendra said:

Your Excellency Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to welcome you all at this dinner held in honour of His Excellency the President of India.

It gives me great pleasure to state once again that the friendship existing between Nepal and India has been strengthened further by this visit. It has always been our effort to build up relations between India and Nepal on an exemplary basis. Nepal expects the same from India too.

You know that Nepal has been progressing day by day under the Panchayat system. We are very much indebted to various friendly countries and specially India for the help and cooperation rendered by them in carrying out our nation-building programmes. We are all exceedingly happy to express once again best wishes on behalf of Nepal for the peace, progress and prosperity of the people of India under the able leadership of Their Excellencies the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan and the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

In conclusion, with cordial thanks for the warm hospitality extended to us, I request you all to join me in proposing a toast to the health and long life of His Excellency the President on this happy occasion.

NEPAL INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Reply by President Radhakrishnan

Replying to the toast, Dr. Radhakrishnan said :

Your Majesties, Your Excellencies and distinguished guests : His Majesty and the members of his party have been with us only for two days. I am glad that they felt themselves; quite happy. When we go to Nepal, we find ourselves absolutely at home and I hope they did not find themselves strangers here.

It is true that so far as we are concerned, we try to develop friendly, co-operative relations with all our neighbours. Unfortunately, we have some conflict with Pakistan at the present moment. I hope all those who have watched the progress of events are aware that this is not of our seeking. It has been thrust on us and no Government could have continued without abdicating its functions if it did not defend itself when its territory was overrun and people attacked. Yet, we are waiting for an opportunity when these relations will be improved and the relations with Pakistan could be normalised. We are waiting for that opportunity and we will not let go any chance which comes to us. I may assure Their Majesties and all the friends who are present here that it is not our desire to prolong this conflict for one moment longer than it is absolutely necessary.

We also know that to civilise a human being, it takes a lot of time. To de-civilise him is easy and effortless and we are trying to guard ourselves against any such thing. Love of truth happens to be one of the weakest of human passions and at the present moment, perhaps it is necessary for us to conform to truth as strictly and as absolutely as possible. It is my earnest hope that in the few days which Their Majesties and the members of the party spend here, they will find their stay useful, comfortable and enjoyable. I ask you to drink to the health of Bharat Nepal maitri.

NEPAL USA PAKISTAN MALI **Date :** Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on Indo-Pakistan Conflict

345

The following is the text of the Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's statement in Parliament on November 5, 1965 on the Indo-Pakistan Conflict :

In the statement which I had made in this House on September 24, 1965, I had given an account of the developments culminating in a cease-fire coming into force between India and Pakistan at 3.30 a.m. on the 23rd September, 1965. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by going into details about subsequent happenings which have been fully reported in the Press. I would instead try to present the broad picture of the later developments and to share with the House Government's views and thoughts on the various issues that have yet to be resolved.

The cease-fire is still far from being fully effective. The main reason for this is the fact that Pakistani Forces have continuously tried to occupy posts and areas which were not in their hands when the cease-fire came into effect. It is these violations by Pakistan that account for the uneasy conditions that prevail in areas where our troops are facing the Pakistan army. The House will recall that the actual hour of the cease-fire had to be put off by fifteen hours bevond the dead-line set in the Security Council Resolution on September 20, 1965, because Pakistan delayed its acceptance of the cease-fire till the last minute. During this period which elapsed between the acceptance of cease-fire by both countries and its actual coming into force, Pakistani forces were actively engaged in trying to occupy fresh territory wherever possible and particularly in South-West Rajasthan. Even after the cease-fire, Pakistani troops did occupy a few posts and villages in Rajasthan which are separated from each other by long distances and are located in areas where there had been no fighting before.

Apart from Rajasthan, in the Fazilka Sector on the 24th and 25th September, in the Tithwal area on the 11th October, Pakistan launched major attacks in total disregard of the cease-fire. In the Chhamb area too, they have repeatedly tried to move forward after the cease-fire.

The Cease-Fire Agreement cannot stand in the way of our troops regaining territory treacherously occupied after the cease-fire came into effect. Wherever such violations have occurred, we have obviously no choice left except to deal with the situation and foil the Pakistani designs. Our taking such remedial action cannot be considered a violation of the cease-fire. It is necessary that the Security Council give serious thought to this aspect of the matter. We have been regularly drawing their attention to the cease-fire violations by Pakistan, the total number of which now adds up to about a thousand. The Security Council must esure that there are no more violations of the cease-fire and that the places occupied after the cease-fire are vacated forthwith. If real progress is to be made on

346

the road to peace, the cease-fire must be made truly effective. Until the cease-fire becomes effective, it is not possible to proceed to the subsequent step of withdrawal of armed personnel. This was emphasized by me in a letter dated the 18th October, 1965 to the Secretary-General. I place on the Table of the House copies of communications* exchanged between the Governmerit of India and the U.N. Secretary-General and between our Permanent Representative on the U.N. and the President of the Security Council.

Another factor of the greatest importance in any discussion on withdrawals is the manner in which we can be assured that the infiltration technique which Pakistan initiated on the 5th August, 1965 will not be repeated again. I had emphasized this point in my discussions and correspondence with the Secretary-General even before the cease-fire came into being. As far as I am aware no statement has been made by any Indian delegate to the U.N. or to the U.N. Security Council which has been inconsistent with whatever I have said in this House. I find it necessary to revert to this point with even greater emphasis, because we have reports of a fresh build-up of infiltrators in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir and in the tribal areas. The tragic events of the last few months should make the U.N. and the Security Council realise that prevention is not only better but easier than cure. if firm action had been taken when infiltration

began and General Nimmo reported on it, perhaps much of the tragic loss of life and property which followed, could have been avoided. At that time, despite all our efforts, strong and prompt action was not taken. I do hope that the Secretary-General will start immediate investigations into what is going on in Pakistanoccupied Kashmir in preparation for unleashing a fresh wave of infiltrators.

I cannot help expressing the feeling that the world would be saved much trouble and miserv if aggression is not countenanced anywhere. and objective efforts are made to identify the aggressor. In the recent conflict, the fact of Pakistani aggression could be seen by any one who wanted to. The Chief UN Observer gave a clear and objective verdict. The Security Council itself referred to August 5 as the crucial date. On this date, India had taken no action. it was Pakistan that had started sending massive waves of infiltrators and clearly she was the aggressor. Impliedly, Pakistan's aggression was noted but this certainly was not enough. A clear verdict was necessary and a body which is charged with the important responsibility of preserving world peace must necessarily be prepared to give a clear verdict. This is all the more necessary, because a new technique is being adopted under which invasions are launched in disguise, and forces of destruction are unleashed without the. usual declaration of war. It is for this reason that India had been urging from the beginning that Pakistan should be identified as the aggressor. On its part, Pakistan has been denying all along its complicity in sending infiltrators into Kashmir. The actual position is, however, so clear that any impartial agency could testify to it. I would still Re to suggest that the aggressor in the recent conflict be identified by some such method.

Pakistan it seems, is not really interested either in a cease-fire, which it grudgingly accepted in form but not in substance, or in the subsequent steps which the Security Council Resolution on the subject contemplates, namely, the withdrawal of ail armed personnel which includes not only troops but also other infiltrators. Pakistan is pleading instead for immediate steps for bringing about what it describes as a political settlement. Translated into plain words, Pakistan wants the Security Council to give it what neither its armed infiltrators nor its regular troops could give it. With this object, Pakistan's Foreign Minister engineered a meeting of the Security Council and tried to have a discussion on the internal situation in Kashmir making all kinds of wild and baseless accusations. Our Foreign Minister made it quite clear that while we were ready to co-operate with the Security Council in the task of restoring peace, we would not participate in any discussion on matters relating to our internal affairs. When it became clear Mr. Bhutto could not be restrained from raising matters pertaining to the internal administration of our State of Jammu and Kashmir, the Indian delegation abstained from taking part in subsequent meetings of the Security Council.

If Pakistan wants an end to the present tense situation, let it first honour and respect the Cease-Fire Agreement. Let it put an end to the daily violations of the cease-fire. Let it then withdraw its armed personnel from our territory and we shall also withdraw our troops from the areas under our occupation in Pakistan. More important than any of these things, let Pakistan stop the various things which it is doing apparently in preparation for a fresh trial of strength. Let it stop the recruitment of irregular forces in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. Let it put a stop to the digging of trenches and putting up of military structures which is going on at so many places just across the present cease-fire line. Let it give up its attempts to acquire arms and ammunition. Let it release the goods, the cargo and the vessels it has seized. Let it also give up its collusion with China which is based only on a common hatred of India and is -----

* Not included.

347

aimed at weakening and disintegrating this country. Let Pakistan, to put it briefly, first restore normal relations before we can discuss how to establish better relations.

Once Pakistan genuinely embarks upon the path of peace, the Government and the people of India will be ready to reciprocate. Unfortunately, all the evidence that we have about Pakistan's intentions shows no signs of any change of heart, any re-thinking, any desire to prefer peace to war. In these circumstances, we have to shape our policy on two planes, as it were. On the one hand, we have to be careful not to allow ourselves to be swayed by the same atmosphere of hatred, which the Pakistani leaders have tried to build up, and not to depart from the fundamentals of our policy--of peace, of secularism and of economic development. On the other hand, we have to be vigilant and prepared to meet any threat at any time on any part of our territory.

In our relations with Pakistan, we shall continue to behave in accordance with the canons of civilised society. Pakistan violated all diplomatic immunities by subjecting our High Commission in Pakistan to a search at the, point of rifles and bayonets. Even though the movements and activities of the personnel of the Pakistan High Commission in Delhi were restricted, they enjoyed every protection and lived in safety and without molestation of any kind. Rather than retaliate against them, we decided to recall our High Commissioner from Pakistan and it is not our intention to send him back in the immediate future.

There has been a good deal of discussion with regard to the question of payment of our dues under the Indus Waters Treaty. The Minister of Irrigation and Power yesterday made a statement and the House is going to discuss this question. We do not wish to go back on cornmitments solemnly entered into by us, whether in regard to the Indus Waters Treaty or under the Kutch Agreement. While we are always ready to meet force with strength, we shall continue to honour our pledged word.

Regarding the seizure of our ships and cargoes by Pakistan, the Minister for Transport has already made a statement in this House.

On the plane of preparedness, we are doing all that is necessary. We are fully alive to the fact that at a time of their own choosing, Pakistan and its ally China might decide to act against us in concert, and we have, therefore, to be always on our guard against any eventuality. In our defence effort, we want to achieve self-reliance, to the maximum extent possible and in the shortest possible time. Our soldiers who are fighting at the front are fully entitled to the best that this country can give them, and in this effort we must not be found wanting.

A new Department of Defence Supplies has been created in the Ministry of Defence with the prime object of locating capacity within the country for those items, whether they are spare parts or components or complete equipment, needed for our defence for which we are dependent on imports. Even so, we may have to import either arms or the machinery to produce them. It was this imperative need that made me appeal to our people to subscribe to the Gold Bonds in a massive way. We have got to harness a substantial part of the gold reserves in this country and put them to the service of the nation, if we are to be strong and selfreliant. We have given considerable thought to the new Defence Loans and the National Defence Gold Bond Scheme, which are now in operation, and we have tried to take a practical view and give whatever inducements are possible. In themselves, these schemes are a useful investment, but what is more important, they represent a vital contribution to the nation's defence effort. Our countrymen today are imbued with a fierce determination to offer any sacrifice to make the country strong. I have every hope, therefore, that people will respond suitably to these schemes and especially that of the Gold Bonds in order to attain this objective.

The House would naturally want to know how we view the likely course of future events so far as Indo-Pakistan relations are concerned. Our own position is quite clear. We want to live in peace with Pakistan. We have never taken the initiative in forsaking the path of peace, nor shall we do so in future. We do not want to annex any part of Pakistan's territory. But the restoration of peace and its future preservation can be assured only if Pakistan gives up the stormy course of wanton aggression. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, propitiate an aggressor. Threatened as we are with a renewal of aggression, we have to be ever vigilant and ready.

Looking at all the circumstances, there is every possibility that the period of travail which began in August last may continue for a long time. As a nation, we have to be prepared to meet this many-sided challenge. There is, therefore, no room for complacency. At the same time, the experience of the recent past must fill us all with a new confidence. Hon'ble Members would be gratified to know that when I visited the forward areas in the Lahore and Sialkot Sectors three weeks ago, I found the soldiers and the airmen imbued with the highest morale. Most of them had fought in the battlefield and had seen some of their colleagues laying down their lives heroically in defence of the Motherland. On behalf of this House, and indeed on behalf of all the people of India, I conveyed to them our feeling of highest appreciation and deep gratitude and told them how

348

the entire nation was united in its determination to fight the invader.

I have been able also to go to other places and to see millions of persons, all resolved to meet any hardship and to make any sacrifice. Undoubtedly, the people are facing difficulties, but these are not felt nor mentioned. It seems that there is a regeneration, and millions of our countrymen are ready to give of their best to make the nation self-reliant and strong. Towards this single common purpose, I know that this House and this Nation will flinch from no danger and count no sacrifice too great.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA LATVIA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Defence Minister's Statement in Parliament on Chinese Intrusions

The Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, made the following statement in Parliament on November 15, 1965 in reply to a calling-attention notice :

On November 13 at 7 a.m., a Company of Chinese soldiers, approximately 100 strong, came up close to two of our out-posts in the Dongchui La area on the Sikkim-Tibet border and opened unprovoked fire of an intense character. The firing continued till 5 p.m. Our troops returned the fire. It is confirmed that the Chinese had actually crossed over to our side of the border, to a depth of about 50 yards, for a body of a Chinese soldier was found lying at this point. along with the body of one Indian soldier who had also been killed in the exchange of fire. The Chinese had earlier been observed dragging away one body of a dead Chinese soldier. Our troops made efforts to recover the body of the Indian soldier, but the Chinese kept up a strong barrage of fire throughout the day which precluded this. Later in the evening, when our troops went forward, they discovered that the Chinese had, under cover of darkness dragged away the second body of the Chinese soldier, and also the body of the Indian soldier. The trail of the dragging of the bodies was visible on the snow.

Although the Chinese strength was several times that of the Indian soldiers manning our outposts, they stood their ground and inflicted more casualties than what they suffered. It is, however, most regrettable that the Chinese should continue to engage in unprovoked firing and intrusions on our side of the border. All this creates unnecessary tension. It seems that in the area just across the Dongchui La, the Chinese are firmly entrenched ever since they brought up their troops close to the border in September. They have committed seven intrusions into Sikkim. This is the third intrusion over the Dongchui La. The earlier two were on September 20 and on September 26, 1965. On the last occasion the Chinese made an intrusion in strength and kidnapped a small three-man patrol of Indian soldiers, well within the Indian side of the border. The Chinese have yet to return the kidnapped personnel, for the return of whom we have made a demand.

The Government of India have lodged a protest with the Government of China about the latest incident of unprovoked firing and wanton aggressive activity by Chinese troops across the

Sikkim border.

CHINA USA INDIA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

RHODESIA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Rhodesia

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 12, 1965 about Rhodesia :

The Government of India have been shocked at the illegal seizure of power by the white minority Government of Mr. Ian Smith in Rhodesia

349

by a unilateral declaration of independence on 11th November, 1965. This outrageous action in defence of world opinion and accepted canons of civilized behaviour will have far-reaching consequences of a most serious nature. The Government of India condemns this action in the strongest terms and expresses its full solidarity with and support of the African people of Rhodesia.

In regard to Rhodesia our position has always been that legally, constitutionally, politically and morally Great Britain is responsible for the situation in that country. The legal arguments put forward in the past by U.K. about their inability to interfere in Rhodesia have been rejected by the United Nations which has always considered Rhodesia as a British colony. The General Assembly in its resolution of 12th October and 5th November, 1965, called upon the United Kingdom Government to take all possible measures including the use of force to prevent a unilateral declaration of independence and, in the event of such a declaration to take all steps necessary to put an immediate end to the rebellion with a view to transferring power to a representative Government in keeping with the aspirations of the majority of the people.

We have, therefore, repeatedly expressed the view that Great Britain must shoulder full responsibility for the future of Rhodesia so as to ensure that:

- (a) The grant of independence is preceded by the grant of full democratic rights to the people of Rhodesia on the basis of one man one vote;
- (b) all repressive and unjust laws are repealed and all political prisoners are released so as to create proper climate for constitutional conference;
- (c) all steps being taken by the white minority Government of Rhodesia to establish itself as an independent Government are frustrated; and
- (d) Great Britain does not recognise any authority that might be set up in the sole interest of the minority.

The British Government have now taken certain measures to meet the situation created by unilateral declaration of independence. These are, however, belated measures and if firm action had been taken in the earlier stages this serious situation would not have developed. We consider it British Government's duty to nullify and checkmate the move by Mr. Smith and his so-called Government and to take necessary measures, including the use of force, as enjoined by the General Assembly Resolution of 5th November not to allow the rebel Government to consolidate their illegal hold on 4 million people of Rhodesia.

The Hon'ble Members are aware that India has taken a leading part in the United Nations and other world forums in advocating the establishment of an independent Rhodesia on the basis of a duly constituted democratic government elected on the principle of one-man-one-vote. We took this stand also in the Non-aligned Nations Conference in Cairo in October 1964 and we have supported the resolutions passed by the Organisation of African Unity on the subject. To demonstrate our solidarity with the African people struggling for the vindication of their legitimate rights and to register our protest against the policies pursued by the minority Government, we withdrew our diplomatic mission from Salisbury on 7th May, 1965.

The Government of India have in the past repeatedly declared that any unilateral declaration of independence by the White minority Government will be illegal and unconstitutional and will not be recognised by the Government of India. We shall not, therefore, recognise the Government which has unilaterally seized power, and should a Provisional Government representing the people of Rhodesia, recognised by the OAU, be established, the Government of India will also recognise it.

I would like to take this opportunity to declare following the severance of diplomatic relations the severance of all economic relations with Rhodesia with immediate effect until such time that a Government of the people of Rhodesia is established. We express the hope that all other Governments would do likewise.

The Government of India has throughout this controversy given full support to the declarations made and resolutions passed on the future of Rhodesia by the OAU and the African Heads of State Conference, and in the Special Committee of Twentyfour, and the General Assembly of the UN, and the Conference of Non-Aligned Heads of State has co-sponsored all resolutions on Rhodesia. The Government of India would now, in pursuance of its firm policy, offer full cooperation to the Security Council, the General Assembly and the OAU in whatever steps they may propose to deal with problems posed by unilateral declaration of independence. For this purpose the Government of India would maintain close touch with friendly Governments in Africa and of the Commonwealth and others so as to deal with this serious development.

The situation created by the unilateral declaration of independence is not only explosive but a serious danger to international peace. Here are all the elements of racism, reaction, fanaticism, disunity and exploitation of man by man. Here it is being planned that Angola, Mozambique, South Africa and South West Africa are to be kept in one form or another in perpetual bondage. The Government of India, therefore,

350

feels that the issue of the future of Rhodesia is an issue of the greatest importance in the whole process of decolonialisation because the manner in which unilateral declaration of independence is now handled will. have the most serious consequences for the peace, stability and progress of the whole of the African Continent and of Asia and the world.

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM PERU EGYPT ANGOLA SOUTH AFRICA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE

Sardar Swaran Singhs Statement in Lok Sabha

The following is the text of a statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the Lok Sabha on November 10, 1965, regarding the postponement of the Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers and the reaction of the Government of India thereto :

The Foreign Ministers of the Second Afro-Asian Conference met in Algiers on the 30th October, with 45 countries participating out of 61 to whom invitations had been sent. Neither China nor Pakistan attended. The Conference adjourned on the 2nd of November, having decided to postpone the Summit meeting indefinitely. As I had to be present in New York during the Security Council debates on the Indo-Pakistan conflict, Foreign Secretary, Shri C. S. Jha, led the Indian Delegation.

The House will recall that the original date

set for the Conference was in June, but without convening, the Foreign Ministers' meeting and the Summit were then postponed to the 28th October and the 5th November, 1965 respectively. During October, China made a proposal in the Standing Committee of 15 nations seeking the postponement of the scheduled meeting. This came soon after China's apparent failure to establish a dominating position among Afro-Asian States and also after it became known that an overwhelming majority now supported Soviet participation. The proposal was supported by Cambodia and Pakistan but failed to secure acceptance by the Standing Committee, which rightly decided that it wag not competent to decide the question. Subsequently, at the suggestion of the Standing Committee the Government of Algeria undertook a poll which showed that a large majority of States confirmed their participation. Accordingly the Conference of Foreign Ministers was convened on the 30th of October. The Indian Delegation proceeded to Algiers fully prepared to take Part in the Conference and so further the objectives of Afro-Asian solidarity.

Our Delegation at the very outset raised the primary question of composition of the Conference and make three separate proposals that U.S.S.R., Malaysia and Singapore be invited to participate in the Conference, so that these countries could take part in the work of the Conference from the very beginning. Eighteen delegations spoke in support of this Indian proposal. Two others supported Malaysia and Singapore, but 'abstained on Soviet Union's participation. None of the others opposed the proposal. The report of the Conference presented by the Rapporteur Ambassador Lopez of the Philippines, at the conclusion of the Conference, recorded the following :

"All delegates who spoke on the Indian proposal, expressed support thereof and none of them opposed it."

I may add that it was only subsequent to the Rapporteur's report that Indonesia objected to Malaysian participation. The Foreign Minister of Algeria, Mr. Bouteflika, who was the Chairman of the Conference, summing up the Conference proceedings in a public session, said : "I am voicing the feelings of all when I say that the general consensus of opinion had clearly been revealed in favour of inviting the U.S.S.R. to take part."

Thus the Conference accepted U.S.S.R. in the Afro-Asian family and recognised the right of Malaysia and Singapore to participate in the Conference, even though the adjournment did not permit these countries to be invited formally to the Conference.

From the very beginning there was a move by some countries to postpone the Conference. A proposal was made for according priority to the consideration of the report of the Standing Cornmittee. It was argued that the decisions on procedure should precede discussion on any other point : this would, among other things, raise the issue whether the question of participation should be decided by a majority vote or through unanimity among the Afro-Asian countries.

The move for postponement gained support, however, not because the majority wished to

351

support China's viewpoint but because there was a strong feeling that, under the present circumstances, many Heads of State and Government would not be able to attend the summit on 5th November and the meeting would prove infructuous. Many African States also seemed to feel that if the Conference continued, they might be risking African unity by getting involved in issues of no immediate interest to Africa. We expressed the view that the regrettable absence of some States was no reason for postponing the Conference and that much useful work could be done, but that, of course, if the majority wanted a postponement, we would not stand in the way. Several delegations opposing the adjournment pointed out that no single country, however powerful, should be allowed to break up the Conference. Many speakers announced that this might be the last Afro-Asian Conference for quite some time.

The decision to adjourn was taken by a majority of the delegations in a closed session of heads of delegations only, which had been preceded by private group meetings in which several delegations and the Chairman of the Conference took part. The resolution to postpone the Conference indefinitely, that was worked out in these secret meetings, was not altogether satisfactory to us. The Indian delegation, therefore, made our position abundantly clear on the resolution in the plenary session of the Conference. The Foreign Secretary stated that while agreeing to the decision to postpone the Afro-Asian summit meeting, he must point out on behalf of the Government of India that this would hardly serve the noble cause of Afro-Asian solidarity and that it may be taken advantage of, on the widest possible scale, by the imperialist nations and those against Afro-Asian solidarity. The Foreign Secretary also read into the record India's two specific reservations to the resolution. First, he stated that India was opposed to the continuance of the Standing Committee : it had been constituted to fulfil a specific task which had been completed, and if and when, it was desired to hold the Second Afro-Asian Summit Conference, necessary consultations, through normal diplomatic channels among Afro-Asian Governments, could be undertaken. Secondly, he placed on the record that there was a clear consensus in favour of the participation of the USSR, Malaysia and Singapore, which were entitled to an invitation forthwith to participate in the Conference. The Foreign Secretary also clarified the position of the Government of India with regard to the holding of the Conference by stating :

"We will have to evaluate- the experience of the past few days and the extent of carnestness of the common desire to hold a conference of the kind that was conceived at Jakarta, in deciding whether the difficulties that had led to the postponement of the Conference had disappeared."

The postponement of the Conference has been a setback to the concept of Afro-Asian solidarity. The deliberate refusal of the People's Republic of China to participate in the Conference without any convincing reason, is no doubt partly responsible for the failure of the Conference to meet. The facts, however, are that the Conference met formally in spite of Chinese opposition and boycott, remained in session for several days, was participated in by 45 delegations, and discussed the question of participation of the USSR, Malaysia and Singapore on whose right to participate a consensus was reached These are positive achievements to the credit of the Conference. At the same time the abrupt postponement of the Conference makes it improbable that there will be another Conference in the near future.

I would now like to say a few words about our approach to the concept of Afro-Asian solidarity.

The quest for Afro-Asian solidarity, begun in Bandung, has been marked by many vicissitudes and setbacks. It was a momentous occasion when for the first time the representatives of Asia and Africa met in Bandung and gave notice to the world that Asia and Africa had come of age and were no longer prepared to countenance injustice or inequality or to be dominated from without. We affirmed then that freedom and peace were inter-dependent and that the Governments and peoples of these continents through their united endeavours, were determined to remove the vestiges of foreign domination and demand full equality and respect for human rights for all races and nations.

The countries of Africa and Asia can look back with pride to the historic significance of the first Afro-Asian Conference and its subsequent achievements. The world scene is transformed today because of the resurgence of Asia and Africa. As against 29 members which took part in the First Afro-Asian Conference, there are now some 65 independent countries in the Afro-Asian community. All these were entitled to participate in the Conference which has just been postponed sine die with the consequence that our task of ensuring the fulfilment of the objectives of Bandung remains incomplete. Numerous territories and possessions, large and small, have still to be freed from the shackles of the colonial bondage. Our brethren in Rhodesia and Angola, Mozambique, Aden, South Africa and elsewhere are subjected to racial discrimination and colonial suppression and still look to the free nations of Asia and Africa for their emancipation. The world hovers on the brink of a nuclear holocaust and countries of Asia and Africa remain vitally interested in securing disarmament and the preservation of peace. All these tasks awaited the urgent attention of the Conference.

Meanwhile, examples multiply where arrogant and expansionist nations are using, or threatening to use, force to pursue their objectives and secure territorial expansion. They continue to intervene with impunity in the affairs of other countries. We are, conscious that the long march of economic progress which our people expected and which demand greater cooperation amongst ourselves still lies ahead. The Indian Delegation repeatedly indicated its views that the Conterence at Algiers should have been fully representative and regretted the absence of countries who chose to stay away. In particular, the Indian delegation considered the inclusion of Soviet Union would add immeasurably to the strength and purpose of Afro-Asian solidarity. The Government of India was gratified that this proposal of the Indian delegation received practically unanimous support of the delegations present at Algiers.

The Government of India are convinced that propaganda and pressures used by some powers have dealt a severe blow to Afro-Asian solidarity. The present adjournment may now prove to be only a temporary setback and the whole spirit of Afro-Asian solidarity as conceived in Bandung has been put into jeopardy. But these developments reveal the scant respect paid by some coun tries to the sovereign equality of all States of Asia and Africa, big or small. They further demonstrate that some countries attempted to serve their national interests on the pretext of Afro-Asian solidarity.

It is necessary to emphasise that, nationalism in Asia and Africa which has struggled successfully and emerged triumphant from the dark night of colonialism would never allow it to be used for selfish ends of ambitious powers. Nor will any country succeed in prescribing preconditions for its participation or impose its will by force of dictation in a conference of equal sovereign states.

Long years ago when our leaders, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru raised the banner of revolt against imperialism, it was in the hope that the freedom of India would contribute to the freedom of other peoples in Asia and Africa. India had no wish to dominate any areas beyond our frontiers; nor to prescribe a pattern of internal policies for other countries. We have sought to develop our relations with other countries, on the basis of Peaceful Co-existence and mutual respect for their independence and personality. Indeed, we look forward with confidence to a world made safe for diversity with constructive cooperation inside and outside the United Nations. We firmly believe that the Government of independent nations of Africa and Asia will not permit others to interfere in their own affairs or be ripened for revolution from without. We look with grave apprehension at the prospect of a new cold war between the so-called rural areas in the world and the industrialised North and so promote economic chaos when the disparities are far too wide. We believe that the inevitable changes impelled by the forces of history, such as antiimperialism, should secure the adjustments without resort to violent and dangerous conflicts. Those who seek to marshall independent nations into obedience can only expect greater disappointments. Sovereign nations will neither be subdued by threats or numbed by propaganda, nor can they be deceived by slogans or corrupted by promise of material gains.

The responsibility for the present setback to Afro-Asian solidarity rests wholly on those who never truly believed in the principles of Bandung. However, these principles remain untarnished and India will continue to adhere to them in spite of the failure of the Algiers Conference.

ALGERIA INDIA CHINA PAKISTAN USA CAMBODIA MALAYSIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE INDONESIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

TANZANIA

Joint Communique on Visit of Indian Trade Delegation

The following is the text of a joint communique issued in Dar-es-Salaam on November 20, 1965 at the end of the two-day visit of an Indian trade delegation to Tanzania :

The Indian Delegation led by Shri Manubhai Shah, the Indian Minister for Commerce, arrived in Dar-es-Salaam on November 19, to hold discussions on trade and economic matters with the Ministers and officials of the Government of Tanzania. The Indian Commerce Minister called on President Julius K. Nyerere and conveyed to him a personal message from the Indian Prime Minister inviting him to pay an early visit to India for which time and date will be fixed in due

353

course. The President conveyed his warmest regards to Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri.

The Indian Minister for Commerce, during his stay in Dar-es-Salaam called on the Minister for Commerce and Cooperatives, Mr. A. M. Babu, the minister for Industries, Mineral Resources and Power, Mr. A. Z. N. Swai, the Minister for Finance, Mr. Jamal, and the Minister of State, for Central Establishments, Mr. Bhoke Munanka.

Four Indian officials and experts met their counterparts in the Ministries of Commerce and Cooperatives and of Industries, Mineral Resources and Power. In the course of the talks held, the Indian Delegation was greatly impressed with the striking progress made by Tanzania since her independence in the development of her economy, education and industrialisation.

NEED FOR TRADE AGREEMENT

During their stay in Dar-es-Salaam the Indian Delegation held discussions with the Tanzanian authorities on the need for conclusion of a Trade Agreement between India and Tanzania on a longterm basis. Officials having reached positive conclusions, it is expected that the trade agreement will be signed early in January, 1966 when a Tanzanian Delegation led by the Minister for Commerce will visit India.

The two Delegations also discussed the possibility of entering into an arrangement for increasing the volume of trade between the two countries on a planned basis. In the talks to be continued in India it is expected to considerably increase the overall trade between the two countries and to diversify the exchange of more and more commodities between the two countries. In this connection, the, Indian Delegation reaffirmed India's interests in Tanzanian products like copra, cloves, cotton, sisal and raw cashewnut. Likewise, Tanzania would buy more textiles, art silk fabrics, pharmaceuticals and medicines, engineering goods, plastics, electrical industrial machinery, agricultural equipment, machine tools and other products from India.

FRIENDSHIP AGREEMENT

The Indian Commerce Minister conveyed the Indian Government's willingness to enter into an agreement on friendship, technical, economic and scientific cooperation with the Government of Tanzania for the purpose of facilitating exchange of technical personnel, provision of training facilities in technical schools, scientific institutes, factories and production centres, grant of scholarships, deputation of experts, exchange of technical information and setting up of joint industrial ventures by both countries. In emphasising the necessity and expediency for building up a strong technical cadre, the Indian Commerce- Minister offered to provide adequate facilities in different industrial and scientific fields in India to Tanzanian nationals. It is hoped to finalise this agreement also during the forthcoming visit of a Tanzanian Delegation to India.

OFFER OF FINANCIAL HELP

The Indian Commerce Minister conveyed to the Tanzanian Government an offer by India of a credit of rupees twentyfive million (equal to about pound sterling two million) for the purpose of setting up industrial projects in Tanzania. It may be recalled in this connection that the Government of India seat a high-powered technical delegation to Tanzania about six months ago. The Swaminathan delegation during their visit examined the possibilities of starting new industries and joint ventures and setting up of an industrial estate in Tanzania. Further discussions on these matters were held and as a result, the two sides agreed that the prospects of starting industries are good in the fields of solvent extraction plant, timber industry, pharmaceuticals, textiles, sugar and

small-scale engineering projects like manufacture of fans, air conditioners, air coolers, water coolers, razor blades, pencils etc. Machinery and capital goods and equipment from India for such industries will be financed from the long-term loan of rupees twentyfive million offered by the Indian Government. Details of the utilisation of the loan will be finally concluded during the visit of a Tanzanian delegation to India.

The Indian Commerce Minister also conveyed to the Government of Tanzania the Indian Government's offer to help in the setting up of a training-cum-production centre in an industrial estate. The cost of machinery and equipment for the training-cum-production centre amounting to rupees 500,000 more will be gifted by the Indian Government to this first estate in Dar-es-Salaam. The industrial estate will be built into twentyfive factory sheds at a suitable site by the Tanzanian Government with the technical cooperation of experts who will be sent from India. Steps will shortly be taken to finalise the details of the estate in consultation with the Tanzanian authorities and experts.

PURCHASE OF CLOVES BY INDIA

Discussions were also held between officials of the State Trading Corporation of India and Zanzibar State Trading Corporation regarding continued purchase of cloves from Zanzibar by India. India has been a major buyer of Zanzibar cloves in the past. The Zanzibar delegation expressed the desire that India should continue to be a steady buyer of this commodity. The Indian side agreed to consider suitable arrangements under which this could be arranged. Such an arrangement will be finalised for the purchase of cloves worth about Rupees 3.4 million by suitable exchange of goods between the Zanzibar Trading Corporation and the State Trading Corporation of India.

354

TECHNO-ECONOMIC STUDIES

As a first step on the road to mutual technical and scientific cooperation between the Governments of Tanzania and India, the Technological Consultancy Bureau of the National Industrial Development Corporation (NIDC) of the Indian Government has agreed to undertake detailed techno-economic studies in respect of the following industries :

- (1) Manufacture of Hardboard and Chipboard.
- (2) Manufacture of soaps and detergents.
- (3) Fruit processing and preservation.

The Technological Consultancy Bureau of the NIDC will shortly depute specialists to make on-the-spot studies in this connection and hopes to submit its report to the Tanzanian Government authorities at the earliest. These studies would help determine patterns of production, investment, economic viability etc. which would help the early implementation of the schemes.

It is proposed to start a branch office of NIDC's Technological Consultancy Bureau in the industrial estate which is planned to be established shortly by mutual cooperation between the Governments of Tanzania and India. This office will be able to offer technical advice and services for the establishment of new ventures by entrepreneurs in Tanzania. The services of the Technological Consultancy Bureau of the NIDC are at the disposal of the Government of Tanzania for complete designing, engineering and construction of new industrial plants which may be decided upon for the implementation in furtherance of Tanzania's industrial development programme. The Bureau is capable of undertaking a turnkey job of projects after mutual agreement between the Tanzanian and Indian authorities.

TANZANIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UGANDA

India-Uganda Trade Agreement Signed

Four agreements were signed between India and Uganda at a ceremony held in Kampala on November 18, 1965. Shri Manubhai Shah, the Indian Minister of Commerce, signed on behalf of India, and the Uganda Minister of Commerce and Industry, Mr. Lamek Lubowai on behalf of the Uganda Government. Those who were present at the ceremony were the Indian High Commissioner, Shri A. S. Dhawan, Permanent Secretary Oto, Uganda Ministry of Commerce and other senior officials.

Speaking after signing the India-Uganda Trade Agreement-first to be signed by India with one of the East African countries---Uganda Minister of Commerce expressed hope that trade between Uganda and India will develop further. He said: "We in Uganda know fully well that your country is passing through a critical period due to the problems created by your neighbours. That in spite of these pressing problems, the Indian Minister has been able to visit Uganda for concluding the Trade Agreement, shows India's genuine regard and interest in promoting more trade and cooperation with Uganda".

Indian Minister Shri Shah in his reply said that though India-Uganda trade was century old, the present Agreement would further increase the flow between the two countries. After conveying the greetings from the Indian people and the Indian Government, Shri Shah said that Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was very keen that, in spite of many problems facing India, she should extend all help and cooperation to the developing nations of Africa. He said that the Agreements signed on November 18 aim at the expansion of trade and for undertaking joint ventures in the field of industrialisation and economic, technical and scientific cooperation. Shri Shah also expressed the hope that more and more Ugandans would come to India for training in industrial and technical fields.

Shri Manubhai Shah presented to the Ugandan Minister a wrist watch made at the Hindustan Machine Tools as a proof of India's technical advancement.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

The following is the text of a joint communique issued at the conclusion of the Trade Agreement:

At the invitation of the Government of Uganda, an Indian Delegation led by Shri Manubhai Shah, Indian Minister of Commerce, arrived in Kampala at the beginning of this week. Earlier a team of Indian experts and technicians had reached Uganda for detailed discussions with the experts of the Government of Uganda.

The Indian delegation visited Jina, Lugazi, Kinyala and some other parts of Uganda.

355

The delegation was very much impressed with the great strides and progress that Uganda had achieved since her independence, particularly Uganda's developments in the fields of education and industrialisation were most striking to the Indian visitors.

The Indian Minister Mr. Shah also met Mr. Kalule Ssettala, Mr. Nekyon, Minister of Planning and Community Development, Mr. Obwangor, Minister of Justice, Mr. L. Lubowa, Minister of Commerce and Industry and other Ministers of the Government of Uganda. The Indian officials met their counterparts in the Ministries of Planning and Community Development, Agriculture and Commerce and Industry and Finance.

The main discussions between the Ugandan and the Indian delegations centred round : (1) Preparation and conclusion of the first trade agreement between Uganda and India; (2) Agreement on friendship and technical, economic and scientific cooperation between the two countries; (3) establishment of a large-scale sugar project in Kinyala and (4) purchase of Uganda lint by India.

After detailed discussions and negotiations, the first trade agreement between the two countries was signed on November 18 by the Uganda Minister of Commerce and Industry. Mr. Lameck Lubowa and India's Minister of Commerce Mr. Manubhai Shah.

India has been the largest single buyer of Uganda cotton. Likewise Uganda has been purchasing from India cotton textiles, rayon silk fabrics, jute goods and other manufactures, pharmaceuticals and chemicals, light engineering items, iron and steel and various other consumer goods. The overall trade between the two countries was approximately 80 million Rupees in 1964. The Trade Agreement aims at expanding and increasing the overall flow of trade between the two countries and increasing items of import and export between two countries.

The trade agreement provides that payments for purchase and sales by both sides will be in convertible currencies. Both countries by mutual agreement could also make appropriate arrangements to expand mutually beneficial exchanges. For facilitating Indo-Uganda trade a provision exists for countries to meet in either country as and when required. Such reviews would provide the necessary mechanism to see that difficulties in the flow of expanding trade are removed and that business organisations of both sides are continuously geared to increase the volume of trade between the two countries.

UGANDA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Nov 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Proposed Establishment of Military Bases by U.K. in Indian Ocean

The following is the text of a statement made by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, in the Lok Sabha on November 23, 1965 regarding the reported decision of the British Government to establish military bases in the Indian Ocean :

The British Government have decided to set up a new colony to be known as the British Indian Ocean territory, to provide defence facilities for the British and United States Governments in the Indian Ocean. Certain islands at present administered by the Governments of Mauritius and Seychelles, both of which are British colonies, have been taken over to form this new colony. The main islands involved are the Chagos archipelago, 1,200 miles north east of Mauritius, and other group of small islands near the Sevchelles.

According to the British Colonial Secretary, "it is intended that the islands will be available for the construction of defence facilities by the British and United States Governments, but no firm plans have yet been made by either Government. Appropriate compensation will be paid."

While some compensation will be paid to the Governments of Mauritius and Seychelles for taking over these islands the amount remains to be determined.

It appears that the British Government made these arrangements in view of the grant of independence to Mauritius in 1966.

Government of India's policy in regard to bases in the Indian Ocean has been one of strong opposition and this is known to the British Government.

The idea of a colonial power detaching and retaining a part of the Administered territory is repugnant to the present-day thinking and is against the U.S. resolution on the independence of colonial territories.

356

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM MAURITIUS USA SEYCHELLES

Date : Nov 01, 1965

December

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1965 Vol. XI DECEMBER . 12

No

CONTENTS

PAGES

BURMA Shastri-Ne Win Joint Communique 357

CANADA India-Canada Money Order Agreement Signed 358

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY Indo German Credit Agreement Signed 359

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS
Dr. Rafik Zakaria's Speech in the General Assembly on Tibet 360
Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speech in the Special Political Committee on Apartheid 362
Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speech in the General Assembly on the granting of Freedom to Colonial Peoples 365
Shri V. C. Trivedi's Speech in the Political Committee on Denuclearization of

Africa 367 Shri V. C. Trivedi's Speech in the Political Committee on Cyprus, 368

NEPAL Indo-Nepal Joint Communique 370

PAKISTAN Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Parliament on Tashkent Talks 371

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC Indo-UAR Trade Agreement Signed

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

BURMA CANADA INDIA GERMANY CYPRUS USA NEPAL PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN **Date** : Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Shastri-Ne Win Joint Communique

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, accompanied by Shrimati Lalita Shastri, paid a goodwill visit to the Union of Burma from December 20 to December 23, 1965. At the conclusion of the visit, a joint communique was issued on December 23, 1965, by the Prime Minister of India and the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma.

The following is the text of the joint communique :

At the invitation of His Excellency, General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma, His Excellency Shri Lal Babadur Shastri, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, paid a goodwill visit to the Union of Burma from the 20th to the 23rd December, 1965. His Excellency Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was accompanied by Shrimati Lalita Shastri, His Excellency Shri Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, and high-ranking officials of the Government of the Republic of India.

TRADITIONAL FRIENDSHIP

His Excellency the Prime Minister of the Republic of India and the members of his party were accorded a warm welcome and cordial hos-

372

pitality by the Government and the people of the Union of Burma, which reflected the traditional friendship between the peoples of the two countries. The Prime Minister expressed happiness at visiting a close neighbour with whom India enjoyed friendly ties over the centuries. He was particularly pleased to renew his personal acquaintance with Chairman Ne Win. The Chairman expressed his pleasure in having this opportunity to welcome the Prime Minister.

During the visit the Chairman and the Prime Minister held talks on the question of further developing the friendly relations and cooperation between the two countries and exchanged views on international questions of common interest. These talks were held in an atmosphere of great cordiality and mutual understanding.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister noted that the relations between their two countries have been fundamentally one of goodwill towards each other. As this was the Prime Minister's first visit to the Union of Burma, he was interested to make a personal study of the important social and economic changes that are being made in Burma and the progress that is being made by the country as a result of the introduction of Burmese way to socialism. The two leaders agreed that the aims and ideals of the two Governments to create a happier future for their peoples were similar and that they could benefit from each other's experience in the development of their respective economic and social programmes on the basis of socialism.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister noted that there was scope for expanded trade and commerce between the two countries, as well as possibilities for greater co-operation in the economic, technical and cultural fields. The two leaders agreed that efforts should be made to exploit these possibilities to the maximum extent.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister reviewed the problems which have arisen in connection with the departure of a large number of persons of Indian origin from Burma. The Chairman reiterated his assurance to the Prime Minister that resident foreigners who could play a useful role in the new social order that Burma is building would be given facilities to enable them to live and to work in Burma as citizens should they so desire. The two leaders agreed that continued efforts should be made to find early solutions to any outstanding problems, and they were hopeful that with goodwill and mutual understanding on both sides such solutions would be achieved without much difficulty.

NON-ALIGNMENT

The two leaders reaffirmed the devotion of their two countries to the cause of peace and international understanding. They reiterated their faith in the policies and principles of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence and agreed that these policies had contributed to the preservation of peace in the world and had promoted the concept of equality among sovereign States, big or small. The two leaders believed that if peace and progress were to be maintained relations between States, should be governed by the

357

principles of mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and of noninterference in each other's internal affairs. They reiterated their belief in the peaceful settlement of all problems without resort to the use of threat or force.

DISARMAMENT

The two leaders reaffirmed their support for the early attainment of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They agreed on the serious dangers inherent in the spread of nuclear weapons and expressed the hope that the eighteen-nation disarmament committee would devote itself with a sense of urgency and determination to the conclusion of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. They expressed the hope that all States would abide by the spirit and provisions of the Moscow Test Ban Treaty and emphasised the urgent need for extension of this treaty to cover underground tests as well. They welcomed the recent decision of the UN General Assembly to convene a world disarmament conference as an important step towards the attainment of general and complete disarmament.

UNITED NATIONS

The two leaders extended their support to the United Nations Organisation and emphasized the need for it to develop into an effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security and for the promotion of understanding and co-operation between nations and peoples. In this connection, they recognized the need for necessary changes to be made in the world organization so that it may better reflect present international realities.

VIETNAM

The two leaders expressed deep concern over the increasingly grave situation in South-East Asia, which greatly undermines the efforts of independent, developing countries in the region for economic development and social betterment. They were of the view that the Geneva Agreements concerning the States of Indo-China provided the best framework within which a solution of the problem of Vietnam could be found.

RHODESIA

The Chairman and the Prime Minister exchanged views on situation in Rhodesia and expressed their deep concern over the recent development there. They agreed that as Rhodesia was a colony of Britain, it was for the Government of Britain to take speedy and vigorous steps to effectively implement the resolutions of the General Assembly. They emphasized that the will of the majority of the people of Rhodesia should be respected. They regretted the continuance of the racial policy in South Africa and in certain other parts of Africa still under colonial rule and expressed the support of their countries for those who were still struggling for their independence.

TASHKENT MEETING

The Prime Minister referred to the Indo-Pakistan situation and informed General Ne Win of his forthcoming visit to Tashkent on an invitation from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union to meet the President of Pakistan. General Ne Win expressed his sincere good wishes for the success of the meeting, and earnestly hoped that it would help pave the way for better understanding between the two countries. The Prime Minister conveyed to the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma his heartfelt gratitude for the warm welcome and generous hospitality extended to him and Shrimati Shastri and members of his party. The Chairman, on behalf of the people and Government of the Union of Burma, expressed deep appreciation and gratitude to the Prime Minister for visiting the Union of Burma. The Prime Minister extended, on behalf of the President of India, an invitation to the Chairman to visti India. The invitation was accepted with much pleasure.

BURMA USA INDIA RUSSIA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND CHINA SOUTH AFRICA UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN

Date : Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

CANADA

India-Canada Money Order Agreement Signed

An agreement was signed in- New Delhi on December 27, 1965, between India and Canada for a direct money order service between the two countries. On behalf of India the agreement was signed by the Chairman, Posts and Telegraphs Board, Shri L. C. Jain. Mr. D. B. Hicks, Minister in the Canadian High Commission, signed for his Government.

358

Under the agreement, money orders from Canada will, in future, be drawn in Canadian dollars. The amount of these money orders will be converted into Indian rupees at the official exchange rate. India will be entitled to a commission equal to 1/2 per cent of the amount of money orders.

So far, money orders from Canada were received through the U.K. and the amount of

these money orders was received in poundsterling. In 1964-65, over 4,000 money orders of the value of over Rs. 3.76 lakhs were received from Canada via the United Kingdom. India got more than (pond)28,000 by paying these money orders in rupees.

Money order service from India to Canada will remain suspended for the present.

At present, money order remittances are received in India from 107 countries. The amount of these money orders is about Rs. 2.50 crores every year. During 1964-65, pound-sterling worth Rs. 1.70 crores was received in the country.

The Posts and Telegraphs Department has entered into bilateral agreements with 22 countries for direct money order service to reduce time taken in transit and also to cut the cost of remitting money to India.

CANADA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA **Date** : Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Credit Agreement Signed

An agreement for a German Credit totalling Rs. 40.90 crores (DM 343.6 million) for the fifth year of India's Third Five-Year Plan pledged at the Aid India Consortium meeting in April last, was signed in New Delhi on December 22, 1965. The Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, H.E. Baron D. von Mirbach and Shri S. Bhoothalingam, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, signed on behalf of their respective Governments.

Of the total aid, a sum of Rs. 29.00 crores

(DM 243.6 million) will be treated as governmental economic assistance and the balance of Rs. 11.90 crores (DM 100 million) will be extended in the form of suppliers' credit.

UTILISATION OF AID

The sum of Rs. 29.00 crores (DM 243.6 million) of governmental economic assistance will be utilised as follows :

- (i) Rs. 11.14 crores (DM 93.6 million) for refinancing liabilities of the Rourkela Steel Plan.
- (ii) Rs. 7.14 crores (DM 60 million) as commodity aid for the Purchase of goods and services including fertilisers in Germany. In the use of this money, the requirements of Indo-German enterprises in India will be taken into consideration.
- (iii) Rs. 4.76 crores (DM 40 million) for new development projects.
- (iv) Rs. 5.96 crores (DM 50 million) for loans to small and medium undertakings by the Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India, the Industrial Finance Corporation of India and the National Small Industries Corporation.

The suppliers' credit of Rs. 11.90 crores (DM 100 million) will be utilised for the purchase of capital equipment and machinery.

TERMS OF CREDIT

- (i) The loan of Rs. 11.14 crores (DM 93.6 million) is repayable in 16 years at 5.5% interest per annum.
- (ii) The other three loans totalling Rs. 17.86 crores (DM 150 million) are repayable in 25 years (with a grace period of 7 years) at an interest rate of 3% per annum.
- (iii) The suppliers' credit will be for a period of 10 years after delivery of the goods and will carry interest at rates

to be determined.

359

IMPORTS WITH GERMAN ASSISTANCE

Under German assistance, India has been importing equipment for various industries, viz., automobile, chemicals, engineering, power, steel, etc., and maintenance requirements for the economy.

Among the important projects undertaken with German assistance are the Rourkela Steel Project, Rourkela Fertilizer Plant, Neyveli Briquetting and Carbonisation Plant, Neyveli Fertiliser Project, Durgapur Power Station (5th Unit), Expansion of the Mysore Iron & Steel Works and its conversion into an alloy and special steel plant, New Government Electric Factory, Mysore, Expansion of the Kalinga Pig Iron Plant, Kargali Coal Washery Extension, Sawang Coal WasherY, TELCO, etc.

TOTAL AID

German assistance to India by way of credits so far totals Rs. 446.8 crores (DM 3753.2 million). Out of this, Rs. 140.06 crores (DM 1176.6 million) was given during the Second Five-Year Plan period. The balance of Rs. 306.74 crores (DM 2576.6 million) has been provided for the Third Five-Year Plan. Up to the end of October 1965, a sum of Rs. 323.04 crores (DM 2713.54 million) was drawn under the German credits.

GERMANY INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Dr. Rafik Zakaria's Speech in the General Assembly on Tibet

Dr. Rafik Zakaria, Minister for Urban Development, Government of Bombay, and Member of the Indian Delegation, made the following speech in the Twentieth Session of the General Assembly on December 14, 1965 on the question of Tibet :

As representatives are aware, for the past fifteen years the question of Tibet has been from time to time under the consideration of the United Nations. It was first raised here in 1950 at the fifth session of the General Assembly, but it could not be placed on the agenda. In fact, my country opposed its inclusion at that time because we were assured by China that it was anxious to settle the problem by peaceful means. However, instead of improving, the situation in Tibet began to worsen, and since then the question has come up several times before the General Assembly of the United Nations Our delegation participated in the discussion at the fourteenth session in 1959 and although we abstained from voting we made it clear that, because of our close historical, cultural and religious ties with the Tibetans, we could not but be deeply moved and affected by what was happening in that region. We hoped against hope that wiser counsel would prevail among the Chinese and that there would be an end to the sufferings of the people of Tibet.

However, the passage of time has completely belied our hopes. As the days pass, the situation becomes worse and cries out for the attention of all mankind. As we know, ever since Tibet came under the stranglehold of China, the Tibetans have been subjected to a continuous and increasing ruthlessness which has few parallels in the annals of the world. In the name of introducing 'democratic reforms" and of fighting a "counter-revolution", the Chinese have indulged in the worst kind of genocide and the suppression of a minority race.

To begin with, we in India were hopeful that, as contacts between the Chinese and the Tibetans under the changed set-up became closer and more intimate, a more harmonious relationship would emerge. In fact, in 1956, as a result of his long talks with Mr. Chou En-lai, the Chinese Premier, my late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru felt confident that a mutually agreeable adjustment between the two peoples would be established. Even the Dalai Lama expressed a similar hope to our late Prime Minster, but, as subsequent events have proved, the Chinese never believed in living up to their assurances. They promised autonomy to Tibet and the safeguarding of its cultural and religious heritage and traditions but, as the International Commission of Jurists, in its June 1959 report on Tibet, has emphasized. they attempted on the contrary :

"to destroy the national, ethnical, racial and religious group of Tibetans as such by killing members of the group and by causing serious bodily and mental harm to members of the group."

360

The world is aware that it was in protest against the oppression and enslavement of Tibet that the Dalai Lama, who is held in the highest esteem by all Tibetans and, indeed, respected as a spiritual leader by all Indians, fled from Lhasa and took asylum in India. Today there are thousands of Tibetan refugees in my country-approximately 50,000-who have left their hearths and homes and fled from their country to join their leader and seek refuge in India. The flight of these refugees still continues, for the Chinese have transformed Tibet into a vast military camp, where the indigenous Tibetans are made to live like hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Although the relationship between Tibet and India is centuries old and has flourished all through the ages in all its manifestations, whether religious, cultural or economic, we have always taken care not to make the relationship a political problem. In recent years, despite the fact that the Dalai Lama and thousands of his Tibetan followers have come to our land, and despite the fact that China has turned Tibet itself into a base for aggression against our northern borders, we have not exploited the situation. Undoubtedly our national sentiments are now and again aroused as a result of the atrocities and cruelties committed by the Chinese against Tibetans, but we have exercised the greatest caution, for we believe that what should concern all of us is the much larger human problem, namely, the plight of these good and innocent people who are being victimized merely because they are different, ethnically and culturally, from the Chinese.

Here I feel that it would not be out of place to put this august Assembly the following facts which stand out stubbornly and irrefutably in connexion with Chinese policy in Tibet:

- The autonomy guaranteed in the Sino-Tibetan Agreement of 1951 has from the beginning remained a dead letter;
- Through increasing application of military force, the Chinese have in fact obliterated the autonomous character of Tibet.
- (3) There has been arbitrary confiscation of properties belonging to monasteries and individuals and Tibetan Government institutions;
- (4) Freedom of religion is denied to the Tibetans and Buddhism is being suppressed together with the system of priests, monasteries, shrines and monuments:
- (5) The Tibetans are allowed no freedom of information or expression;
- (6) There has also been carried out a systematic policy of killing, imprisonment and deportation of those Tibetans who have been active in their opposition to Chinese rule;
- (7) The Chinese have forcibly transferred large numbers of Tibetan children to China in order to denationalize them, to indoctrinate them in Chinese ideology and to make them forget their own Tibetan religion, culture and way of life; and
- (8) There has also been a large-scale attempt to bring Han Chinese into Tibet, and thereby make Tibet Chinese and overwhelm the indigenous people with a more numerous Chinese population.

These atrocities, carried out ruthlessly, with utter disregard for Tibetan sentiments and aspirations, and in complete violation of universally recognized human rights, add up to a frightful programme of the suppression of a whole people. It surpasses anything that colonialists have done in the past to the peoples whom they ruled and enslaved. That is why the United Nations General Assembly took note of the situation in Tibet and passed two resolutions, one in 1959 and the other in 1961, deploring the denial of these human rights to the people of Tibet by the Chinese Government and appealing to it to restore those rights to the Tibetan people. But all such pleas have fallen on deaf cars.

Is this situation not a challenge to human conscience? Can we---dedicated as we are here to Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights-remain mute spectators to the ghastly tragedy that is being enacted by a ruthless and oppressive regime in Tibet? In a recent appeal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Member States, which is contained in document A/6081, the Dalai Lama, who has been a model of restraint, serenity and, indeed, of humanity, has warned the Organization that the Chinese, if unchecked would "resort to still more brutal means of exterminating the Tibetan race". There is no limit to the hardships that the Tibetan people are suffering. Even their supply of food is restricted and controlled by the Chinese, who first feed their military forces in Tibet, and then whatever remains is given to the indigenous Tibetans. My delegation naturally feels concerned about the terrible deterioration in the situation in Tibet. On 17 December 1964, for instance, the Dalai Lama was formally deprived of his position as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Autonomous Region of Tibet and denounced as "an incorrigible running dog of imperialism and foreign reactionaries"; this was immediately followed by the deposition on 30 December 1964 of the Panchen Lama, whom the Chinese tried assiduously to take under their

361

wing, and by his condemnation as a leader of the "clique of reactionary serf owners".

Thus the Chinese have severed the remaining political links between Tibet and its two politicoreligious structures. and have given a final blow to what they fondly used to call, in the past, "the special status of Tibet".

Moreover, the campaign to dispossess Tibetan peasants of their land and to distribute their properties is also being accelerated with the definition of what precisely constitutes feudal elements being expanded, from time to time, to cover a wider and wider range of peasants. In fact, these so-called land reforms are being used by the Chinese Government to advance its own political purpose and to turn the Tibetan peasants into slaves of its system. The naked truth-which all of us must face-is that the Chinese Government is determined to obliterate the Tibetan people; but surely no people can remain for long suppressed. I have faith in the world community. I believe it will be able to help restore to the Tibetans all the freedoms which we have enshrined, with such dedication, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

For our part, we assure the United Nations that-as in the past-we shall continue to give all facilities to the Tibetan refugees, and do our best to alleviate their sufferings and hardships. The Dalai Lama has been living in India for some years now, and is carrying on his religious and humanitarian activities without any restrictions from us. We shall continue to give the Dalai Lama and his simple and peace-loving people these facilities and all our hospitality.

It is for these reasons that we support, fully and wholeheartedly, the cause of the people of Tibet. Our hearts go out to them in their miserable plight and in the terrible suppression that they are suffering at the hands of the Government of the People's Republic of China. Although that regime has given us, and continues to give us. provocations, we have refused to use the Tibetan refugees as pawns in our conflict with China. We do not believe that the sufferings of one people should be made a weapon in the armoury of another.

In the end, may I express the fervent hope on behalf of the United Nations that there would soon be an end to the reign of misery and oppression in Tibet, and that the people of Tibet will be able to share with us all those human rights that all of us, in different lands, are so fortunate as to possess and enjoy.

INDIA USA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speech in the Special Political Committee on Apartheid

Shri G. Parthasarathi, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following speech in the Special Political Committee on December 3, 1965 on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa :

Mr. Chairman, the consideration of the racist policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa has always been one of the most important items on the agenda of the General Assembly during the past twenty years. Although discussion of this problem in the United Nations has not had the desired impact on the Government of South Africa, my delegation believes that such discussion serves at least to focus the attention of the world on the outrageous policies of the racist regime in South Africa.

This question has acquired added urgency this year in view of the grave developments which have taken place in the area bordering South Africa. It is the firm conviction of my delegation that the question of apartheid in South Africa cannot be viewed in isolation from other colonial and racial problems in Africa. The reactionary forces of racism and fanaticism which committed an act of piracy in Southern Rhodesia have been sustained by the assistance and encouragement received for so long from powerful forces in the Western world, and more particularly from South Africa and-Portugal. As we stated during the discussion of the Southern Rhodesian question in the Security Council on 12 November 1965

"The three forces of colonial and racist domination in Africa, that is, South Africa, Portugal and the Smith clique, are acting in concert to perpetuate white supremacy and economic exploitation. The fate of one is inevitably linked with that of the other two." (S/PV. 1258, p. 41).

Mr. Chairman, my delegation has studied with great care the reports of 17 June and 10 August 1965 of the Special Committee on the Policies A Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. I should like to place on record the appreciation of my delegation of the invaluable work of the Chairman, the Rapporteur and other members of that Special Committee, and their notable contribution to the study of this problem. My delegation accepts the recommen-

362

dations of the Special Committee contained in Part III of its report of 10 August 1965 A/5957).

As the representatives present here are no doubt aware, my Government was the first to take economic and political steps against the South African regime long before the General Assembly and the Security Council recommended such measures. Indeed, it was India which first drew the attention of the world community in 1946 to the inhuman and intolerable state of affairs in South Africa. My Government has also implemented all of the recommendations of the General Assembly. and the Security Council, promptly and fully. We have also offered our unstinted support to the Organization of African Unity in its efforts to eradicate this evil of racism from the African continent. My country was the first to announce a voluntary contribution of 25,000 rupees in response to the appeal of the Special Committee made on 25 October 1964 for funds to help the, victims of the policies of apartheid.

My delegation believes that it is not enough merely to pass resolutions, either in the General Assembly or the Security Council, year in and year out. For nineteen years the United Nations has been considering this question. Commissions and committees have been constituted to resolve this issue. Reports have been submitted, and resolutions adopted. Yet, during this entire period, the non-whites, and anyone who struggled against the inhuman policies of the racist regime, were being subjected to greater and greater repression and unspeakable indignities. Is it not time to ask ourselves whether we really want to get rid of this scourge of humanity? While the Powers which had the means to persuade and even force the racists to give up their nefarious policies contented themselves with impracticable and token, measures, the South African racists intensified their cruet methods of oppression. Illegal measures, backed by brute force, were used to reduce the majority of the population to serfdom. It wits possible for them to maintain a regime of such cruelty and barbarism only because the rest of the world refrained from taking bold and resolute steps to bring it to heel. By lack of resolution our Organization has been guilty of sacrificing the human worth and dignity of 13 million people. I submit that we cannot solve the problem by adopting half-hearted measures. Unfortunately, even these half-hearted measures have not been implemented by the friends of South Africa.

Let us consider for a moment the various stages through which South Africa has frustrated all attempts by the United Nations to solve this problem peacefully and without coercive action. The issue has been before this world body since 1946, when India first raised it. During the years in which only the question of the treatment of people of Indo-Pakistani origin in South Africa was considered, that Government displayed complete indifference and insensibility to negotiation, good offices, or any other method of restoring the rights and freedoms of those who had been forcibly and ruthlessly deprived of them. South Africa's defiance of world opinion increased, and more so when the broader issue of apartheid came to be discussed in the United Nations. With successive changes in leadership, Governments in South Africa became more and more reactionary. As the intensity of feeling rose in the United Nations and in the world community, so did the death toll of the tragic victims of apartheid. For every word of the resolutions and reports adopted by the United Nations, the rulers in South Africa hunted out more victims and obliterated them.

Resolution 1761 (XVII) was adopted in the earnest hope that at last the majority of the

United Nations had found a way to make South Africa realize the inadvisability of any further defiance of the Organization. Had the measures recommended by the United Nations been implemented fully and earnestly by all its Members, it would have saved the suffering millions in South Africa from tyranny and oppression. It is a matter of profound regret that a handful of the Member States found it necessary either to ignore the recommendations or to find ingenious explanations and excuses to justify the deliberate flouting of them. The world is well aware that these countries confined themselves to expressions of sympathy with the unfortunate people of South Africa, while carrying on extensive trade with the racists of that country against the recommendations of the United Nations.

The issue was then taken to the Security Council, because the majority of the Member States felt-and my delegation shared this feeling--that the time for recommendations was over, and that mandatory coercive action under Chapter VII of the Charter was desirable and, indeed, essential. However, due to the uncooperative attitude of some of the permanent members, the Security Council failed to take into account the realities of the situation and did not declare the existing state of affairs in South Africa as constituting a threat to peace. The reports of the Special Committee give us a comprehensive picture of the monstrous activities of the racist regime in South Africa and provide us with detailed information on the military build-up and the extent of investments of foreign. based corporations in South Africa. I need not go into these details, which are available in these reports, and which have been further ably sup. plemented by Mr. Marof, the representative of Guinea, during the course of his intervention in this Committee on 29 November 1965.

363

It is a matter of great concern to us that while the United Nations is trying to stop the flow of arms and capital to South Africa, the Special Committee reports that, in violation of the recommendations of the United Nations, a few Member States continue to supply South Africa with weapons to suppress the 13 million nonwhites in that country. What is worse, they are actually helping South Africa to develop its own capacity to manufacture such weapons.

All the recommendations of the Special Committee are based on one fundamental conclusion that the situation in the Republic of South Africa constitutes a serious threat to peace. My delegation supports this conclusion and joins others in calling for mandatory measures, as provided in Chapter VII of the Charter. Economic sanctions, as set out in Article 41 of the Charter, are the only effective means for a peaceful solution of the problem. For these steps to be effective, however, it is very necessary that those States which recently had close trade and other relations with the South African Government should actively co-operate with the United Nations in implementing them. We have no doubt that if the principal trading partners of South Africa join in implementing all the recommendations of the Special Committee, the South African Government will be compelled to face the realities of the situation and be obliged to revise its policies.

Even the Expert Committee appointed under the Security Council resolution of 18 June 1964 recognized that the South African economy was vulnerable to pressure in several fields, provided that the main trading partners of South Africa co-operated in enforcing economic measures.

An excuse is quite often put forward by certain interested countries that enforcement of economic sanctions against South Africa would hurt most the people in whose cause they are supposed to be undertaken. This contention is not valid, as the leaders of the non-white peoples themselves reject such seeming solicitude and advocate economic sanctions wholeheartedly. Indeed, the non-white majority in South Africa is prepared and ready to undergo any hardships in order to rid itself of its bondage. As Mr. Ngcobo, the Treasurer-General and member of the national executive of the Pan-Africanist Congress said eloquently during the course of his testimony to the Special Committee on 19 April 1965 :

"... the story of [my] country is not only a story of grief, want, hunger, homelessness, a story of torture, endless persecution and prosecution but also a story of heroes, past and present, and of service, sacrifice and suffering." (S/6605, p. 20). My delegation shares the earnest hope expressed by the Special Committee, in paragraph 149 of its report, dated 10 August 1965, that the Security Council and the General Assembly will decide to implement effective measures in this year of international co-operation and that positive action will be taken to eliminate the incalculable dangers of racism in South Africa to enable the people of that country to play their rightful role in Africa and the world.

I should like to recall here that the group of experts established by the Secretary-General, in pursuance of the Security Council resolution of 4 December 1963, has suggested that the Security Council should invite the South African Government to send its representatives to take part in discussions under the auspices of the United Nations on the formation of a national convention, fully representative of all the people of South Africa, to decide the future of their country at the national level. The group has also expressed the view that if no satisfactory reply is received from the South African Government by a stipulated date, the Security Council would be left with no effective peaceful means for assisting in resolving the situation except to apply economic sanctions. The South African Government, quite predictably, refused to respond to this invitation.

The Special Committee has mentioned in its reports that the South African Government has intensified its racist policies and has ordered a stringent application of them in various fields of civic activity. New repressive legislation has been enacted. This is a clear indication that the South African Government does not pay any attention to the wishes of humanity at large, expressed in this Organization. My delegation considers that effective economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter are the only means left to the world community by which to influence the Government of South Africa. The Special Committee has also mentioned that South Africa is vulnerable to international economic measures but it must be emphasized that only a total embargo on trade with South Africa can yield results.

It is high time that the Security Council took decisive action in this respect. As a matter of

fact, the lukewarm attitude of some of the permanent members of the Security Council is the main cause of the intransigent attitude adopted by the South African Government. Further hesitation by the Security Council will heighten racial tensions in Africa to the breaking point.

364

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA PORTUGAL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN GUINEA RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speech in the General Assembly an the granting of Freedom to Colonial Peoples

Shri G. Parthasarathi, Permanent Representative of India to, the United Nations, made the following speech in the Twentieth Session of the General Assembly on December 1, 1965 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples :

The General Assembly is now discussing the reports of the Special Committee for the years 1964 and 1965. These reports run into 3,500 pages and my delegation has followed the discussion on them, both in the Fourth Committee and in the plenary, with very great interest. Having been under colonial rule ourselves, we cannot but be deeply concerned about the future of those peoples and territories that have not yet obtained independence.

It was five years ago that the General Assembly adopted the, historic Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. A year later the General Assembly established the Special Committee on decolonization. The delegation of India has been closely associated with both the Committee of seventeen and the Committee of twenty-four. I would like to take this opportunity to pay special tribute to the Chairman of the Committee of twenty-four, Mr. Coulibaly of Mali, whose dedication to the cause of decolonization is so praiseworthy. The Committee is indeed fortunate to have a person of his energy, patience, courtesy and goodwill to preside over its deliberations.

The reports of the Committee deal with some sixty territories and contain two special studies : one on South West Africa and the other on Portuguese territories. This is the first time that a United Nations body has undertaken a detailed examination of the situation in all the non-selfgoverning territories. Both these special reports are extremely valuable as they reveal the appalling conditions that prevail in South West Africa and the Portuguese colonies.

Since the establishment of the Special Committee on decolonization, several countries in Africa and elsewhere have attained their independence. But the hard core of colonialism and racialism remains embedded in Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea and South and South West Africa. The Southern half of Africa is the last citadel of colonialism and racialism in that continent and the General Assembly has to face the problems arising out of such a situation. My delegation earnestly wishes for the peaceful progress of those territories to independence and freedom, but it is unlikely that this will happen. The declared policies of the regimes of Portugal, Rhodesia and South Africa run counter to the spirit of the Charter, the Declaration on Human Rights, the Declaration on decolonization, and other resolutions of the General Assembly.

Not only has my delegation co-sponsored relevant resolutions on South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and the Portuguese colonies, but we have taken action against Portuguese colonialism and carried out the provisions of the resolutions in regard to South Africa, South West Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Unfortunately, there are still some members in the Assembly who continue to assist these racist and oppressive regimes directly or indirectly. Had it not been for such assistance it is unlikely that the Smith faction would have dared to usurp the Government of Southern Rhodesia.

While the situation in the southern part of Africa is bleak and dangerous, my delegation notes that the process of decolonization in certain other parts of the world is proceeding in the right direction, although slowly. In this context my delegation would like to welcome the recent decision of the British Guiana Constitutional Conference held in London that British Guiana should attain independence on 26 May 1966. It was unfortunate that the administering Power was unable to create, conditions which would have enabled one of the major parties in British Guiana to attend the Constitutional Conference. As my delegation stated before, British Guiana could have attained independence much earlier if the administering Power had pursued more enlightened policies. However, it is the earnest hope of my delegation that the people of British Guiana will compose their differences and work towards national unity, progress and prosperity. My delegation would like to sound a note of caution however, if the administering Power were to delay or hinder the attainment of full independence by British Guiana, such action would be fraught with grave consequences.

The situation in Fiji, where on one pretext or another the administering Power is reluctant to relinquish its hold, causes the United Nations much concern. This concern has already been expressed by the Fourth Committee, which adopted a draft resolution on it only last week. It is regrettable that the Government of the United Kingdom should persuade itself that in the second half of the twentieth century it should create conditions which, as the resolution adopted by the Fourth Committee clearly shows, foment separatist tendencies and delay the progress of Fiji to complete nationhood and independence. It is well known that colonialism has always brought in its

365

wake racial discrimination and communal disharmony.

My delegation does not wish to dilate on this matter since the representative of Ceylon, when Introducing the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee, stated the cause of the people of Fiji most eloquently and clearly. I would only appeal to the Government of the United Kingdom to act in Fiji, as it has done in Mauritius, by fixing an immediate date for independence on the basis of representative institutions and democratic elections conducted on an unqualified "one man, one vote" principle. However, my delegation regrets that certain countries, which themselves are born out of the merging of races, should attempt to focus attention on racial and ethnic differences rather than on common nationhood.

Now I turn to the Cook Islands, and I do so with satisfaction. New Zealand, the erstwhile administering Power, has always played a forwardlooking role in colonial matters. Its achievement in the field of decolonization has been praiseworthy. New Zealand was the only administering Power to vote for General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It is also to the credit of the New Zealand Government that it has always sought to build up multi-racial societies eschewing racial discrimination and ethnic differences. Another example of the progressive policy of the Government of New Zealand is to be seen in the attainment of full self-government by the Cook Islands.

The New Zealand delegation co-operated with the Committee of twenty-four and the General Assembly, and invited the United Nations to observe the elections in the Cook Islands and the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly established as a result of the elections.

In this connexion, my delegation would like to pay a well-deserved tribute to Ambassador Adeel, who, as the representative of the United Nations in the Cook Islands, performed a responsible and difficult task with ability and impartiality.

The developments in the Cook Islands, which have now attained self-government within the meaning of Article 73(e), give us confidence that the people of this Territory have chosen and will always choose their destiny in full freedom and without interference from any outside party.

The Special Committee of twenty-four and its sub-committees accomplished a pioneering task in examining the situation in the smaller island territories with respect to the implementation of the Declaration. The conclusions and recommendations submitted by the Special Committee are of great significance, since the administering Powers will be able to act on these recommendations in discharging their responsibilities in implementing the Declaration. It is to be noted with regret, however, that some of the administering Powers have not extended the full co-operation which the Special Committee of twenty-lour and the United Nations expects from them as Member States.

It has been proved beyond doubt-and this has been clearly demonstrated in the case of the Cook Island-that visiting missions from the United Nations can be of great assistance to the people of these Territories and to the administering Powers in realizing the objectives of resolution 1514 (XV). It is therefore to be hoped that the other administering Powers will extend facilities to all visiting missions which the Special Committee and the General Assembly may consider it necessary and desirable to send. Arguments have been advanced that the dispatch of visiting missions from the United Nations to Non-Self-Governing Territories would be tantamount to interference in the internal affairs of the administering Powers. This contention has been rejected by the General Assembly. What is more, the United Nations has certain responsibilities towards, Non-Self-Governing Territories, and it is the obligation of the administering Powers to cooperate with the United Nations in all possible ways.

In surveying the work of the Special Committee, my delegation would like to refer to the important work done by the Committee during its visit to Africa in May and June 1965, at the invitation of the Governments of Ethiopia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia. This visit enabled the United Nations to renew direct contact with people under colonial rule in Africa and to acquire greater knowledge of their present status as well as of their aspirations. The Special Committee's work in Africa will have served to demonstrate further the concern of the United Nations for the plight of dependent peoples and to enable it to assist in the speedy emergence of many countries from dependence to freedom.

India has always been in the vanguard of the struggle against colonialism, both in the United Nations and elsewhere. When we look back at 1945 and look around us today, we notice the striking success achieved in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism. But this Organization cannot afford to be complacent. Much has been done, but much more remains to be done in Angola, Mozambique, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Aden and many other territories not yet independent.

India is passionately dedicated to the noble task of the rapid and total eradication of colonialism and racialism. So long as racialism and colonialism exist, there can be no real peace, no real progress and no real understanding among

366

Peoples. India will always extend its full support to all peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence.

I have not attempted to go into a detailed consideration of all the questions which arise out of the reports of the Special Committee, since my delegation had an opportunity to express its views. both in the Committee of twenty-four and in the Fourth Committee. My delegation reserves the right to intervene in a debate when the draft resolutions on this item are considered.

INDIA USA MALI ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM FIJI MAURITIUS NEW ZEALAND ETHIOPIA TANZANIA ZAMBIA

Date : Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Speech in the Political Committee on Denuclearization of Africa

Shri V. C. Trivedi, Ambassador of India in Berne, and Member of the Indian delegation. made the following speech in the Political Committee on December 1, 1965, on the denucleariza-

tion of Africa :

The delegation of India wishes to make a few brief comments on the item under consideration to express its appreciation and give its full support to the-efforts being made by the peace-loving countries of Africa to establish a denuclearized zone covering the continent of Africa and its adjacent waters and islands. India agrees entirely with these countries in their objectives and their desiderata in this project. The draft resolution contained in document A/C. 1/L. 346 Rev. 1, cosponsored by twenty-seven African delegations has. therefore, the whole-hearted support of the Indian delegation,

India also welcomes with appreciation and support the efforts of the countries of "tin America to establish a similar denuclearized zone in their continent. The Indian delegation hopes that the endeavours of the African and Latin American countries in this field will be successful in the immediate future.

The twenty-seven delegation draft has been prepared most carefully and reflects admirably the requirements of Africa. I do not wish to dwell-at length on the various provisions of this draft resolution as there is hardly anything of substance which I can add to the highly illuminating statements already made by many of its cosponsors. The Indian delegation would, however, like to emphasize that operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6. which form the operative core of the draft resolution, are extremely pertinent and deserve the support of the entire international community. In particular, operative paragraph 5, with its realistic assessment of the situation. enunciates a very valid requirement of the sovereign. Peace-loving nations of Africa. The Indian delegation would also like to emphasize that countries belonging to other continents are in accord with the objectives of the non-aligned nations of Africa as reflected in the draft resolution before us.

The debate on this item has its relevance to areas other than the continent of Africa and its adjacent waters and islands. The Indian delegation would refer in this context in particular to the eight points of general principles set out by the representative of the United Arab Republic. These are highly important principles and I should like to quote points 1, 2, 3 and 4, which are of universal validity. These are :

"First, that the denuclearization of any geographical entity, whether it is on land or on the sea, should be examined on its merits.

"Secondly, that in some areas, because of various obvious reasons, denuclearization. could not be realized unless examined in conjunction with conditions prevailing in other neighbouring areas.

"Thirdly, that any denuclearization of any area should be worked out and agreed upon basically by the countries most concerned.

"Fourthly, that in order to have political or military effect, any programme to denuclearize any area should have the solemn support and respect of the nuclear Powers." (1389th meeting, page 16).

The Indian delegation is in entire agreement with these excellent guidelines.

One of the welcome features of the continent of Africa is that the sovereign African States which are putting forward their peace proposition are non-aligned. As the representative of the Sudan said only a few moments ago, they have no pacts with military blocs possessing nuclear weapons. Denuclearization of a region becomes difficult and even impossible when one or more countries in the region are interested more in nuclearized or nuclearizing allies than in denuclearization.

There has been a reference to the Indian Ocean in our debate. In fact, there have been in the past references to the desirability of a denuclearized zone for Asia and the Pacific. Unfortunately. And much to the regret of the entire international community this region which was more or less a denuclearized zone, except for military alliances, has now become a nuclearized zone. And this unhappy development took place only a week after the momentous non-aligned Conference held in Cairo in the early part of 1964, which declared

367

that various proposals pertaining to the denuclea-

rization zones in different continents, including Asia, were:

"... steps in the right direction because they assist in consolidating international peace and security and lessening international tensions." (A/5763, page 23)

What I described as the peace proposition of the sovereign African nations deserves the full support of us all.

INDIA SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA SUDAN EGYPT

Date : Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Speech, in the Political Committee on Cyprus

Shri V. C. Trivedi, Ambassador of India in Berne, and Member of the Indian Delegation made the following speech in the First (Political; Committee on December 14, 1965 on the question of Cyprus

The Indian delegation considers it highly appropriate that the First Committee is debating the question of Cyprus immediately after about seventy representatives have expressed their views in statements, scholarly as well as passionate, philosophical as well as detailed, on the supremely important principle of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty. On that fundamental principle we have beard no disagreement in the Committee, although there have been some isolated and indirect references designed to reduce the irreducible force and deemphasize the emphatic validity of the principle of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of sovereign and independent States. All the statements have in fact reinforced the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter

on this theme and have proclaimed their strong and passionate opposition to all forms of intervention. A sovereign and independent State. whether it is large or small, whether it is aligned or non-aligned. whether or not it is militarily powerful, is entitled to receive unambiguous affirmation from all Members of our Organization that its sovereignty and independence are sacrosanct and that no other State is entitled to interfere under any pretext whatsoever in its domestic affairs and its full exercise of its sovereignty.

The Republic of Cyprus is an equal Member of the United Nations, and the Charter of the United Nations proclaims the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. The Charter does not recognize, and international law does not recognize any interference with the exercise of the sovereignty of nations. In fact the Charter specially enjoins all Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Other consideration are secondary: only the Charter is supreme for its Article 103 specifically provides that the obligations of the Members under the Charter shall prevail over their obligations under any other international agreement. The Republic of Cyprus is thus entitled to the full protection of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and to a clear rejection of all attempts to use force or threaten the use of force against the full exercise of its sovereignty and against its sacred right to defend its independence, unity and territorial integrity.

It was on the basis of this universal law, defined in the United Nations Charter and posited on the canons of civilized international behaviour, that the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries declared their views on the question of Cyprus at their second conference, held in Cairo in October 1964. They said:

"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 without any foreign intervention or interference the political future of the country, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations." (A/5763)

The delegation of India would appeal to all delegations to support this declaration not only because it represents the unambiguous views of the nonaligned countries, but also because it is based on all that civilized international behaviour stands for. It emphasizes that there are no different peoples of Cyprus; there is only one people -the Cypriot people. The unity of the people of Cyprus is sacrosanct. The territorial integrity of Cyprus is sacrosanct. Many States, of Africa. Asia and Latin America are multiracial, multireligious, or multi-lingual. What these countries consider to be of paramount and overriding importance is their Unity and their territorial

368

integrity. Nothing should or could bring into question this unity and integrity of the State.

In its intervention in the Committee on the preceding item, my delegation had gone into the evolution and the abiding validity of the primary principle of non-intervention and protection of sovereignty and independence of States. I do not, therefore, deem it necessary to dwell in any detail on the eternal verity of this immutable principle. What the Indian delegation wishes to emphasize is that this principle should apply to the sovereign Republic of Cyprus as to any other Member of the United Nations. in our debate so far many speakers who have preceded me have spoken of the history of this unhappy island Republic, of imperialist manoeuvres and impositions, of constitutional oddities and unconstitutional interventions, of armed aggression and subversive infiltration; but these issues are of secondary importance. What is supremely important is that Cyprus, which became an equal and sovereign Member of the United Nations on 20 September 1960, is, in the words of the Cairo Declaration, "entitled to and should enjoy, unrestricted and unfettered sovereignity and independence". Any attempt to impose restrictions or fetters on its sovereignty is thus in direct violation of the Charter.

In his statement the other day the Foreign Minister of Cyprus gave us an exhaustive and welldocumented background of the question since the colonial conquest of 1571. This sorry tale of the suffering of the brave people of Cyprus is, of course, relevant, particularly its fight for independence against the overwhelming might of alien military occupation. During the course of this struggle, restrictions and fetters were imposed by instruments known as the London and Zurich Agreements. Whatever may have been the situation in 1571, or 1923, or 1925, or 1959, or 1960, the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned. Countries were emphatic in their view that there should now be no restrictions and fetters on the sovereignty of Cyprus. What is valid in the context of the situation today is the sovereign will of the Republic of Cyprus to maintain its unity, its independence and its territorial integrity. What is valid is that Cyprus is a Member of the United Nations since 20 September 1960 and is entitled to all protection under the Charter.

In addition to giving an exhaustive and illuminating historical background of the rebirth of his Republic, the Foreign Minister of Cyprus also explained to us in convincing detail the efforts made by the Government of Cyprus to co-operate with the United Nations Peace-keeping Force on the one hand, and to ensure harmony among all its citizens and full protection of the, fundamental rights of all its people without any discrimination, on the other. The Government of Cyprus can be justifiably proud of its re-cord on both these counts despite all the provocations and interventionist influences with which it had to contend.

There will be grievances, real or imaginary, in all countries and them will be differences among various political, economic, and social groups within a country. These differences have to be resolved, however, in an atmosphere of royalty and harmony, national integrity and modern democracy, and not through external intervention.

It is on the strength of these fundamental

principles and facts that the delegation of India has co-sponsored the thirty-two-delegation draft resolution contained in document A/C. 1/L. 342/Rev. 2. This comprehensive draft resolution takes account of the relevant efforts of the United Nations to deal with the question of Cyprus as well as of the Cairo Declaration of the non-aligned countries, and notes the Declaration of Intent and Memorandum of the Government of Cyprus. Operatively, it reaffirms the rights of Cyprus as a full and equal Member of the United Nations and enjoins all States to respect and observe the provisions of the United Nations Charter on the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic without any foreign intervention and interference. The draft resolution further recommends the continuation of the United Nations mediation efforts. This draft resolution is thus the only response that this Committee can make on this question, and the Indian delegation trusts that the Committee will endorse it overwhelmingly.

Before concluding, I should like to quote what the Foreign Minister of India said on this question during the general debate-in the current session of the Assembly. He said

"For two years now, the brave people of Cyprus have been facing interference from without, armed and otherwise-interference designed at best to curb the sovereignty and independence of the State of Cyprus, and at worst to partition the Island along sectarian lines. We, in India, were subjected to this accursed process decades ago, culminating in the partition of the country in 1947. As we have all seen, partition only creates new problems. We, therefore, view with the utmost sympathy the efforts of the Government of Cyprus to maintain the unfettered sovereignty, independence and unity of the State of Cyprus." (A/PV. 1358, page 23-25)

369

INDIA CYPRUS USA SWITZERLAND EGYPT UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Indo-Nepal Joint Communique

The following is the text of a joint communique issued in New Delhi on December 20, 1965 at the end of the State visit to India of Their Majesties the King and the Queen of Nepal :

At the invitation of the President of India, Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal paid a State visit to India from November 25 to December 19, 1965. Their Majesties were accompanied by Rt, Hon'ble Kirti Nidhi Bist, Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Foreign Minister, Shrimati Bist, Rt. Hon'ble Khadga Bahadur Singh, Minister without portfolio, General Sher Bahadur Malla, Principal Military Secretary to His Majesty, Bada Kaji Pushpa Raj, principal personal Secretary to His Majesty and other officials of His Majesty's Government. The Royal Party later proceeded on a tour of other places of economic, cultural and religious interest in the country and visited a number of important development projects, including Bhakra Dam, Nangal Fertiliser Factory, Atomic Energy Establishment at Trombay, the Hindustan Aeronautics at Bangalore, the Integral Coach and Heavy Vehicles Factories at Madras and the Hindustan Ship Building Yard at Vishakhapatnam. They also visited the holy temples in Varanasi, Mathura-Brindaban, Mysore, Nasik Kanyakumari, Rameshwaram, Madurai, Kancheepuram, Puri and Bhubaneshwar. The Banaras Hindu University conferred the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Letters on His Majesty at a special convocation. The distinguished guests returned to Nepal from Patna on December 20, 1965.

Their Majesties received a warm and affectionate welcome during their stay in New Delhi. They attended several functions organised in their honour and visited places of interest in the capital. People in other parts of the country also received Their Majesties in large numbers with great warmth and cordiality. Their Majesties were deeply touched by this spontaneous and affectionate welcome throughout their tour. This visit of Their Majesties has, indeed, been a great landmark in the history of Indo-Nepal friendship.

While in New Delhi, His Majesties had friendly and informal exchange of views with the President and the Prime Minister on matters of interest and concern to India and Nepal. His Majesty and the Prime Minister also reviewed the prevailing international situation. These discussions were marked by complete understanding and identity of views between the two countries,

NON-ALIGNMENT

His Majesty and the Prime Minister reaffirmed their faith in the policies and principles of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence and also restated that the principle of self-determination can apply only to dependent and Trust Territories and Cannot be extended to integral parts of sovereign States. They agreed that these policies have contributed to the preservation of peace in the world and have promoted the concept of equality among sovereign States, big or small. His Majesty and the Prime Minister reiterated their belief in the peaceful settlement of all problems without resort to the use or threat of force.

INDO-PAK DIFFERENCES

The Prime Minister gave a resume of events leading to the armed conflict which started, as recognised in the reports of the Secretary-General to the Security Council with the massive infiltration of trained and armed Pakistani personnel in Kashmir on August 5, 1965, and subsequently. His Majesty and the Prime Minister agreed that Indo-Pakistan differences should be resolved between India and Pakistan in a peaceful manner without interference from third parties.

INDO-NEPAL RELATIONS

His Majesty and the Prime Minister reviewed Indo-Nepal relations which are based on close bonds of history, geography and culture and a community of views and interests between the two countries. They expressed satisfaction at the continuing growth of co-operation and partnership in diverse fields of activity to the mutual benefit of both countries. The Prime Minister expressed his gratification that Nepal had successfully completed its Second Plan of Economic Development and launched the Third Five Year Plan and indicated India's continuing assistance and cooperation in the implementation of the Plan. His Majesty expressed satisfaction at the rate of progress on India-aided projects now under construction in Nepal.

The President and the Prime Minister welcomed the opportunity provided by the visit of Their Majesties for renewal of personal contacts which they value. To further promote these contacts at the highest level and friendly exchange of views in future His Majesty extended an invitation to the President of India to visit Nepal at any convenient time. The President thankfully accepted the invitation. The date of the visit to Nepal by the President would be decided according to the convenience of both the sides.

370

NEPAL INDIA USA PAKISTAN **Date :** Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Ministers Statement in Parliament on Tashkent Talks

The Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following statement in Parliament on December 10, 1965 on the proposed talks in Tashkent:

On September 18, I received a communication from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Kosygin, proposing a meeting in Tashkent between President Ayub Khan and myself under the good offices of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, if the parties so desired, for the re-establishment of peace between India and Pakistan. I sent a reply on September 22 to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR in which I agreed to his proposal for a meeting between President Ayub Khan and myself in Tashkent, to discuss the question of restoration of peaceful relations between India and Pakistan. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR had sent a similar communication to President Ayub Khan. As could be gathered from President Ayub Khan's communication to Mr. Kosygin, a summary of which was later published in the Soviet press, the Pakistan President thanked the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for his proposal and made reservations to the effect that the talks could only be held after the ground had been prepared and that this could be done first in the Security Council. I informed the House on 22nd September of Mr. Kosygin's proposal and our acceptance of it.

On November 16, I was informed by Mr. Kosygin that he had received a communication from the Pakistan Foreign Minister on behalf of the President of Pakistan, urging that talks between President Ayub and myself should take place in Tashkent as proposed by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, of the USSR. The Chairman asked for my views on the proposed meeting and as I stated, in the House on November 16, I did not say to the proposal. At the same time, I made it clear that so far as the Kashmir question was concerned, it was not Possible for us to deviate from the position that Kashmir was a part of India and that there was no question of parting with our territories.

Following upon this, there were informal consultations in Moscow between our Ambassador and the Soviet Government and I was also met by the Soviet Ambassador. I received a communication on November 27 from Mr. Kosygin in which I was informed that the Pakistan President was prepared to have the proposed talks in Tashkent without any preconditions, Certain tentative suegestions were communicated to me about the date of the meeting. I replied to Mr. Kosygin agreeing to a meeting in the first week of January 1966, and it has since been announced that this meeting will commence on January 4, 1966.

We on our part have agreed to the Tashkent

meeting as we believe in establishing peaceful and good neighbourly relations through discussions. I have made it clear that our discussions in Tashkent should cover the totality of relations between India and Pakistan so that the two countries can live on the basis of enduring peace and mutual cooperation.

The facts of history and geography make it imperative that India and Pakistan should have harmonious and mutually cooperative relations. We have always believed that war and military conflict cannot provide a real solution to any problem between nations. If Pakistan has agreed to these talks with a genuine realisation that peace is preferable to conflict, the coming meeting at Tashkent may be worthwhile.

I would like, Sir, to take this opportunity also to make a brief report to the House about the present situation on our borders and to inform the House about certain visits abroad which I am scheduled to undertake during the coming weeks.

A situation of uneasy truce still continues on our western borders with Pakistan and, despite a ceasefire agreement, Pakistan is committing violations at different places at different times. Our armed forces have been dealing with this situation with considerable restraint, though naturally they have defended their positions.

In Rajasthan sector, as the House is aware Pakistan has occupied certain isolated posts subsequent to the ceasefire being effective in complete disregard of the agreement which she had accented. This situation could not possibly be countenanced. Accordingly, action has been taken to rectify the situation, and some progress has been made.

The Chinese also have stepped up their activities on our frontiers. They have attempted intrusions at a number of Places. What their real objectives are, it is difficult to say. It is apparent, however, that they want to maintain an atmosphere of tension all the time and to keep up their Pressure.

Altogether, the situation on our frontiers is such as to call for continuous, vigilance and the

371

country must remain on guard against the collusive activities of Pakistan and China. Our armed forces are alert and vigilant. We must remember, however, that the situation that we face will not he short-lived.

I would like to inform the House that in the coming weeks I propose to visit the United States of America and the Union of Burma, at the invitation of the Governments of these two friendly countries. I am looking forward to meeting President Johnson and the friendly American people. Between India and the United States of America, there are many things in common. I am confident that my forthcoming talks with President Johnson, which are scheduled to commence tin February 1, 1966, would lead to a closer understanding between our two countries and to a better appreciation of each other's point of view. I should like to express my sincere thanks to President Johnson whose decision in regard to accelerated food aid would help substantially in tiding over the present difficult food situation.

The House would recall that, some months ago, we were honoured by the visit of General Ne Win, President of the Union of Burma. At that time, the President had very kindly invited me to visit Burma and, ever since then, I have been looking forward to visiting this friendly neighbour of ours. I am very glad, therefore, that I would now have the opportunity of doing so very shortly. I shall leave for Burma on the morning of Monday, December 20, and will return to India on the morning of Thursday, December 23.

Important tasks lie ahead, and I have no doubt that I shall carry with me the good wishes of all the Honourable Members of this august House. To the people of the countries that I visit, I shall convey the warm good wishes of the people of India. It is our duty and our responsibility to explain our attitudes and our policies to the peoples of the world in an endeavour to gain their understanding. I think it is necessary for us to reiterate that India stands firmly for peace and for international amity. We seek friendship with all, more especially with our neighbours. We want to devote our energies to the vital task of developing our economy and improving the living standards of our people. The monies that we spend today on defence, we would much rather

spend on fighting poverty, were it not for the serious threat to our territorial integrity all along our frontiers. The problems that will arise will be challenging, and these, I need hardly tell the House, will be attended to with every caution and care.

PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA RUSSIA CHINA BURMA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Dec 01, 1965

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Indo-UAR Trade Agreement Signed

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on December 11, 1965 regarding the Trade Arrangement between India and U.A.R. for 1965-1966, between H.E. Mr. Mahmoud Sidky Mourad, Under Secretary of State of the U.A.R. Ministry of Economy and leader of the U.A.R. trade delegation, and Shri B. G. Rau, Additional Secretary of the Ministry of Commerce and leader of the Indian delegation.

The following Press Communique was issued on the talks between the two delegations :

A trade delegation from the United Arab Republic, led by H.E. Mr. Mahmoud Sidky Mourad, Under Secretary of State, Ministry of Economy, U.A.R., and consisting of six other members, visited India from December 2 to December 11, 1965. The visit was in pursuance of the understanding reached between the two countries when an Indian delegation visited U.A.R. in June, 1965. The delegation had frank and friendly discussions with an Indian delegation led by Shri B. G. Rau, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce.

The U.A.R. delegation also called on the Minister of Commerce, Shri Manubhai Shah, and the

Minister of Petroleum & Chemicals, Shri Humayun Kabir. The delegation also visited Agra and the industrial units in and around Delhi.

The two delegations, during their talks, reviewed the present trade exchanges between the two countries and an understanding was reached to increase the level of trade further. The trade between the two countries during 1965-66 is likely to be in the order of Rs. 50 crores. While UAR will be selling to India increased quantities of cotton, rice, in spite of unfavourable rice crop this year, and rock phosphate. Indian exports to U.A.R. of tea, jute goods and iron and steel products as well as engineering and chemical items will go up substantially in the current year.

372

Foreign Affairs Record

VOLUME XI 1965

I N D E X

AFGHANISTAN

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Dr. Mohammad Yusuf Afghan Prime Minister's Reply Indo-Afghan Joint Communique		18	17 9
Indo-Afghan Cultural Agreement Ratified			20
ALGERIA			
Prime Minister Boumedienne's Message to President Radhakrishnan Prime Minister's Message to Mr Boumedienne	141	141	
ANGLO-AMERICAN CONSORTIUM			
Agreement on Fifth Steel Plant Signed			1
ARABLEAGUE			
India's Diplomatic Recognition: Letters Exchanged	141		
ARAB LEAGUE SUMMIT			
Prime Minister's Message		183	

BURMA

President's Speech at Dinner in Honour of General Ne Win Reply by General Ne Will Joint Communique on General Ne Will Visit 2 Shastri-Ne Will Joint Communique CANADA	20 2	1 357
Prime Minister's State Visit to Canada . Prime Minister's Speech at McGill University Joint Communique Indo-Canadian Money Order Agreement Signed	114 116	113
COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS CONFERENCE	5'	
Final Communique Commonwealth Mission on Vietnam:	118	
Statement of Guidance	124	
Agreed Memorandum on Common- wealth Foundation	124	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		
Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner" in honour of Mr. Lenart Czechoslovak Prime Minister's Reply Indo-Czech joint Communique Indo-Czech Agreements on New Project Signed	43 46	44 44
Indo-Czech Cultural Exchange Plan Joint Communique on President's State Visit 20	63	142
DENMARK		
Agreement on Tonnage Certificates of Ships signed	23	
ETHIOPIA President Radhakrishnan's State Visit President's Speech at the Haile Selassie University President's Speech at his Banquet to the Emperor Joint Communique	265 267 267	264

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Credit Agreement Signed

FINLAND

President's speech at Dinner in honour of Dr. Kekkonen Reply by Dr. Kekkonen President Kekkonen's speech at Dinner in honour of President Radhakrishnan Reply by President Radhakrishnan Indo-Finnish Joint Communique	24 25 26 27 28
FRANCE	
Prime Minister's speech at Dinner in honour of M. Pompidou French Prime Minister's Reply President's speech at Luncheon in Honour of the French Prime Minister Reply by the French Prime Minister Joint Communique on French Prime Minister's Visit	29 30 30 31
32 Freach Prime Ministers Farewell Message	33

INDIA USA AFGHANISTAN ALGERIA BURMA CANADA VIETNAM NORWAY SLOVAKIA DENMARK ETHIOPIA GERMANY FINLAND FRANCE

359

Date : Dec 01, 1965