1966

January

Volume No
1995
Content
Foreign Affairs Record1966Vol. XIIJANUARYNo. 1
CONTENTS PAGE HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS
President's Republic Day Message 1 Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation on Republic Day 2
PAKISTAN
Indo-Pakistan Agreement on Withdrawal of Troops 4
POLAND
Protocol under Indo-Polish Shipping Treaty 7
TASHKENT SUMMIT
Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Speech at the OpeningSession7Tashkent Declaration9Sardar Swaran Singh's Broadcast to the Nation on TashkentDeclaration10
TANZANIA
First India-Tanzania Trade Agreement12India-Tanzania Friendship Agreement13
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

New Five-Year Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Fertilizer Loan Agreement

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PAKISTAN POLAND UZBEKISTAN TANZANIA INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Republic Day Message

The President Dr. Radhakrishnan, broadcast on January 25, 1966 the following message to the nation and to the Indian nationals abroad on the eve of the seventeenth Republic Day (Jan. 26):

Friends,

I am glad to have this opportunity, on the eve of the seventeenth Republic Day, to say a few words to our nationals at home and abroad.

The year just passed has been a difficult one. Only a fortnight ago, we lost Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, whose name will be remembered in our history. Men live in people's minds not for the wealth they amass, or the power they wield, or the positions they occupy. All these are ephemeral. Even memories of heroic deeds and stirring events fade away. What endures is the moral example we leave behind. Lal Bahadur was a treat servant of the Indian people and was dedicated to peace and progress. In the unfortunate armed conflict with Pakistan he did not shrink from the use of force in the cause of just self13

16

defence. Our fighting forces enhanced their prestige and honour by their many deeds of daring and skill, courage and sacrifice. It is a tragedy that in the lives of nations, as of men, 'we are obliged to use force and indulge in wars sometimes, before we settle down to ways of peace.

TASHKENT DECLARATION

Thanks to the good offices of the Soviet Union and its Prime Minister, Mr. Kosygin, the President of Pakistan and our Prime Minister went to Tashkent to discuss and compose their mutual differences, wherever possible. In these difficult negotiations Lal Bahadur showed unruffled calm and single-minded devotion to peace. In the Tashkent Declaration the two Governments have declared their intent to discuss all their problems in an atmosphere of peace and goodwill. No one will claim that the declaration is a perfect document. It has in it elements of give and take, compromise and conciliation. But the principles of renunciation of force for settling our disputes, the observance of the cease-fire line and noninterference in the internal affairs of each other, if faithfully carried out. will create a friendly atmosphere and help us to live as good neighbours.

Though the ending of all wars would give us cause for rejoicing, still so long as envy, bitterness, fear and national passions remain in the hearts of men, that goal will be distant. The Tashkent Declaration is a major step onward on the difficult road to peace. It kindles hope for a new start in our relations with Pakistan. Let us approach our task with humility. Small nations are not innocent nor are big nations incapable of mistakes.

STRENGTH OF DEMOCRACY

It is an indication of the strength of our democracy that in June 1964 we effected the transition smoothly from Nehru to Shastri. Last week we elected with speed, dignity and orderliness a successor to Shastri. The election was a contested one and its conduct proved a victory for sheer decency in public life. The two candidates were free from traces of bitterness or rancour. They both love the country and the ideals we cherish and our people will stand together as one in facing the tremendous tasks that await us. It is our hope that the new Government, headed by one who was brought up in an environment of exalted idea --- will carry on the torch of freedom and dem---and ---ght social, economic and political injustice, with courage, integrity and compassion. The Government should attend immediately to the food problem among others.

APPETITE FOR POWER

The world has suffered not so much from our love of wealth or possessions as from the appetite for power. To regulate human activities, to protect mutual rights and enlarge opportunities for human fulfilment, the political arrangement of representative democracy was devised. To be successful, it requires responsible leaders who will strive with vision and imagination to preserve the freedom which has been won by the courage and sacrifice of thousands of devoted men and women and not let it be lost by the selfish indifference or interference of a few, Our leaders should

1

lead the people instead of being led by them. We must educate them not to conform to the moods of the moment or the passions of the hour. We must train them to appreciate the preciousness as well as the precariousness of the democratic freedoms we possess.

Our democracy detests the enslavement of the soul. The human being should not be crushed by the Organisation, power should not be wielded by a small group, policy should not dictate hatred of others, and the intimate emotional life of men should not be transformed into the life of the robots.

We love our country because we love truth and justice. It is not a question of my country right or wrong. It is a question of making our country measure up to the finest image we have of her.

Our society demands our loyalty and devotion since it povides us with certain liberties and helps us to realise the supreme ends of life, the four purusarthas, dharma, artha, kama and moksa. To achieve these objects. to produce free creative personalities. we have to put an end to starvation, malnutrition. epidemics, illiteracy, social inequalities and industrial backwardness. Nothing is so important to man as man. The results of our democracy should be seen in our villages, farms and factories. schools and hospitals. The day cannot now be far off when democracies the world over will give the highest priority to education. health. housing and care for the young, the old and the helpless.

Even if we improve the conditions of life, we cannot neglect the inner life of man. Man himself has to be changed. His chief enemy is his own unruly nature, the dark pent-up forces in him. We have been developing desires and starving purposes. Love, which is the heart's compassion, is becoming rave in this world. It must Prow wider in extent and deeper in perception.

PEACE WITHIN AND WITHOUT

Peace is in the hearts of all men of goodwill. We need peace within and without to solve our problems. If the values of civilisation are to endure, we must come to terms with our close neighbours and work for world fellowship.

The grave emotional concern of thinking men today is over the present state of the world. If deep uneasiness disturbs us when we look out on the world, it only shows that a great change must come. We are trembling on its verge. Whether it is a leap forward to unmeasured prosperity or a Plunge backward to barbarism, depends on us, on what we make of the spectacular achievements of science and technology. We have enough material explosives which can put an end to life on earth.

Let us work for just and peaceful settlements, wherever possible, and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as an essential preliminary for. complete disarmament. That way lies sanity.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation on Republic Day

In a broadcast to the nation on the Republic Day, January, 26, 1966. The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, said:

Thirty-six years ago, on this very day, my voice was one of thousands repeating the historic and soul-stirring words of our pledge of independence.

In 1947 that pledge was fulfilled. The world knew that a new progressive force, based on democracy and secularism, had emerged. In the seventeen years that Jawaharlal Nehru was Prime Minister, the unity of this, country with its diversity of religion, community and language became a reality, democracy was born and grew roots. We took the lint steps towards securing a better life for our people by planned economic development. India's voice was always raised in the cause of the liberation of oppressed peoples, bringing hope and courage to many. It was heard beyond her frontiers as the voice of peace and reason, promoting friendship and harmony amongst nations.

During his brief but memorable stewardship, Shastriji enriched the Indian tradition in his own way. He has left our country united and determined to pursue our national objectives. Only yesterday we committed his mortal remains to the sacred rivers. The entire country sorrowed for the great loss. I feel his absence intensely and personally, for I worked closely with him for many years.

My own approach to the vast problems which confront us is one of humility. no tradition left by Gandhiji and my father, and my own unbounded faith in the people of India give me strength and confidence. Time and again India has given evidence of an indomitable spirit. In , recent years, as in the past, she has shown unmistakable courage and capacity for meeting new challenges. There is a firm base of Indianness which will withstand any trial.

NUMEROUS PROBLEMS

The coming months bristle with difficulties. We have numerous problems requiring urgent action. The rains have failed us. There has been drought in many parts. As a result, agricultural production, which is still precariously dependent on weather and rainfall, has suffered a sharp decline. Economic aid from abroad and earnings from export have not come to us in the measure expected. The lack of foreign exchange has hurt industrial production. Let us not be dismayed or discouraged by these unforeseen difficulties. Let us face them boldly, Let us learn from our mistakes and resolve not to let them recur. I hope to talk to you from time to time to explain the measures we take and to seek your support for them.

Above all else we must ensure food to our people in this year of scarcity. This is the first duty of government. We shall give urgent attention to the management and equitable distribution of foodgrains, both imported and procured at home. We expect full co-operation from State Governments and all sections of the people in implementing our plans for rationing, procurement and distribution. Areas like Kerala which are experiencing acute shortage will receive particular attention. We shall try especially to meet the nutritional needs of mothers and children in the scarcity affected areas to prevent permanent damage. We cannot afford to take risks where basic food is concerned. We propose, therefore, to import large enough quantity of foodgrains to bridge this gap. We are grateful to the United States for her sympathetic understanding and prompt help.

MORE PRODUCTION

Only greater production will solve our food problem. We have now a well-thought out plan to reach water and chemical fertilisers and new high-yielding varieties of seed as, well as technical advice and credit to farmers. No where is selfreliance more urgent than in agriculture and it means higher production not only for meeting the domestic needs of a large and increasing population, but also for growing more for exports. We have to devise more dynamic ways of drawing upon the time and energy of our rural people and engaging them in tasks of construction. We must breathe new life into the rural works programme and see that the income of the rural labourer is increased.

BASIC INDUSTRIES

Our strategy of economic advance assigns a prominent role in the public sector for the rapid expansion of basic industries, power and transport. In our circumstances, this is not only desirable but necessary. It also imposes an obligation to intiate, to construct and manage public sector enterprises for further investments. Within the framework of our plans, there is no conflict between the public and private sectors. In our mixed economy, private enterprise has flourished and has received help and support from government. We shall continue to encourage and assist it.

SELF-RELIANCE

Recent events have compelled us to explore the fullest possibilities of technological sellreliance : how to replace, from domestic sources, the materials we import, the engineering services we purchase, and the know-how we acquire from abroad. Our progress is linked with our ability to invent, improvise, adapt and conserve, We have a reservoir of talented scientists, engineers and technicians. We must make better use of them. Given the opportunity, our scientists and engineers have demonstrated their capacity to achieve outstanding results. There is the shining example of Dr. Homi Bhabha and the achievements of the Atomic Energy Establishment. The path shown by Dr. Bhabha will remain an inspiration.

Our programmes of economic and social development are encompassed in our Plans. The Third Five Year Plan is drawing to a close. We are on the threshold of the fourth. The size and content of the Fourth Plan received general endorsement of the National Development Council last September even while we were preoccupied with the defence of our country. Its detailed formulation was interrupted due to many uncertainties, including that of foreign aid. We propose now to expedite this work. In the meantime an annual plan has been drawn up for 1966-67, the first year of the Fourth Plan. This takes into account the main elements of the Five Year Plan.

GAP BETWEEN INTENTION AND ACTION

In economic development, as in other fields of national activity, there is a disconcerting gap between intention and action. To bridge this gap we should boldly adopt whatever far-reaching changes in administration may be found necessary. We must introduce new organizational patterns and modern tools and techniques of management and administration. We shall instil into governmental machinery greater efficiency and a sense of urgency and make it more responsive to the needs of the people.

POLICY OF PEACE

In keeping with our heritage, we have followed a policy of peace and friendship with all nations,

3

yet reserved to ourselves the right to independent opinion. The principles which have guided our foreign policy are in keeping with the best traditions of our country, and is wholly consistent with our national interest, honour and dignity. They continue to remain valid, During my travels abroad I have had the privilege of meeting leaders in government and outside and have always found friendship and an appreciation of our stand. The fundamental principles laid down by my farther, to which he and Shastriji dedicated their lives, will continue to guide us. It will be my sincere endeavour to work for the strengthening of peace and international cooperation so that people in all lands live in equality, free from domination and fear.

TASHKENT DECLARATION

We seek to maintain the friendliest relations with our neighbours and to resolve any disputes peacefully. The Tashkent Declaration is an expression of these sentiments. We shall fully implement it, in letter and spirit.

Peace is our aim but I am keenly aware of

the responsibility of government to preserve the freedom and territorial integrity of the country. We must therefore be alert and keep constant vigil, strengthening our defences as necessary. The valour, the determination, the courage and sacrifice of our fighting forces have set a shining example. My thoughts go out today to the disabled and the families of those who gave their lives.

WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Peace we want because there is another war to fight-the war against poverty, disease and ignorance. We have promises to keep to our people of work, food, clothing and shelter, health and education. The weaker and underprivileged sections of our people-all those who require special measures of social security, have always been and will remain uppermost in my mind.

Youth must have greater opportunity. The young people of India must recognise that they will get from their country tomorrow what they give her today, The nation expects them to aspire and to excel. The worlds of sicence and art, of thought and action beckon to them. There are new frontiers to cross, new horizons to reach and now goals to achieve.

ONE NATION

No matter what our religion, language or State, we arc one nation and one people. Let us all, farmers and workers, teachers and students and scientists and technologists, industrialists, businessmen, politicians and public servants, put forth our best effort. Let us be strong, tolerant and disciplined, for tolerance and discipline are the very foundations of democracy. The dynamic and progresssive society, the just social order which we wish to create, can be achieved only with unity of purpose and through hard work and cooperation.

Today I pledge myself anew to the ideals of the builders of our nation-to democracy and secularism, to planned economic and social advance, to peace and friendship among nations.

Citizens of India, let us revive our faith in the future. Let us affirm our ability to shape our

destiny. We are comrades in a mighty adventure. Let us be worthy of it and of our great country.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UZBEKISTAN **Date :** Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Indo-Pakistan Agreement on Withdrawal of Troops

The agreement signed in New Delhi on January 22, 1966 between the Chief of Army Staff, India, and the Commander-in-Chief, Pakistan Army, for disengagement and withdrawal of troops provides for the disengagement of troops within five days, the dismantlement of defences in occupied territory in 21 days thereafter and the complete withdrawal of troops by 25 February, 1966, as provided for in the Tashkent Declaration.

The disengagement in the plains areas, generally, will be by withdrawal by either side to a distance of 1000 yards from the line of actual control. In hill areas the two sides will keep to the features in their possession, except where they are considered too close. In such cases mutually

4 agreed withdrawal will be arranged by local commanders.

Apart from providing for dismantling of defence works the agreement provides for continuing of existing restrictions on flights of aircraft and disallows firing of weapons or explosives within 10,000 metres of the line of actual control, The good offices of UNMOGIP and UNIPOM will be utilised in achieving the disengagement and dismantling of defences. While withdrawals will be completed by 25th February, 1966, everywhere, earlier sector-wise withdrawal is envisaged wherever dismantling of defences has been completed. On completion of withdrawals the Ground Rules 1961 will again become operative.

The agreement provides for meeting of Sector Commanders and further meetings between the Chief of Army Staff, India, and the Commanderin-Chief, Pakistan Army, to resolve any points of dispute and for the use of the good offices of Maj.-Gen. Marambio, in case of need.

The agreement further provides for meeting of local commanders in the Eastern sector to reduce tension by arranged withdrawals, as considered necessary. It also lays down that Border Security Forces of either side will not open fire across the border, and where an incident of firing takes place it will be investigated jointly by representatives of the two countries, Liaison will be maintained between the commanders as provided for in the Indo-East Pakistan Border Ground Rules, and quarterly meetings will be held to assess the working of the agreement in practice.

The following is the Aft of the Agreement:

INTRODUCTION

This agreement is in four parts :

Part I - Procedure concerning the immediate disengagement of troops and reduction of tension;

- Part II Procedure concerning the withdrawal of troops from the occupied areas;
- Part III Procedure concerning reduction of tension in the Eastern Sector;

Part IV - General Points.

PART I

DISENGAGEMENT OF TROOPS AND REDUCTION OF TENSION

PHASE I

Both forces will withdraw 1,000 yards from the line of actual control in sectors as specified below :-

- (a) RAJASTHAN/SIND
- (b) AMRITSAR/LAHORE
- (c) JAMMU/SIALKOT
- (d) AKHNUR/CHHAMB (from River CHENAB NW 8061 to MAWA WALI KHAD NW 7770).

In all other sectors including sectors divided by the 1949 Cease Wire Line, troops will continue to hold their respective picquets as by so doing they will be automatically separated from each other. The only exception to this will be where, in hilly terrain, opposing forces are at present considered to be too close to each other, each side will withdraw to a distance to be mutually agreed upon by the local commanders not below the rank of Brigadier.

[NOTE-- In the Amritsar-Lahore sector, this 1000 yards withdrawal will be modified so that Pakistani troops who are actually on the West bank of the BRB Canal and Indian troops who are on the East bank of the BRB Canal facing each other will withdraw all armed personnel off the embankment to a distance of 200 yards on each side. Unarmed personnel may, however, live, move and work in this area.

The same principle will apply in Sulaimanki-Fazilka Sector, Hussainiwala Sector and Khem Karan Sector.]

After the withdrawal in this phase no new defences of any kind will be prepared in occupied territory.

There will be no movement of armed military, paramilitary or police personnel either armed or unarmed within-the demilitarised zone and no civilian personnel will be permitted within it by either side.

The period for completion of this phase will be five days.

PHASE II

In this phase both sides will remove and nullify all defences which will include the--

- (a) lifting of mines; and
- (b) dismantling of all other defence works, less permanent defence structures constructed of steel and cement.

The period for completing this phase will be twenty-one days which will commence immediately after the five-day period mentioned in para 5.

Working Parties for this purpose will be found by unarmed military personnel in uniform. No civilian or civil labour will be used for these tasks.

5

While every effort will be made to dismantle all defence works Within the specified period, where owing to weather and other conditions it is not possible to complete this, the uncleared areas so left will be clearly marked and a sketch of these given to the other side.

There will be no firing of weapons or use of explosives within 10,000 metres of the line of actual control. Where explosives have to be used to dismantle defence works, this will only be done under supervision as specified later and after due intimation to the other side.

The present agreement affecting restriction on flights of aircraft will continue to apply.

To ensure that the action agreed to in PART I above is being implemented in letter and in spirit, the good offices of UNMOGIP and UNIPOM will be utilised, in the event of a disagreement. their decision will be final and binding to both sides.

PART II

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM OCCUPIED AREAS

After the dismantling of defences has taken place, all troops, paramilitary forces and armed police who are now on the other side of the international border and Cease Fire Line, will be withdrawn. This withdrawal will be completed by 25 February 1966. If in any particular sector or part of a sector, the dismantling of defences has been completed earlier than the last date specified, withdrawal may be sectorwise if mutually agreed to.

During this withdrawal, there will be no follow up by civilians, armed military, paramilitary or police personnel until 25 February 1966. Only unarmed military personnel at a strength mutu ally agreed upon at the sector level may move into these unoccupied areas for normal police duties (see paragraph 16 below).

After troops of both sides have crossed into their own territory, the procedure which was being followed by Pakistan and India before 5 August 1965, for the security of the internationalborder and the Cease Fire Line, will apply. Attention is drawn to Ground Rules 1961 for West Pakistan/Punjab, Rajasthan and Gujarat (India).

It is essential that under all circumstances troops must move out of occupied areas by 25 February 1966, even if the dismantling of defence and lifting of mines have not been completed.

For immediate settlement of any points of dispute that may arise, sector commanders not below the rank of Major General will be designated by name and appointment both by India and Pakistan who will meet to settle the differences. Telephone or R/T communication will be established between these designated sector commanders and will be permanently manned.

Any matter on which there is disagreement will be referred to the C-in-C, Pakistan Army, and COAS, India, for their joint decision. If the issue is still not resolved by them the good offices of Major General T. Marambio will be utilised and his decision will be final and binding on both sides.

PART III

REDUCTION OF TENSION IN THE EASTERN SECTOR

The limit of withdrawal in the Eastern Sector will be left to local commander, not below the rank of Major General to mutually decide where necessary, in consultation with the civil authorities concerned. Both sides will arrive at a working agreement, as soon as possible.

Border Security Forces consisting of armed paramilitary units, police or any other irregular forces of both sides will not open fire across the border under any circumstances.

Any encroachments across the border will be dealt with through apprehension of personnel concerned and thereafter handing them over to civil authorities.

In any case where firing takes place across the border it will be investigated on the spot by a joint team consisting of border personnel from both sides within 24 hours of occurrence. Brigade Commanders/DIsG responsible for this investigation will be designated by name and appointment sectorwise for West Bengal, Assam and Tripura by India and for the adjoining areas of East Pakistan by Pakistan.

Liaison between commanders and telephone communications at various levels will be established as given in paras 12 and 13 of the Ground Rules for Indo-East Pakistan border.

To ensure that the above agreement is fully implemented, quarterly meetings will take place between Army and Police authorities of India and Pakistan, alternately in India and Pakistan, to assess the extent to which the agreement is working in practice.

These are a supplement to the Ground Rules formulated by the Military Sub-Committee of the Indian and Pakistani delegations on 20 October 1959.

PART IV

GENERAL POINTS

In order to resolve any problems that may arise in the implementation of this agreement and to further maintain friendly relations between the two countries, the C-in-C Pakistan and the COAS

6

India will meet from time to time. The meetings will be held alternately in India and Pakistan and will be initiated by the respective Governments concerned.

Ground rules to implement this withdrawal agreement in the Western Sector will be formulated by Lt. General Bakhtiar Rana-Pakistan, and Lt. General Harbaksh Singh-India, under the Chairmanship of Major General T. Marambio as early as possible.

This agreement comes into effect as from 0600 hours IST/0630 hours WPT 25 January 1966.

PAKISTAN INDIA UZBEKISTAN USA LATVIA

Date : Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Protocol under Indo-Polish Shipping Treaty

A protocol under the Indo-Polish Shipping Treaty of 1960 on shipping service between Poland and India was signed in New Delhi on January 28, 1966 by the delegations of the two countries headed respectively by Mr. H. Burau, Managing Director of the Polish Ocean Lines, Gydnia, and Dr. Nagendra Singh, Secretary and Director-General of Shipping, Ministry of Transport.

The signing followed a review held in a cordial and friendly atmosphere on January 27 and 28. The review takes place annually when meetings are held alternatively in India and Poland, and this was the 5th annual meeting of the Indo-Polish Shipping Service. The representatives of the three Indian Shipping Lines participating in the shipping service between India and Poland namely, Scindia Steam Navigation Company, Shipping, Corporation of India Limited and India Shipping Company also took part in the discussions. The protocol reiterates the desire of both the Polish and Indian shipping interests to strengthen the Indo-Polish shipping service to the mutual benefit of the two countries and also to contribute jointly to the promotion of international cooperation in shipping.

POLAND INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TASHKENT SUMMIT

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Speech at the Opening Session

The Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and President Ayub Khan of Pakistan met at Tashkent (USSR) from January 4 to January 10, 1966, and discussed the relations existing between the two countries.

Speaking at the opening session of the Tashkent Meeting on January 4, Prime Minister Shastri said :

First of all, I want to convey to you, Chairman Kosygin, the feelings of sincere appreciation with which my people, my Government and I hailed your bold initiative which has brought me and President Ayub Khan of Pakistan together in this historic Asian city. It is with great pleasure that I express on my behalf and on behalf of my delegation our gratitude for the hospitality which has been lavished upon us and the care and attention which has been bestowed upon us. The great welcome which the people of Tashkent gave us was indeed very moving.

7

POSITIVE RESPONSE

Our response to your invitation for a meeting in Tashkent was immediate and positive. The objective of peace which inspired you is indeed a noble one. Peace is vital for both India and Pakistan and indeed for the world as a whole. It should be our endeavour to try to open a new chapter in Indo-Pakistan relationship. I would not like to go into past history. I feel, and I am sure President Ayub Khan also feels, that the conflict which took place between our two countries was Most unfortunate. Our objective at this meeting should be not recrimination over the past, but a new look towards the future.

I know that there are many unresolved differences between our two countries. Even between countries with the best of relationship, there are differences and even disputes. The question which we have both to face is whether we should think of force as a method of solving them, or whether we should decide and declare that force will never be used. If other countries, even those with vast resources and much deeper differences, can avoid an armed conflict and live together on the basis of Peaceful co-existence, should not countries like India and Pakistan whose main problem is the economic betterment of their people, give up the idea of solving any problems by recourse to arms?

RESPECT FOR TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

The only justification for the use of force in international relations is to repel aggression. Our assurance to each other not to use force would mean, therefore, that each agrees to respect the territorial integrity of the other. We have always said, and I say it today also, that we unreservedly accept Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Equally, we have to preserve our own territorial integrity and sovereignty. Respect for each other's sovereignty is essential for peace and good relations.

Once this has been clearly accepted, the whole character of Indo-Pakistan relationship could be transformed to the benefit of the people of both countries. Let me say quite clearly and very sincerely that we wish Pakistan's progress and prosperity. We have ourselves been striving to better the lives of our people. We are convinced that prosperity would come sooner to the subcontinent, if there was better relationship between India and Pakistan.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

The foundation of such relationship should be, as I have said, the acceptance of the policy of peaceful co-existence. in pursuance of this, action will have to be taken on several fronts. For instance, the atmosphere of cold war has to be removed. If through propaganda, in the press or by radio, a feeling of animosity or distrust is generated and sustained between the two countries, whatever we, as Heads of the two Governments might say, there will always exist the danger of a conflict. Our aim should be to improve the totality of the relationship between the two countries. Our trade has been shrinking. It should grow instead. Many rivers flow between India and Pakistan. Instead of being a source of controversy, they could, through cooperative endeavour, enrich both our countries. There are many other areas of economic cooperation which, given goodwill and understanding, can be developed to our mutual advantage.

In saying all this, I am not trying to suggest that we could or should shut our eyes to the many points of difference that exist between the two countries.' I do not want to enumerate them. What I do say, however, is that all these problems must be resolved through talks and negotiations and not by resort to force. An armed conflict creates more problems than it solves. It is an impediment to understanding and agreement. On the other hand, in an atmosphere of peace, we can make real progress towards solving the differences between us.

RENUNCIATION OF FORCE

It would be a notable achievement if at this meeting which Chairman Kosygin has convened, an agreement could emerge for renouncing the use of force for settling our differences. This should pave the way for the kind of good neighbourly relations which both countries need and would also make the solution of many of our problems much easier. We could and should, of course, discuss other matters as well, but even if we differ on some of them and cannot see our way to an immediate agreement, we should still not forsake the path of peace.

NOT WAR BUT PEACE

A heavy responsibility lies on our shoulders, The sub-continent has a population of 600 million--one-fifth of the human race. If India and Pakistan have to progress and prosper, they must learn to live in peace. If there is constant conflict and hostility, our peoples would suffer even greater hardships. Instead of fighting each other, let us start fighting poverty, disease and ignorance. The problems, the hopes and the aspirations of the common people of both the countries are the same. They want no conflict and war, but peace and progress. They need, not arms and ammunition, but food, clothing and shelter. If we are to fulfil this obligation to our people, we should, in this meeting, try to achieve something specific and positive.

This is a momentous meeting. The eyes of the world are upon us. Let it not be said that the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister

8

of India met and failed to reach an agreement. Let us show by our actions that we are capable of seeing our own problems in the wider context of world events.

UZBEKISTAN INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TASHKENT SUMMIT

Tasked Declaration

The following is the text of the Declaration signed in Tasked on January 10, 1966 by the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan : The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan, having met at Tasked and having discussed the existing relations between India and Pakistan, hereby declare their firm resolve to restore normal and peaceful relations between their countries and to promote understanding and friendly relations between their peoples. They consider the attainment of these objectives of vital importance for the welfare of the 600 million people of India and Pakistan.

Ι

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agree that both sides will exert all efforts to create good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan in accordance with the United Nations Charter. They reaffirm their obligation under the Charter not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means. They considered that the interests of peace in their region and particularly in the Indo-Pakistan Sub-Continent and, indeed, the interests of the peoples of India and Pakistan were not served by the continuance of tension between the two countries. It was against this background that Jammu and Kashmir was discussed, and each of the sides set forth its respective position.

Π

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that all armed personnel of the two countries shall be withdrawn not later than 25 February, 1966 to the positions they held prior to 5 August 1965, and both sides- shall observe the cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line.

III

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that relations between India and Pakistan shall be based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other.

IV

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that both side will discourage any propaganda directed against the other country, and will encourage propaganda which promotes the development of friendly relations between the two countries.

V

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the High Commissioner of India to Pakistan and the High Commissioner of Pakistan to India will return to their posts and that the normal functioning of diplomatic missions of both countries will be restored. Both Governments shall observe the Vienna Convention of 1961 on Diplomatic Intercourse.

VI

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed to consider measures towards the restoration of economic and trade relations, communications, as well as cultural exchanges between India and Pakistan, and to take measures to implement the existing agreements between India and Pakistan.

VII

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that they give instructions to their respective authorities to carry out the repatriation of the prisoners of war.

VIII

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the sides will continue the discussion of questions relating to the problems of refugees and evictions/illegal immigrations. They also agreed that both sides will create conditions which will prevent the exodus of people. They further agreed to discuss the return of the property and assets taken over by either side in connection with the conflict.

IX

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the sides will continue meetings both at the highest and at other levels on matters of direct concern to both countries. Both sides have recognized the need to set up joint Indian-Pakistani bodies which will report to their Governments in order to decide what further steps should be taken. * * * *

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan record their feelings of deep appreciation and gratitude to the leaders of the Soviet

9

Union, the Soviet Government and personally to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. for their constructive, friendly and noble part in bringing about the present meeting which has resulted in mutually satisfactory results. They also express to the Government and friendly people of Uzbekistan their sincere thankfulness for their overwhelming reception and generous hospitality.

They invite the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. to witness this Declaration.

UZBEKISTAN INDIA PAKISTAN USA AUSTRIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TASHKENT SUMMIT

Sardar Swaran Singh's Broadcast to the Nation on Tasked Declaration

The following is the text of a radio broadcast given by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, on January 15, 1966 on the, Tashkent Declaration :

I speak to you as one who was privileged to be associated with our late Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in Tasked during his mission of peace. The week that we spent in Tashkent was unforgettable. They were days of meetings, negotiations and sincere efforts to reach understanding and meeting of minds. The Prime Minister and his colleagues worked as a team, determined to see the establishment of peace and goodwill between India and Pakistan. We were all proud to work under his inspiring leadership. After strenuous efforts in which Chairman Kosygin played a most notable good offices role, President Ayub Khan and Prime Minister Shastri were able to reach agreement on a declaration which was signed in Tasked on the 10th of January.

In the Tasked Declaration India and Pakistan have chosen to turn away from mutual conflict and have resolved to base their relations on peace, friendship and good neighbourliness.

REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENT

This in itself is a remarkable achievement which reverses the trends of the past 17 years and marks a new era in the relations between the two countries. The central point of the whole Declaration is the renunciation of force by both sides for the settlement of their disputes For many years in the past, India had emphasized the importance of a no-war declaration by both countries, to the effect that all differences and disputes between them should be settled peacefully without resort to arms. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached on such a declaration between India and Pakistan all these years. It is a tribute to the statesmanship and sincerity of purpose of the President of Pakistan and of Prime Minister Shastri that at last both countries have agreed not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means.

It has always been our view that is only in an atmosphere of freedom from tension and of goodwill created by such a declaration that both sides could reach solutions to the problems between them.

RENUNCIATION OF FORCE

Article I of the Tashkent Declaration seeks to embody the agreement regarding renunciation of force. The crucial sentence therein reads "they reaffrm their obligation under the Charter not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means". The greater part of the discussion in Tashkent centred round this basic question. Prime Minister Shastri made it clear that the main issue was whether or not the two countries wanted to settle their disputes peacefully. He insisted on a clear affirmation that there shall be no resort to force. The Pakistan position was that any declaration would be valueless unless there was a political settlement, or a self-executing machinery for the settlement of the Kashmir question was set up. Eventually, after a great deal of discussions there was agreement that the Declaration should specifically, mention agreement on non-use of force as a means of settling any disputes between the two countries. This has been done by a categorical reaffirmation of the, obligation which both countries have, as members of the United Nations, to refrain in their mutual relationship from the threat or use of force.

WITHDRAWAL OF ARMED PERSONNEL

Article II of the Declaration provides for the withdrawal of all armed personnel of the two countries not later than February 25, 1966 to the pre-August 5 positions, as required in UN Resolutions. Prime Minister Shastri gave he fullest consideration to all aspects of the question of withdrawals before agreeing to this clause. He very carefully examined his letter of September 14 to the U.N. Secretary-General in which he had stated "that when consequent upon the ceasefire becoming effective further details are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open to further infiltrations

10

or prevent us from dealing with infiltrations that have taken place". The late Mine Minister and the entire Indian delegation felt that the conditions laid down by the Prime Minister had been completely met by Pakistan's agreement not only to withdraw all armed personnel, but also to respect, after withdrawals, the cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line and the undertaking of noninterference in each other's internal affairs.

Prime Minister Shastri had made it clear, on more than one occasion, that if the question of Kashmir was raised by President Ayub, be would have to reiterate India's viewpoint and this is exactly what he did as Article I of the Declaration indicates. The important point is that though the viewpoints of both countries of Kashmir continue to be irreconcilable, both sides have nevertheless, agreed not to take recourse to arms over this or any other question.

JOINT INDO-PAKISTAN BODIES

There are provisions in the Declaration which refer to normalisation of relations and discussion of various other problems. It is hoped that for a consideration of these, joint Indo-Pakistani bodies will be constituted. Meetings at Ministerial and Heads, of Government level are also contemplated. All these are very salutary provisions. It is only in these ways that we can tackle the various outstanding problems between the two countries.

SPIRIT OF PEACE AND GOODWILL

More important than the words of the Declaration is the spirit underlying it. We are confident that the Tashkent Declaration, signed by the two Heads of Government and witnessed by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., embodies the spirit of peace and goodwill on which future relations between the two countries can be based to the lasting benefit of their peoples. It is our intention to implement the declaration faithfully. We already initiated the steps for the normalisation of relations between the two countries. Our High Commissioner to Pakistan is returning to his post. The Pakistan High Commissioner has already arrived in Delhi. The three Chiefs of Services from both countries are going to meet shortly. The direct contacts between Defence Chiefs will not only facilitate withdrawals, but also consider measures to ensure tranquillity on the Indo-Pakistan borders in the East and the West, as well as across the ceasefire line.

The Tashkent Declaration is a tribute to the vision and statesmanship of the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India. Equally, one cannot but recognise the tremendous contribution which was made by Mr. Kosygin who not only sponsored the idea of the Conference, but also, at all stages and particularly when difficulties arose, acted as a messenger of peace and helped to resolve all obstacles. He did not propose much less impose, any particular solutions. Yet without his good offices, the Tashkent Declaration could not have taken shape.

TASHKENT DECLARATION A TRIUMPH OF PEACE

The Tashkent Declaration is a declaration of peace and goodwill between India and Pakistan. It has been hailed all over the world as a great act of statesmanship and as a significant contribution to world peace. Dozens of messages of congratulations have been received from Heads of Government and States all over the world. The Tashkent Declaration implemented sincerely and earnestly, will make an immeasurable contribution to the happiness of millions of people in the sub-continent and to peace in Asia and the world. Both India and Pakistan can use their resources for economic development and for betterment of the standards of living of their peoples. The dangerous tensions which have characterised the relations between the two countries will be eliminated. Both countries will be able to conserve their resources for peaceful economic development. Their security will be strengthened by the assurance of peace flowing from the Declaration.

Virtual agreement on the text of the Tashkent Declaration was reached at midnight of the 9th January. The next day, Prime Minister Shastri felt greatly relaxed and entertained President Ayub at a quiet lunch a couple of hours before the Declaration was actually signed. No one who saw him that afternoon looking hale and hearty feeling obviously happy at the triumph of peace and goodwill, would have had any inkling of the impending tragedy.

The Tashkent Declaration is a monument to Prime Minister Shastri's wisdom, statesmanship and love of peace. This Declaration is his last gift to our nation. He wanted us to work for peace as steadfastly and courageously as we had fought to preserve our honour and integrity. It is up to us to live up to his expectations. All of us, in whatever walk of life and wherever we are, at the Centre or in the States, in towns or in villages, should dedicate ourselves to working for the basic objectives of peace and amity between India and Pakistan embodied in the Tashkent Declaration.

UZBEKISTAN INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI **Date :** Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TANZANIA

First India-Tanzania Trade Agreement

The first trade agreement between India and Tanzania was signed in New Delhi on January 28, 1966 by Mr. A. M. Babu, Minister for Commerce and Cooperatives of Tanzania, and Shri Manubhai Shah, India's Minister of Commerce.

The agreement envisages considerable increase in the trade between the two countries and increased cooperation in the economic field.

The following is the text of a Press communique issued on the talks between the Indian and the Tanzanian delegations :

At the invitation of the Government of India, a high-powered Trade and Economic Delegation led by H. E. Mr. A. M. Babu, Minister for Commerce and Cooperatives, United Republic of Tanzania, accompanied by the Assistant Commissioner and the Commercial/Marketing officer of Tanzanian Ministry of Commerce, the Chief Industrial Officer of the Ministry of Industries of Tanzania, a representative of the Zanzibar State Trading Corporation, the Vice-Chairman of the Tanganyika Coffee Board and other representatives of trade from Tanzania, arrived in Bombay on the morning of January 25, 1966. The delegation reached Delhi the same day in the evening after visiting a number of industries in Bombay.

The Tanzanian Delegation will also be visiting Calcutta, Madras, Bangalore and other places in India before their departure from Bombay on February 4, 1966.

The Indian Delegation was led by Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of Commerce, Government of India. The two delegations discussed common problems of trade and economic cooperation between Tanzania and India. Historically speaking, commercial, cultural and friendly ties between the two countries have existed from ancient times. A large number of Indians are settled in Tanzania and trade between the two countries has continued for centuries. While cashewnuts, cotton, oil seeds, oil nuts and oil kernels, dyeing and tanning extracts, synthetic tanning materials, vegetable fibres (except cotton and jute), crude animal materials inedible and cloves have been the major commodities of import by India, cotton piecegoods, jute manufactures, machinery (non-electrical), manufactures of metal, clothing, sugar and sugar preprarations and spices have been the major commodities of India's exports to Tanzania.

The annual trade between the two countries in recent years has been of the order of nearly Rs. 10 crores both ways on an average ((pond) 8 million sterling). The two delegations considered that an Agreement on Trade and Economic Cooperation should be entered into between the two countries. With this end in view, a Trade Agreement has been finalised by the two delegations which was concluded and signed this afternoon, by the Tanzanian Commerce and Cooperatives Minister, His Excellency Shri Abdulrahman Mohamed Babu and the Indian Minister of Commerce, 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 two years and will continue in force after that for two more years.

The Agreement aims at expanding and increasing the over-all flow of trade between the countries to a level of Rs. 16.6 crores ((pond) 12.25 million sterling) and increasing the items of export and import between the two countries.

The Trade Agreement provides that payments for purchase and sales by both sides will be convertible currencies. Both countries by mutual agreement could also make appropriate arrangements to expand mutually beneficial exchanges. For facilitating Indo-Tanzanian trade a provision exists for representatives of the two 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.

INDUSTRIAL AND JOINT VENTURES

The Government of India have agreed to assist in the establishment of an industrial estate in Tanzania and a team of experts has already been sent to Tanzania for initial investigations. The trading centre, costing about Rs. 5 lakhs, would form a part of this Industrial Estate and is being given as a gift by the Government of India to the Government of Tanzania.

In pursuance of the Agreement for mutual techno-economic cooperation, the Government of India will assist the Government of Tanzania in the preparation of techno-economic studies relating to various projects, which the Tanzania

12

Government would like to have established in their country. The financing of the approved projects will be possible under the credit of Rs. 2.5 crores already extended by the Government of India to the Government of Tanzania. Every effort will also be made to enlist the cooperation of Indian and Tanzanian industrialists in the setting tip of new industrial ventures in Tanzania. Already Indian industrialists have taken the initiative to examine the feasibility of setting up a textile mill hard board and chip board plant, soaps and detergents. The scope for the establishment of other industries like fertilizers, caustic soda, vegetable oil processing and solvent extraction plant, agricultural tools and implements and paper board is being explored.

The Government of India have decided that the National Industrial Development Corporation of the Government of India will act as the coordinating agency for all technical matters in respect of such assistance from India.

At the request of the Government of Tanzania

the Government of India have agreed to depute a number of specialists to assist in rationalising and modernising the cottage industries and also to provide certain equipments for this purpose.

As a result of these friendly negotiations and the far-reaching decisions arrived at between the two delegations, both the Governments are fully satisfied that the historical tics of friendship, commerce and economic cooperation existing between them will he further strengthened to the benefit of both. In the struggle of the developing countries for the expansion of their trade with the industrialised countries of the world and the diversification and industrialisation of their respective economies, the Governments of Tanzania and India will fully cooperate with each other to achieve their common objectives. Tanzania and India would continue to work in full harmony and cooperation at all the international forums on trade and economic cooperation.

TANZANIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TANZANIA

India-Tanzania Friendship Agreement

India and the United Republic of Tanzania signed in New Delhi on January 28, 1966 an agreement on friendship, scientific, economic and technical cooperation between the two countries.

The agreement was signed for India by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, and for the United Republic of Tanzania, by Rs Excellency Mr. A. M. Babu, Tanzania's Minister of Commerce and Cooperation.

The agreement envisages facilitating the ex-. change 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 the setting up of joint industrial ventures by India and Tanzania.

TANZANIA INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

New Five-Year Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement

The following is the text of the New Five-Year Trade Agreement signed in New Delhi on January 7, 1966 between India and the Soviet Union :

The New Five Year Trade Agreement between India and the Soviet Union which will double the existing trade between the two countries by 1970 was signed at New Delhi on January 7, 1966 by Mr. N. S. Patolichey, Minister of Foreign Trade of USSR on behalf of his country and Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of Commerce, on behalf of India.

The remarkable growth of trade and economic relations between India and USSR can be seen from the fact that in 1953 the total trade between India and USSR was less than Rs. 1 crore (Rupees 10 million) consisting of Rs. 4.5 million imports to India and Rs. 3.6 million exports from India. In 1958, with the conclusion of bilateral trade agreement and what is commonly

13

known as rupee trading, the total volume of trade rose to nearly Rs. 88 crores, consisting of Rs. 66 crores imports and Rs. 22 crores exports. The imports were financed through State-to-State credit in respect of public sector projects. In 1964, the total trade between the two countries reached a spectacular level of Rs. 150 crores both ways (Rs. 75 crores each way).

It is not only in regard to the volume of trade that there has been this remarkable increase: the pattern of imports and exports has also undergone considerable change and the imports in 1905 were composed of nearly 60% of raw materials and components and 40% of machinery and other equipment. This means considerable serving of these essential imports from other sources. The earlier imports were of about 30% raw materials and components and balance for machinery, equipment and other finished products. In the other direction, there has been a steady increase of the proportion of manufactured products from almost an insignificant proportion of their total exports to nearly 33% in relation to the exports. This shows that there has been active implementation of the principles enunciated in the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development and other forums about improving the industrial base and manufactured exports of developing countries. Thus Indo-USSR trade sets a very good example of relationship in international trade between industrialised Partners and developing countries.

So far as economic relations between India and USSR are concerned, the first economic agreement with Soviet Union was signed in February, 1955 for the erection of steel plant in Bhilai. The total financial assistance rendered by the Soviet Union during the second and third five-year plan periods amounted to Rs. 385 crores. These credits were granted at a low rate of interest and could be rapid through exports of goods within 12 years. The main complexes which have arisen by utilising all the credits are :

- (i) The Steel Plant at Bhilai
- (ii) Heavy Machine Building Plant at Ranchi
- (iii) Mining and Allied Machinery Plant at Durgapur
- (iv) Lignite Thermal Power Station at Neyveli

- (v) Heavy Electrical Plant at Hardwar
- (vi) Indian Drugs and Pharmaceutical Projects

In addition to this, USSR helped consideraly in oil exploration work and in setting up big refineries in India. The Bokaro Steel Plant is the latest of the giant enterprises which will be financed from Soviet credits.

The USSR Government have also given considerable help to India in technological training both by training our technicians in USSR and by sending their experts for training our technical staff in India.

Now a new mile-stone has been reached after the visit of our Prim Minister to USSR in May, 1965 when Mr. Kosygin and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri laid particular stress in their joint communique to the rapid growth of trade between the two countries and set as a target doubling of trade by 1970 over the 1964 level. A delegation from India visited USSR in August 1965 and the, work was followed up by the visit of a high level delegation under the leadership of Mr. Krotov, a senior official of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, who has been discussing with his opposite numbers in India many aspects of trade during the last one month.

Mr. N. S. Patolichev, Minister of Foreign Trade, Government of USSR, arrived in New Delhi on the 4th January, 1966 for finalising the long-term trade arrangements covering the years 1966 to 1970. The discussion were led on the Indian side by Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of Commerce. The first round of discussions in this connection was held in Moscow in August, 1965 when an Indian delegation led by Shri D. S. Joshi, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, visited Moscow. These discussions were continued when the Soviet delegation of experts led by Mr. I. I. Krotov, Chief of the main Import Department of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, USSR, arrived in New Delhi on the 29th November, 1965.

Letters were exchanged on the 7th January, 1966 extending the validity of the Trade Agreemeat of 1963 which was due to expire at the end of 1968. Up to the end of 1970, and detailed shopping lists for each of the years 1966 to 1970 for exports and imports from both countries were finalised and agreed upon. Simultaneously, with the exchange of these letters, a Protocol on the delivery of machinery and equipment from the Soviet Union during this period on long-term credit basis was also signed by the two Ministers.

It will be recalled that during the talks hold with the Prime Ministers of the two countries in Moscow in May, 1965, agreement was reached in principle that trade between the two countries during the period 1966-1970 should be expanded to double the level of what it was in 1964 and that such expansion should provide opportunities inter alia for setting up of industries in either country for meeting the requirements of the other country. The documents signed today are in implementation of this Agreement between the two Prime Ministers.

14

The following are the main features of the documents signed :

(i) The total volume of trade between the two countries in the five years of 1966 to 1970 will reach a total of imports and exports worth Rs. 1300 crores (Rs. 650 crores of exports and Rs. 650 crores worth imports) from the present volume of Rs. 500 crores (Rs. 250 crores worth exports and Rs. 250 crores worth imports) during the years 1961-1965.

(ii) The volume of trade between the two countries each way by 1970 will reach the level of Rs. 150 crores. This is double the level of trade each way in 1964 which stood at Rs. 75 crores. During the intervening period, the volume of trade each way is expected to rise steadily to about Rs. 110 crores in 1966, Rs. 120 crores in 1967, Rs 130 crores in 1968 and Rs. 140 crores in 1969.

Consistent with their policy of increasing their purchases of manufactured products from developing countries. the Soviet side have agreed to import from India during the period 1966 to 1970 an increasing range of products of India's new and developing industries. Manufactured products will form over 40% of the total export-, from India during the period. This is a substantial increase from the previous levels. Among the products in which the Soviet side has shown interest are electric lamps, refrigerators, electric fans, machine tools, textile processing machinery, automobile batteries, room air-conditioners, vacuum flasks, linoleum and PVC cloth, pigments, paints and varnishes, steel and wooden furniture, plastic products, enamel for wire, animal hair other than wool, machine-made woollen carpets, woollen and art silk fabrics and hosiery, cotton textile fabrics, garments, shoes, brushes, finished leather etc. The Soviet Union hag been buying in the past manufactured goods like leather shoes, ready-made garments, spectacle frames and sports goods and have agreed to increase their purchases of these items. It is expected that the sales of textiles will increase almost five-fold to Rs. 20 crores per year in 1970 and shoes to almost 1.5 to 2 million pairs. per year by 1970. Exports of jute goods will touch Rs. 35 crores per year. Black pepper exports Will Teach more than Rs. 5 crores per year by 1970.

The Soviet Union has hitherto been buying mainly pepper and cardamom among Indian spices. They have agreed to consider the import of other kinds of spices including processed spices such as curry powder. Similarly, besides buying increasingly bulk cashew kernels, they have agreed to import substantial quantities of cashew kernels in the form of consumer packs. They have also agreed to buy compound animal feeds in addition to de-oiled cakes, which they have been importing in the past. The USSR will increase the proportion of tanned and semitanned goatskins to be purchased during the period in preference to raw skins. There will be all round increase in the export of the usual traditional items from India such as tea, jute products, tobacco, coffee, cotton textiles etc.

On the side of India's imports from USSR, a prominent feature is provision for machinery and equipment, and spares and components for maintaining the production programme of the various projects set up in India with Soviet assistance such as the Heavy Electrical Projects, Hardwar; the Heavy Machine Building Plant, Ranchi; the Coal Mining and Machinery Project, Durgapur; the Oil Drilling Projects in Gujarat and elsewhere; the Bhilai Steel Project; the Instrument Plant at Kotah and the Drugs Projects etc. In all about forty major projects built with Soviet cooperation will receive their components, parts and equipment under the Trade Plan. In addition, the Soviet Union will supply to India in increasing quantities essential raw materials for maintaining economic activity, such as nonferrous metals, newsprint, sulphur, tin plates. ammonium sulphate etc. In the new protocols signed today between the two Ministers, new credit terms for eight and ten years have also been provided for all major capital goods, imports from USSR, which had to be so far financed by India on a cash basis under the Trade Plan.

India is already taking steps for setting up special manufacturing units for meeting the requirements of the Soviet Union in respect of items like leather footwear, fruit juices, garments, chrome, tanned and finished leather electric bulbs etc. The Soviet side would also consider taking corresponding action for setting up in the Soviet Union additional industrial capacity for meeting the essential requirements of India in respect of such items like ammonium sulphate, tin plates, ferro-alloys and special steels. Indies import requirements of most of the petroleum products will now be covered from USSR under the new Agreement.

This historic Agreement marks a major step forward in trade and economic relations between India and the USSR. As a result of continuous consultations and steps proposed to be taken by the two countries during the coming five years, a bigger and larger base would have been laid for further major expansion of trade between the two countries after 1970. Both Mr. Patolichev and Mr. Shah expressed complete satisfaction at the conclusion of the new trade pact and hoped that this will further strengthen the cordial relations already existing between the two countries.

15

INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ITALY **Date :** Jan 01, 1966

Volume No

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Fertilizer Loan Agreement

India and the United States signed in New Delhi on January 4, 1966 under which the U.S. will provide Rs. 23.8 crores (\$ 50 million) for the purchase of fertilizer to help satisfy India's urgent needs for the near future and to encourage a further increase in agricultural productivity.

Shri S. Bhoothalingam, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, signed for India and Dr. John P. Lewis, Minister-Director, U.S. Agency for International Development Mission, for the United States.

The new agreement gives effect to President Johnson's December 9 announcement of a fifty million dollar loan to India for the urgent purchase of fertiliser.

The Government of India plans to spend a like sum from other foreign exchange available to it. The fertilizer and raw materials for fertilizer production thus procured should permit increased Indian foodgrain output of three to four million tons.

The Indian Supply Mission in the United States had previously been informed by USAID that fertilizer orders placed since December 10, would be financed by the loan.

The loan is one of the measures being taken to avert intensification of India's food crisis and to increase the grain supply.

Stepped-up, shipments of wheat from the United States will begin this month under another emergency action announced by President Johnson at the same time. To help meet the immediate food crisis, the President authorised further extension of the existing Food for Peace Agreement so as to provide an additional 1 1/2 million tons of wheat, equal to about three months' shipments under the programme previously. Some 800.000 tons of the newly authorised amount has already been ordered and booked for shipment during the month of January and the remaining 700,000 tons are expected to be shipped in February.

Previous U.S. loans and grants have supplied India with fertilizers containing approximately 400,000 tons of nitrogen and valued at approximately Rs. 62 crores (\$ 130 million). A quarter of the nitrogen applied by Indian farmers during the current year has been imported with U.S. assistance.

The U.S. is also assisting two large plants for production of fertilizer in India.

16

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1966

February

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1966 Vol. XII FEBRUARY No. 2

CONTENTS

BURMA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on late Prime Minister Shastri's Visit to

Burma

PAGE

CEYLON Indo-Ceylon Trade Arrangement	17
India's Economic Assistance to Ceylon	18
CZECHOSLOVAKIA Indo-Czech Trade Arrangement	18
DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE Shri V. C. Trivedi's Speech in the General De Disarmament Committee	ebate of Eighteen-Nation 19
HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS President's Address to Parliament	26
HUNGARY Indo-Hungarian Joint Communique	29
Indo-Hungarian Trade Agreement Extended	31
Indo-Hungarian Air Agreement	32
Indo-Hungarian Agreement for Scientific Co	llaboration 32
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri K. L. Ghei's Statement in the Ad Hoc Co	ommittee of Finances 33
NORTH VIETNAM Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement about Presi	dent Ho Chi Minh's Letter to
Dr. Radhakrishnan	35
PAKISTAN Defence Minister's Statement in Parliament on Withdrawal of Armed Forces	
under Tashkent Agreement	36
TASHKENT MEETINGPrime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Tashkent Declaration36	
Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabl Tashkent Declaration	ha initiating the Debate on 37
Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Lok Sabha Debate on Tashkent Declaration 42	
Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha initiating the Debate on Tashkent Declaration 48	
Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Rajya Sabha Debate on Tashkent Declaration 53	
UNITED KINGDOM	

Indo-British Food Emergency Loan Agreement

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on her Talks with Vice-President

Humphrey

59

WEST GERMANY Indo-West German Shipping Agreement

60

59

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

BURMA INDIA NORWAY SLOVAKIA HUNGARY VIETNAM PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN USA GERMANY

Date : Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on late Prime Minister Shastri's Visit to Burma

The following is the text of a statement made in Lok Sabha by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, on February 28, 1966, regarding the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's visit to Burma:

During the visit of the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, to Rangoon from December 20 to 23, 1965, a series of talks took place in ail atmosphere of extreme cordiality and understanding between him and the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Burma, Gen. Ne Win. These talks covered a wide range of topics. The two statesmen exchanged views on current international questions. with particular reference to the developments in South East Asia and on Indo-Burmese relations. The talks disclosed an identity of approach and similarity of views on the problems discussed. The problems of persons of Indian origin in Burma were also reviewed by the two statesmen. The discussions were of a general nature. Both leaders agreed that continued efforts should be made to find an early solution to the various problems. They felt that given goodwill and understanding on both sides, such problems could be solved to mutual satisfaction. More detailed talks on this subject took place between the Burmese Foreign Minister and myself at which the senior officials of the two Governments were present.

The Burmese Government have reiterated their assurance 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. Our discussion saw some further progress in the settlement of the question of compensation for nationalised property and repatriation of Indian assets from Burma and it was decided to continue the discussions after further examination of the points raised by the two sides.

For historical reasons there is a large Indian community in Burma. Their presence in Burma has, no doubt, created delicate, problems of human relations. Time alone can solve all these problems. However, our late Prime Minister's visit has created the necessary climate in which an early solution of these problems could be attempted. The determination of both Governments to solve such problems by friendly discussions has further strengthened the cordial and close relations existing between the two Governments.

BURMA USA INDIA PERU Date : Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Indo-Ceylon Trade Arrangement

Talks were held in New Delhi between the Ceylon Trade Delegation led by Mr. V. A. J. P. Senaratne, Director of Commerce, and the Indian Delegation led by Shri B. D. Jayal, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, from February 16 to 19, 1966.

The two Delegations reviewed the progress of the Trade Arrangement between the two countries for 1965 and also worked out an arrangement for the year 1966 within the framework of the Indo-Ceylon Trade Agreement of 1961.

The Trade Arrangement for 1966 provides for exchange of certain specific commodities like dried fish, tamarind and sakkarai from India and those like copra, cocoanut oil and rubber from Ceylon.

17

Measures for smooth and quicker movement of goods of either side were discussed and details of the arrangement for the year 1966 were agreed upon by both Delegations.

The total value of the specified commodities agreed to in the Arrangement signed today amounts to Rs. 7 crores, out of an over-all annual trade of about Rs. 20 crores both ways The working of the Arrangement is to be reviewed once in six months.

Ceylon also showed interest in the purchase of tyres from India. The Ceylonese Delegation stated that Ceylon might be in a position to supply rubber and take rubber tyres in a parallel arrangement.

INDIA USA **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

CEYLON

India's Economic Assistance to Ceylon

An agreement for a credit of Rs. 2 crores to Ceylon by way of India's economic assistance to that country was signed in New Delhi on February 14, 1966. Mr. H. S Amerasinghe, High Commissioner for Ceylon in India, signed on behalf of his country, and Shri Y. T. Shah, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, signed on behalf of India.

The credit arrangement, which comes into force immediately, will be available for drawing upon till December 31, 1966. Ceylon can use the credit for importing from India dried fish of the value of Rs. 60 lakhs, textiles for Rs. 80 lakhs and dried chillies for Rs. 60 lakhs. The list of goods may be modified as may be agreed to between the two Governments. Both the Governments will take steps to facilitate the import and export of commodities agreed to be supplied.

The loan carries interest at 3% and is repayable in three years.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czech Trade Arrangement

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on February 26, 1966, on behalf of the Governments of Czechoslovakia and India outlining the Trade Arrangement for 1966 between the two countries.

The Arrangement envisages the stepping up of trade between the two countries to Rs. 50 crores in 1966, representing an increase of nearly 25 per cent over 1965.

Mr. L. Pesl, Director of Foreign Trade in the Ministry of Foreign Trade of Czechoslovakia, who led a high-level trade delegation from his country for the talks, signed on behalf of the Government of Czechoslovakia and Shri S. Ramachandran, Director, Union Ministry of Commerce, on behalf of the Government of India.

The discussions, which started in New Delhi on February 14, were held in a cordial and friendly atmosphere.

Czechoslovakia has shown considerable interest in India's manufactured products such as textiles, tyres and tubes, and light engineering products, besides traditional commodities such as tea, coffee, pepper, jute manufactures, de-oiled cakes and tanned and semi-tanned skins. It is expected that in 1966, there will be larger exports of manufactured items than in 1965.

A large portion of India's imports from Czechoslovakia will consist of industrial raw materials, steel and components for collaboration projects in India. The Czechoslovak authorities have agreed to supply raw materials for most of the industries in the public and private sectors set up with their collaboration in India. Some of the projects for which Czechoslovakia has already extended long-term credit are the Foundry Forge project, Machine Toot project and the Heavy Electrical projects at Hyderabad and Tiruchi.

18

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Speech in General Debate of Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee

Shri V. C. Trivedi, India's Ambassador in Switzerland and leader of the Indian Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, delivered the following speech in the general debate of the Committee in Geneva on February 15, 1966 :

I should like to take the opportunity of my first intervention in the general debate in the Committee to thank the representatives who have spoken before me: those of the Soviet Union the United States of America, Nigeria, the United Arab Republic, the United Kingdom, Italy Czechoslovakia, Canada, Poland, Bulgaria-that is, yourself, Mr. Chairman-Brazil and Romania, who have been kind enough to offer their condolences to us on the losses we have suffered in the untimely death of our late Prime Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, and of the late Chairman of our Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Homi Bhabha. Their sentiments express the continued affection and goodwill of these representatives and their. Governments towards the Government and the people of our country, and we are deeply grateful to them for their words of grief, solace and appreciation.

It is a matter of deep gratification to the Indian delegation that we have lost no time in resuming the work of this Committee soon after the adjournment of the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly. It gives us particular pleasure to be able to continue our collaboration with our old colleagues and to offer our warm welcome to those who, have joined us this session either for the first time or after a period of absence. The Indian delegation extends its good wishes to Ambassador Amha Aberra of Ethiopia, Mr. Ijewere of Nigeria, Mr. Blusztajn of Poland, Count Wachtmeister of Sweden and Ambassador Khallif of the United Arab Republic, and assures them of its co-operation in the vital task which the international community has entrusted to this Committee, namely, negotiations on a treaty on general and complete disarmament and on collateral measures and arms

control and limitation and reduction of tension. We shall miss our good friends, Ambassador Hassan, Ambassador Imru and, very shortly, Mr. Obi, but we trust that they will continue to help us in their new assignments. The Indian delegation further extends its welcome to Mr. Spinelli, who has joined us this session and has brought us the hopes and good wishes of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Indian delegation would also take this opportunity to congratulate the delegation of the Union of Soviet socialist Republics on the epoch-making Soviet achievement in effecting a soft landing on the moon.

The Committee is particularly fortunate this session in receiving the inspiring message from His Holiness the Pope on the resumption of our work. It is imperative that we bear in mind in our negotiations the basic consideration stressed by the Holy Father, namely, that: ".....no last-ing peace can be established among men until there has been an effective, general and controlled reduction in armaments." (ENDC/163, p. 3).

At our very first meeting, on 27th January, the representative of the United Arab Republic made a pertinent observation on the task facing the Committee now. He said :

"We are meeting this year at Geneva at a time when a certain number of different developments and factors have combined to strengthen the general cause of disarmament and to give it a new impulse. It would not be without interest to try to discuss here together our ideas on the cause of disarmament as it stands now that we are resuming our work at Geneva". (ENDC/PV. 235, p. 34).

As Mr. Khallif pointed out, the period between our last session and the present session was highly productive, and the debates in the twentieth session of the General Assembly and resolutions adopted by it have certain positive and realistic elements from the viewpoint of procedure as well as of substance.

The preceding speakers have emphasized. that the General Assembly adopted, with overwhelming majorities, five principal resolutions on issues of disarmament. These resolutions thus reflect not the views of this or that country, this or that group, this or that region, but of the entire international community. It is, therefore, essenial that we direct our attention exhaustively and comprehensively to the terms of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

In addition to the resolutions dealing with the questions of a world disarmament conference and the denuclearization of Africa, with which the Committee is not presently concerned, there were three resolutions, 2028(XX), 2031(XX) and 2032(XX), dealing respectively with the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, general and complete disarmament and the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

19

The resolution on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is indeed a historic document and, as pointed out by the representative of Nigeria at our 235th meeting, it is comparable in its importance to the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles (ENDC/5). The McCloy-Zorin Joint Statement forms the basic, framework for our negotiations on a treaty on general and complete disarmament and specifies the essential requirements of an acceptable treaty. And so does resolution 2028(XX), with its operative paragraph laying down five essential principles which should form the basis of any acceptable treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It is these three resolutions which provide, as it were, the agenda and the terms of reference of the current session of the Committee. First, there is the question of general and complete disarmament. This is our basic task, for this Committee has been established for the specific purpose of negotiating a treaty on general and complete disarmament. We have not devoted much attention to this problem recently but have concentrated only on collateral issues. The collateral problems are undoubtedly important, but there is sometimes a tendency to miss the wood for the trees. Devotion to an isolated collateral measure of ten creates a disequilibrium of approach which tends to treat that particular measure as an end in itself or, even worse. to suggest solutions which violate the basic philosophy of disarmament: that of reduction and eventual elimination

of armaments. There are many scholars and commentators, therefore, who are consequently apt to conclude that general and complete disarmament is not possible of achievement or is a myth. As a general rule, any suggestion which envisages, on the one hand, control over some people and, on the other hand, unfettered licence to others in the field of armaments, thus militates directly and fundamentally against this basic philosophy of disarmament.

It is encouraging to note that the messages which we have received from President Johnson, Premier Kosygin, Prime Minister Wilson and Secretary-General U. Thant stress the urgency of going ahead with our negotiations on a treaty on general and complete disarmament. In the Committee, we have had many comments on the problems of security and on methods of ensuring the security of nations, but the Indian delegation is convinced that the real security of all nations can be safeguarded only in the context of disarmament. It is not the armaments of other nations, in any case, which can be a perpetual guarantor of a nation's integrity and independence. It is therefore gratifying that all these personages continue to stress the urgent and vital task of negotiating a treaty on comprehensive disarmament.

To some extent, resolution 2031 (XX) on general and complete disarmament was a procedural resolution. It was heartening to note, however, that the membership of the United Nations had faith and confidence in this Committee : but that puts a corresponding obligation upon the Committee to justify that faith and confidence. Moreover, the resolution did in fact ask the Committee to continue its efforts towards making substantial progress. That is the Committee's mandate; it has to make substantial progress on a treaty on general and complete disarmament. The Indian delegation hopes that once the Committee has concluded the general debate and the general discussion on principles governing an appropriate treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it will pay special attention to the issues of general and complete disarmament.

This resolution also requested the Committee to continue its efforts towards reaching agreement on collateral measures. The messages from the distinguished personages which have been circulated as Conference documents place appropriate emphasis on various measures of this nature. The Indian delegation trusts that negotiations on these measures will not be completely side-tracked by the prominence we may give to more important issues, such as the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the suspension of tests. I do not intend to go into the details of all these measures during this intervention, but I should like to emphasize on particular proposal for consideration.

In this imperfect world of ours there are differences among nations on many issues, but one of the fundamental principles which we need to adopt in international relations is that of nonintervention in the internal affairs of States and of respect for their independence, integrity and sovereignty. Allied to this principle, or as a corollary to it, is the principle of renunciation of force for the settlement of disputes. This matter was debated exhaustively during the last session of the General Assembly, which adopted a noteworthy resolution on it. In this Committee also, we have had discussions on this issue in the past, and references have been made to it during the current session.

I am mentioning this matter specifically as many representatives have referred to the Tashkent Agreement between India and Pakistan and to the "Tashkent spirit." The Indian delegation is convinced that-the approach underlying that agreement is the only approach to international relations. As the Tashkent declaration pointed out:

"...The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agree that both, sides will exert all efforts to create goodneighbourly relations between India and

20

Pakistan in accordance with the United Nations Charter. They reaffirm their obligations under the Charter not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means. The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the relations between India and Pakistan shall be based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other".

Another resolution, 2032(XX), urged that all nuclear weapon tests be suspended. As the members of the Committee are aware, India was the first country to focus international attention on the need to suspend all nuclear weapon tests and nearly twelve years ago appealed to the Disarmament Sub-Committee, as it was called at that time, to put an end to them Year after year and session after session, India brought up the issue in the United Nations General Assembly and, although it was not successful initially, that august Assembly finally adopted a historic resolution [A/RES/1762 (XVII)] which condemned all nuclear weapon tests.

This is one field in which the international community has achieved noteworthy progress. The Moscow test ban Treaty of August 1963 was hailed by all peace-loving peoples of the world as a significant first step in the march of humanity towards sanity and international security. There was general hope then that this first step would be followed by other steps, both in the field of nuclear weapon tests and of other measures of disarmament. Unfortunately, subsequent developments have belied these hopes. The Moscow Treaty continues to be partial in more ways than one. Its prohibition still does not extend to underground tests, and no progress has been achieved in that direction, despite the pleas of the non-aligned delegations and the resolutions of the United Nations. The last, session of the General Assembly, therefore, urged again that all nuclear weapon tests be suspended. In addition the resolution in question asked this Committee to continue, with a sense of urgency, its work on a formal comprehensive test ban treaty, and referred in that context to the improved possibilities of international co-operation in the field of seismic detection.

At this stage, the Indian delegation would like to pay a tribute to the Swedish delegation for the constructive ideas on international seismic cooperation which it has put forward in Geneva and New York. India would like to see all countries agreeing to suspend all nuclear weapon tests. We can then consider what steps the international scientific community can take in mutual co-operation so that such suspension, and later a formal treaty, can be adequately observed.

India has already offered its co-operation in this connection. We have in our country a wellestablished system of seismological observation, and three months ago we established a sensitive array of seismometers at Gauribidanur, about fifty miles north of Bangalore in South India. This array consists of two seven-mile-long arms, which will be extended later to fifteen miles each, and is located in a very suited geographic area with exposures of old granite rocks. The background of earth noise at the site is sufficiently low to ensure that small earthquakes at long distances can be recorded by the array. The data gathered at this station will be published and available to all countries.

The Moscow test ban Treaty, however, is not only partial because it is partial in its prohibited environments and leaves out underground nuclear weapon tests; it is much more regrettably partial in that it has been adhered to only partially by the international community. The peoples of the world were concerned primarily with nuclear weapon tests which spread death-dealing radioactive debris over fields and habitations, over rivers and lakes, over men, women and children. They condemned the callousness of those who, in the pursuit of their policies and purposes, contaminated crops, cattle and men alike and increased the danger not only of cancer and leukamia, but also of genetic and hereditary hazards to children yet unborn. And yet one country, in its arrogance and recalcitrance, in its utter disregard of the will and welfare of humanity, not only refused to subscribe to this treaty, but even glorified in its refusal and in its defiance. The refusal of the People's Republic of China to subscribe to the Moscow Treaty and its flamboyant explosion of atomic devices, not once but twice, is thus a much more serious problem than the lack of progress on reaching agreement on prohibition of underground tests.

As the Indian delegation said in New York during the last session of the General Assembly, the first priority in this field is thus to be accorded to the task of making the Moscow test ban Treaty universally binding. This is not a treaty which is subscribed to by a few Powers with vested interests and their allies; it is a treaty which the nonaligned and non-nuclear nations have urged from the beginning and have signed in an overwhelming number. It is, therefore, urgent and vital for the international community to examine what steps should be taken to ensure the universality of acceptance of this very partial Moscow test ban Treaty.

It is not a fruitful exercise to contemplate on the "what-would-have-been" of any situation, but it appears to me that the great emphasis that is being placed by some people on what is euphemistically called further proliferation--as if the single and organic problem of proliferation can be vivisected--would have been much less today

21

were it not for this recalcitrance of one country in not subscribing to the Moscow test ban Treaty and in embarking on a senseless programme of production of nuclear weapons.

The most significant resolution adopted by the United Nations during the twentieth session was on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons [A/ RES/2028 (XX)]. It was, as I said earlier, a historic resolution laying down in clear terms the main principles on which an international treaty on non-proliferation should be based. Earlier, on 15th September, 1965, during the last session if our Committee, the non-aligned delegations submitted a joint memorandum (ENDC/ 158), putting forward their basic approach to the question of non-proliferation. The memorandum emphasized that a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was not an end in itself but only a means to an end, and the inescapable requirement that measures to prohibit the spread of nuclear weapons should be coupled with some tangible steps and followed by other tangible steps of halting the arms race and limiting, reducing and eventually eliminating the nuclear menace. The United Nations resolution was posited on this basic approach.

Resolution 2028 (XX) gives us our terms of reference. The international community has overwhelmingly instructed us to negotiate within a specific framework and in consonance with a specific set of principles, as it believes that only a faithful and precise implementation of these principles can meet the approval of the peoples of the world and can really solve the problem of

proliferation.

There appears to be a tendency, not so much among those who are familiar with the subject as among laymen, to think that the only proposals on the problem of non-proliferation are two draft treaties, one presented by the Soviet Union (ENDC/164) and the other by the United States (ENDC/152), these are the only two documents which need to be reconciled in order to arrive at an internationally acceptable treaty. As the representative of Italy pointed out the other day, the United Nations resolution specifically mentioned the two draft treaties, the joint memorandum of the eight non-aligned members of the Committee and the Italian proposal of a moratorium (ENDC/157).

The United Nations resolution, in fact, places all these documents in their proper perspective. In the first place. it notes with satisfaction the efforts made by the eight non-aligned members of the Committee to achieve a solution of the problem of non-proliferation. as contained in their joint memorandum. It also notes the declarations adopted by the Organization of African Unity and the non-aligned Conference as well as the two draft treaties presented respectively, by the United States and the Soviet Union and the moratorium declaration presented by Italy.

The Indian delegation believes that it is essential that the Committee examines in detail the framework of a treaty on non-proliferation. as prescribed by the United Nations. Unless this basic framework is kept constantly in view and adhered to faithfully, one is apt to concentrate only on some aspects of the problem and ignore the other equally important, if not more important, aspects.

We in this Committee are a group of negotiators, and we have been given the terms of reference for our negotiations. The Committee is composed of eighteen members and was specifically enlarged from its old composition of ten. consisting of five members of the NATO group and five members of the Warsaw group, so as to include eight non-aligned members. The essence of negotiations in the Committee, therefore, is to negotiate among the entire group, representing the general complexion of the world community, and not just to reconcile the views of the two alliances.

In this context, I should like to refer to the sentiments expressed by the Nigerian delegation both in New York and in Geneva. The other day, at the 235th meeting of the Committee, the representative of Nigeria advised us, and very rightly, that the problem should not be viewed in a myopic or lop-sided fashion, reflecting the anxieties and the needs of two Powers or ten Powers. All members of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee have to look at the problem in a global context and in accordance with the directives given to them by the international community, as reflected in the United Nations resolution.

We have been aware of three different approaches emerging in the discussions in New York and in Geneva on the question of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. As the Indian delegation pointed out during the discussions at the last session of the General Assembly, these three approaches broadly were: first, the nonaligned, non-nuclear, approach; second, the interim approach as reflected in the Italian draft declaration of a moratorium; and third, the approach of the nuclear-weapon Powers and their partners in military alliances and others who feel that their security is safeguarded by the existing nuclear-weapon Powers. We appreciated that there were divergences of varying degree even among the delegations which favoured a particular approach, but basically the discussions revealed these three general trends.

I need not recount in detail at this stage the elements of these three approaches. The nonaligned, non-nuclear nations follow the guidelines laid down at the summit conferences of their

22

Heads of State or Government and sustain the understanding of the problem as given in the non-aligned memorandum of 15 September 1965 --namely, that a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is not an end in itself, but a means to an end that this end is the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, more particularly, of nuclear disarmament and that therefore 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.

There is sometimes a misunderstanding in some minds in respect of this position, and it is alleged that what the non-nuclear, non-aligned countries want is to achieve general disarmament, or at least nuclear disarmament, as part of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. A comment of this nature reveals a complete misreading of the non-aligned position. To be sure, the non-aligned nations are determined to continue to urge on all concerned the imperative need to achieve general and complete disarmament, but they do not say that general 'and complete disarmament must form part of a non-proliferation treaty or that there can be no treaty on nonproliferation unless there is comprehensive or even nuclear disarmament. They do not say that the nuclear-weapon Powers must reduce their existing stockpiles of these dreadful and much-multiplied nuclear weapons before the international community can agree on a treaty on non-proliferation. They do not say any of these things; all that they do say is that certain measures, integral and organic to the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons, must be taken. They go further and say that some measures of limitation and "un-armament", if I may be permitted to coin a word, should be coupled with measures to prevent proliferation, while other measures of limitation, control and disarmament can follow. Their view is that one cannot have, a spurious treaty which heaps all the control, all the limitations and all the prohibitions on non-nuclear countries, while at the same time giving a licence, even indirect encouragement, to the existing nuclear-weapon Powers themselves to proliferate and to continue with their manufacture of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. The nonaligned and non-nuclear nations do not insist on complete and comprehensive equality in this field; all they want is that at least some measures be taken which are fundamental and germane to this disease of proliferation and that the causes of proliferation be dealt with at the same time as its consequences.

The Indian delegation has had occasion in the past to explain in detail what it considers to be the real essence of the problem of proliferation. If one wishes to diagnose a disease one must see the history of the disease. We in this Committee arc obliged to go into the details and the technicalities of the problem. We must, therefore, ask ourselves. why is there a problem of proliferation at all? Why is it that a third country has chosen to be a nuclear weapon Power? Why is it that a fourth country is developing nuclear weapons and missiles? And why is it that a fifth country is embarking on a nuclear weapon programme? Is it prestige ? Is it security ? Is it the menace of other nuclear weapon Powers, incipient or otherwise? Is it the risk involved in the continuation of the existing nuclear menace, the risk of thermonuclear war by miscalculation, accident or design? Or is it all this together? Surely the answers to these questions must furnish the answer to the problem of why there are debates in some countries on embarking on nuclear weapon programmes. Above all the must provide the real answer to the question of how the international community can help these countries--or, as the fashionable phrase is, further countriesto stand firm in their determination to eschew for ever my thought of production of nuclear weapons.

It appears to the Indian delegation that, first of all, we must ensure that no prestige accrues to those misguided nations which have embarked or which are embarking on nuclear weapon programmes. There must be an end to all this talk of a high table or a top table, a select club, centres of nuclear power and a superior coterie or a group of four or five who could meet among themselves and work out the salvation of the world.

Then there is the question of security. As far as the non-aligned nations arc concerned security is not synonymous with protection. no matter bow powerful the protector or how sincere. Real security lies in the elimination of the threat rather than in offering protection after the threat has been translated into actual aggression. We should like to add that what the non-nuclear, non-aligned countries urge in the context of a non-proliferation treaty is not the complete elimination of the nuclear menace here and now; all that they say is that at least a beginning should be made to halt an increase in that threat, to limit the circumference of that threat. That would not provide full security, but it would be an essential

beginning.

In this context the Indian delegation would like to welcome the recent message of 1st February from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to our Committee (ENDC/167) and in particular the willingness of the Soviet Government to include in the draft treaty on non-proliferation a clause on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States parties to the treaty

23

which have no nuclear weapons in their territory. The Soviet draft treaty (ENDC/164) stipulates that the treaty "shall enter into force after its ratification by the parties possessing nuclear weapons," and this new clause would be a specific article in the treaty.

This is indeed a step forward in the direction of our endeavour to negotiate a treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and meets one of the misgivings expressed by non-nuclear nations on the present state of affairs. The Indian delegation would like in particular to pay tribute to the Nigerian delegation, which has consistently put forward this idea as one of the essential features of any non-proliferation treaty.

To the Indian delegation the most heartening feature of this message and this willingness of the Soviet Government to amend its draft is their indication that the nuclear Powers appreciate the misgivings of the non-nuclear countries and that they are prepared to implement some of the ideas put forward by them in rsepect of a treaty on non-proliferation. We sincerely hope that the nuclear Powers will also take into account the other considerations advanced by the non-aligned non-nuclear nations and agree to incorporate appropriate provisions in the draft treaty so as to reflect the memorandum of the non-aligned members (ENDC/158) and resolution 2028 (XX) of the United Nations General Assembly.

It is the memorandum of the non-aligned members which reflects the approach of the nonaligned non-nuclear nations--an approach which received a wide measure of support from a vast number of delegations during the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly. On the other hand there is the approach of the nuclear Powers-the nuclear "haves"-and their allies and others who feel that their security is assured by the present nuclear weapon Powers. The nuclear weapon Powers and their allies believe that all that is necessary is to prevent others from joining the so-called nuclear club, and that the nuclear Powers themselves should continue with their own production, diversification and sophistication of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. It is an approach similar to the example I quoted last August in this Committee of a Moghul emperor of India who was a drunkard himself but who prohibited drinking throughout his empire (ENDC/PV.223, p. 15).

The two draft treaties before us will, however, need to embody a more comprehensive approach, and a global approach. A non-proliferation treaty will need to deal with the disease, at least partially, instead of dealing merely with the symptoms. It will need to deal with the cause rather than the consequence. As the Indian delegation has always maintained, the cause is the existing proliferation. The possibility of further proliferation is, only the consequence.

This is also what resolution 2028 (XX) tells us. It is necessary for the Committee, therefore, to examine carefully the five principles stipulated by the United Nations as the basis of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

There is the first principle-namely, that

"The treaty should be void of any loopholes which might permit nuclear or nonnuclear Powers to proliferate, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons in any form;". [A/RES/2028 (XX), ENDC/161].

The Indian delegation agrees with the Soviet delegation and others which have placed special emphasis on this principle. As we said in the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly, the treaty must prohibit all aspects of proliferation, direct or indirect, through military alliances or otherwise and in any form or shape. As a non-aligned nation we are unable to understand why members of military alliances should receive a special dispensation in the context of non-proliferation. there cannot be three categories of nations, namely, nuclear nations, nonnuclear nations in alliance with nuclear nations, and non-nuclear non-aligned nations. Our eventual objective is to abolish all existing differences of this nature. That will, of course, take a long time, but we should not create a third category now and retard our progress towards the ultimate objective.

There is another element in this principle. which does not seem to have been commented upon so far. The principle, as adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, forbids not only non-nuclear Powers but also nuclear Powers to proliferate. It says so specifically and categorically. It does not say that the non-nuclear Powers shall not proliferate but the nuclear Powers may proliferate and the nuclear Powers will agree only not to disseminate weapons and weapons technology: it says that neither shall proliferate. This is a very important aspect of the first principle stipulated by the United Nations, and must be reflected in any draft which merits serious consideration.

This particular idea is carried forward in a concrete form in the second principle-namely, that

"The treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers". (Ibid. p. 3).

To the non-aligned non-nuclear nations this is the supreme principle. It is not merely a question of sovereign nations rejecting, in the second half of the twentieth century, treaties imposed by powerful nations on weak nations. It is not merely a question of rejection of unequal and discriminatory treaties. It is a principle specifically

24

related to the question of proliferation of nuclear weapons, and emphasizes that to effect a real solution of the problem we must deal with the single and organic issue of present as well as future proliferation.

This principle is very carefully drafted. It says unambigously that this balance of responsibilities and obligations of nuclear and non-nuclear Powers must be embodied--I repeat, embodied-in the treaty. It does not mean that the nuclear Powers may, separately and outside the actual text of the treaty, agree to assume some obligations. Those obligations must be embodied in the treaty.

The main emphasis of this principle is, of course, on the balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations on the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers. If there is to be real equality the nuclear Powers should go completely non-nuclear but that, alas, does not appear to be a practical proposition at the moment. The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has been established to achieve that final consummation, but the Indian delegation appreciates that it is not easy to achieve total nuclear disarmament within a short time. The second principle, as drafted, therefore talks of

"an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers." (Ibid.).

There has, therefore, to be a balance. It has to be all acceptable balance-that is, acceptable to all parties and it has to be a balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations. Apart from the non-aligned memorandum of 15th September, 1965, no document before us embodies this fundamental principle. The Indian delegation has urged on many occasions that the least that should be agreed upon, at least as a beginning, is that all countries, nuclear and non-nuclear, should forgo further production of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles designed to carry those weapons. A provision of this nature must necessarily be incorporated--or, as the principle says, embodied-in the treaty.

There is not the same difficulty in the propositions before us in regard to mutuality of obligations and responsibilities on the question of dissemination of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, except of course in drafting these responsibilities. We must thus have the same agreement in regard to the principle of mutuality in the context of production of weapons which the drafts before us seek to cover as far as the non-nuclear nations are concerned.

The Committee must, therefore, devote its special attention to this principle, otherwise we Shall be acting contrary to the directives given to us by the United Nations. Then there is the third principle-namely, that--

"The treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, more particularly, nuclear disarmament". (Ibid., p. 3).

This reproduces the basic philosophy, expressed in the non-aligned memorandum of 15th September 1965 (ENDC/158). As I said earlier, it is essential that we get away from the notion that all that is necessary is to ensure un-armament of unarmed countries and that we need do nothing towards disarmament. The formulation of this principle by the United Nations thus strengthens us in our conviction that while we are dealing with a non-proliferation treaty we must deal with the problem of reduction and eventual elimination of the nuclear menace as well. It is most encouraging to note that the overwhelming majority of nations who cast an affirmative vote on this resolution in the Assembly desire this to be the basic principle of an international treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The fourth principle stipulates that :

"There should be acceptable and workable provisions to ensure the effectiveness of the treaty;" (Ibid.).

We have the example of the Moscow test ban Treaty, which is at the same time a beacon of hope and a warning signal. The arrogant refusal of China to subscribe to this Treaty has brought us to this sorry state of affairs today. The Indian delegation is particularly distressed to find that man), people talk in terms of accepting the fait accompli of accepting the evil. We must reject this attitude of mind unequivocally. Our great Master, Mahatma Gandhi, taught us one supreme principle, never to compromise with evil.

The Indian delegation will have more to say on this fourth principle of the resolution when we have reached the stage of commenting on the detailed provisions of an acceptable treaty, for it will need to be borne in mind when we negotiate the question of the coming into force of the treaty and of the withdrawal clause. Finally, the fifth principle rightly safeguards special situation of the Latin American States, the African States and any other States which are placed in a similar situation. It is a matter of profound regret to the Indian delegation that an opportunity provided to us in Asia has been denied, particularly since October 1964, when this hitherto non-nuclear area suddenly exploded into a nuclearizing area. In consonance with its ancient traditions of Buddha and Gandhi, Christ and Mohammed, Confucius and Zoroaster, Asia had so much to offer to the world, but that was denied suddenly because the rulers of one country defied the world.

25

The Indian delegation hopes that the discussions in the Committee will proceed on the firm and unflinching basis of these five principles, and that we shall soon have a balanced treaty, an effective treaty and a treaty without loopholesin fact, a treaty which solves the essential problem of proliferation, that is, the problem of present as well of future proliferation. We are still hopeful, and that is why I have not spoken this morning of what I called the third approach. the approach underlying the Italian appeal of a moratorium with various suggestions of amendment-as, for example, the suggestion made by the representative of Libya during the session of the General Assembly to the effect that a moratorium should apply equally and appropriately to the nuclear and non-nuclear nations. The Indian delegation will also have the opportunity of speaking in detail at some stage on the wise suggestion made by the representative of Nigeria, that if comprehensive non-proliferation treaty is likely to be delayed the Committee might consider the question of negotiating a simple non-dissemination treaty which can embody mutual obligations and responsibilities on non-nuclear and nuclear nations alike not to receive or give nuclear weapons and technology. We commend that suggestion, as we did a similar suggestion made by the Prime Minister of Malta at the last session of the General Assembly. As I said, however, we all hope that we shall receive the unquestioned and unqualified support of all members for the five basic principles of the United Nations resolution so that we can go ahead with our problem of negotiating a genuine and comprehensive treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear

weapons.

The problem of negotiating a treaty on nonproliferation has implications far beyond the realm of proliferation of nuclear weapons or even of general and complete disarmament. The attitudes that we take and the approaches we adopt on the will reflect our attitudes and approaches on international relations in general. It is, therefore, imperative that we take a global approach on this issue, take into account the needs and requirements of all members of the international community and follow an approach which reflects our firm adherence to sovereign equality of all nations and to the principles of equality and mutual benefit. Otherwise we shall be repeating the failures of the League of Nations.

I should like to conclude with a quotation from a letter written from prison by Jawaharlal Nehru on 2nd August, 1933, to his young daughter, who is now our Prime Minister :

"Another great failure at world efforts at co-operation has been the disarmament Conference. This Conference was the outcome of the Covenant of the League of Nations....

"The World Disarmament Conference met at last early in 1932. Month after month, year after year, it went on, considering many proposals and rejecting them, reading innumerable reports, listening to interminable arguments. From being a disarmament conference, it almost became an armaments conference. No agreement could be reached, for no country was prepared to consider the question from a wider international point of view; for each country, disarmament meant that other countries should disarm or lessen their armaments while it kept up its own strength."

INDIA SWITZERLAND NIGER NIGERIA USA ITALY BULGARIA CANADA NORWAY POLAND SLOVAKIA BRAZIL ETHIOPIA SWEDEN UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LIBYA MALTA

Date : Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, delivered the following address to the Members of Indian Parliament on February 14, 1966 :

Members of Parliament,

Once again, I welcome you to a new session. A month ago, the nation lost its Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri. He was truly a man of the people who never lost the common touch. He combined firmness of purpose with flexibility of approach. He was a man of deep humility, gentle in his ways, soft of speech and-devoted to peace. In hours of crisis, he was calm, courageous and unflinching.

While deeply distressed by the turn of events which forced us into an armed conflict with Pakistan, he gave an inspiring lead to the nation. Our brave and gallant armed forces have written a new

26

chapter of glory in our history. We honour our heroes, comfort the bereaved and lament the loss of precious fives. The people of India have once again demonstrated their unity and solidarity. communal harmony was preserved throughout the country. Labour showed an exemplary spirit.

When the fighting ceased, Lal Bahadur Shastri bent his energies towards the establishment of good neighbourly relations with Pakistan. Before his sudden untimely death, he had the satisfaction of signing the Tashkent Declaration with President Ayub Khan of Pakistan in the presence of Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., whose good offices and friendly approach, more than anything else, made the agreement possible. It was Lal Bahadur shastri's hope and belief that the Tashkent Declaration would lay the foundation for an enduring peace and friendship between India and Pakistan. More even than the letter, it is the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration that is important. Both sides have to fulfil with faith and vision.

We are fortunate in having very friendly relations with almost all countries in the world. we arc particularly happy that the friendly ties and understanding with our neighbours have been further strengthened. Unfortunately, our relations with the People's Republic of China still continue to be strained. The country has to be vigilant and strong.

Our Government will continue to work for peace in the world. Peace is essential for our own development and progress and for the wellbeing of all peoples. To this end, we shall strive to strengthen international co-operation, based on the principles of peaceful co-existence, non-interference in the internal affairs of others, non-alignment which implies freedom to judge issues on their merits and, above all, the abandonment of the use of force to settle disputes. If the resources of prosperous nations, which are now spent on armaments, could be diverted to the service of mankind, the people living in poverty and ignorance would have a new hope-of achievement in their life time.

One by one co tries in Africa and Asia, which were under colonial domination, have achieved independence and taken their rightful place in the comity of nations. It is unfortunate that some countries are still under Portuguese domination and we sympathise with those who are fighting for their independence. In South Africa, we support the struggle against apartheid.

One of the most unwelcome developments which has taken place is the unilateral declaration of independence by Rhodesia and the seizing of power by a racial minority which is seeking to establish its domination over the people of Rhodesia. We have cut off all relations with Rhodesia, diplomatic and economic, and will continue to give our full support to the people of Rhodesia in setting up a truly democratic Government.

We are deeply concerned about the present situation in Vietnam. Any effort to resolve this conflict by peaceful methods will receive our support.

Last year, I visited Yugoslavia Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Ethiopia. In all these countries, I was warmly received and I found evidence of deep friendship and goodwill towards India and her-people. The Vice-President visited Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Turkey and Greece, where he was received with great cordiality and friendliness. The same friendliness was displayed by the Governments and peoples of Nepal, the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic, Canada, Great Britain, Yugoslavia and Burma during the visits which the late Prime Minister Shastri paid to those countries. We have also had the pleasure of welcoming to our country the King and Queen of Nepal, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Prime Ministers of Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, Laos and Uganda and many other high-dignitaries from all over the world. Many Heads of Government and other high personages came to Delhi last month to pay their homage to Lal Bahadur Shastri and we were geartly touched by their presence.

The year 1965-66 is the last year of our Third Five-Year Plan. The growth of national income, which was slow in the first two years of the Plan, was speeded up with the rise of 4.5 per cent. in the third year and 7.3 per cent. in the fourth year. Ordinarily, it should have been possible to maintain a comparable rate of growth during the current year. Unfortunately, a number of adverse factors have slowed down production. The unprecedented drought which we experienced, the armed conflict in which the country was involved and the suspension of promised economic aid from outside have reduced the rate of growth.

On account of the failure of monsoons, the production of foodgrains in 1965-66 is likely to be only 76 to 77 million tonnes, as against 88 million tonnes in the previous year. The shortfall in the availability of foodgrains, as well as of fodder and water, has created serious scarcity conditions in many States, particularly in Maharashtra, Gujarat, Mysore, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh. The State Governments and Centre have already taken steps to provide relief to the people affected by the scarcity. We take this opportunity to acknowledge the assistance readily given by international organisations and the Governments and people of various friendly countries. In particular, we would like to thank the President of the United States and his administration for their generous help at this time of need.

27

Measures have to be taken to ensure equitable distribution of the available supplies between State and State and man and man. Statutory rationing has been introduced in Calcutta, Madras, Coimbatore and Delhi. It will be introduced in a number of other cities in the coming months.

The Government is aware of the distress caused in Kerala where the availability of rice now admits of a daily ration of 140 grams only per head. This is supplemented by an equal quantity of wheat. There has been considerable discontent and agitation on account of the reduced availability of rice. Steps are being taken to increase the supply of rice by imports from abroad and by additional procurement internally. We trust that States with a surplus will cooperate fully in making more rice available for the people of Kerala.

The present difficulties only re-emphasize the need to concert and implement measures to increase the production of foodgrains in the shortest possible time. Only by the application of modem science and technology can agricultural production increase in an adequate measure. In the new agricultural strategy of our Government, the greatest emphasis has been placed on the use of improved varieties of seeds which are particularly responsive to the application of fertilizers. These new varieties should cover 4.5 million acres of land in 1966-67, and over 32 million acres by the end of the Fourth Plan.

The internal production of fertilizers is being stepped up. The Trombay fertilizers plant has already been commissioned. Neyvelli is expected to go into production in the near future. In 1967, four plants will be commissioned at Namrup. Gorakhpur, Baroda and Vishakhapatnam. Recently certain decisions have been taken to attract private capital also, both foreign and indigenous, for investment in this field. Till such time as domestic production is adequate, the Government proposes to import the requisite quantities of fertilizers for the agricultural programme.

Irrigation projects are being speeded up. It is expected that through major and medium irrigation projects, water for an additional 3 million acres will become available' during the coming financial year. Minor irrigation projects are also receiving attention. About 7 lakh pumping sets are expected to be energised during the Fourth Plan. Considerable emphasis will be laid on rural electrification.

Finance will be required by the farmer to make greater use of fertilizers and of the water from our irrigation projects. Steps are being taken to ensure that credit is made available to the farmer quickly and at relatively low rates of interest.

The high priority we are giving to agriculture is necessary not merely to ensure self-sufficiency in foodgrains, but also to enable us to increase our exports of agricultural and industrial products. Exports showed a marked increase during the first three years of the Third Five-Year Plan. In the last two years, however, they have remained relatively, stagnant. There has been an impressive rise in our exports to East European countries in general and to the U.S.S.R. in particular. However, our balance of payments position with the rest of the world has continued to be tinder strain. While external assistance has been making a welcome contribution to the country's development and while we must thank the many countries and international institutions from whom we receive aid, we must intensify our efforts to increase exports and to make the country self-reliant as quickly as possible.

A number of public sector plants have started production in the recent past. Fresh capacity has been added in the machine building sector, in oil refineries and in the production of alloy steels. Adequate provision will be made in the Fourth Plan for the expansion of industries in the public sector. Special mention has to be made in this context of the steel plant to be set up at Bokaro with Soviet collaboration and of the enterprises intended to put atomic energy to peaceful, constructive uses. The Atomic Energy Commission and indeed the world of science has suffered an irreparable loss in the tragic death of Dr. H. J. Bhabha. The work which he had started must continue with unabated vigour.

The investment which we make in the public sector has to give adequate returns. Our Government proposes to pay special attention to the efficient management of public sector enterprises.

Industries in the private sector have also, to expand their output and capacity. While certain curbs and controls are inevitable in a planned economy and in the context of scarcity, conditions have to be created in which private initiative and private savings can be harnessed to make the maximum possible contribution to growth and development within the framework of the Fourth Five-Year Plan.

The success we have achieved in improving the health of our people and raising the average expectation of life gives us cause for satisfaction. The number of doctors available is now nearly 90,000 as against 70,000 in 1960-61. Hospital beds have increased by nearly a third over the same period. Mortality due to malaria has practically been eradicated over the last decade. Side by side with the fall in 'the death rate, we must bring about a reduction in the birth rate. If our population goes on increasing at the rate of about a million a month, it will be difficult to raise our

28

standards of living and to end our chronic dependence on imports to feed our people. Family planning programmes have to be intensified and brought within the reach of all.

The number of school-going children at the primary stage has gone up from a little above 40 per cent at the commencement of first Plan to nearly 80 per cent this year. The percentage at higher levels has nearly trebled over the same period. The annual out turn from our Technical Training Institutions has doubled during the Third Plan.

Prices continued to rise during the year, although the rate of increase was not as high as in the previous year. In view of the setback in agricultural production this year, steps have to be taken to keep inflationary pressures in check. Curtailment of public expenditure has an important role in this.

Our Government is trying to prune non-Plan expenditure and to concentrate our resources on development. There are, however, certain areas where higher expenditure is unavoidable. We have to provide for the rehabilitation of people affected by the recent conflict. We have to undertake relief measures in the drought-stricken areas. With the increase in recent months of tension on our Northern borders, we cannot but provide for a higher outlay on defence. in the circumstances obtaining, a tighter financial discipline, internal and external, is unavoidable.

Monetary and financial curbs, however necessary they may be in the short run, do not provide an answer to the basic problems of our economy. To fight Poverty we must have higher production. Towards this. end, both the public sector and the private sector have important tasks ahead of them.

The preparation of the Fourth Plan has unfortunately been delayed, due to certain unforeseen developments. The Plan for the year 1966-67 is ready. The State Governments are mobilising resources to implement it. Although the total outlay on the 1966-67 Plan will be-lower than what we had earlier hoped for, every effort will be made to make good the shortfall in the remaining years of the Fourth Five-Year Plan. Members of Parliament, a new Government has come into power, led by one you all know and who belongs to the younger generation of freedom fighters. The reorganisation of Departments and Ministries reflects the priorities to which I have just referred.

Thirty-eight Bills are already before you for your consideration. Amongst the new Bills which the Government proposes to introduce are : Rice Milling Industry (Regulation) Amendment Bill 1966; The Crop Insurance Bill 1966; The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill to replace the Ordinance; The Essential Commodities (Amendment) Bill 1966; The Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Bill 1966; The Forward Contracts (Regulation) Amendment Bill 1966; The Armed Forces (Special Powers Continuance) Bill 1966; and The Import and Export Control (Amendment) Bill, 1966. A statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the financial year 1966-67 will be laid before you.

Members of Parliament, I wish you success in your labours. Our objectives are known and our goals are clear. We have to strive for a better life for our people at home and to assist in promoting peace and co-operation in the world. Towards these objectives, you have to guide the nation with courage and wisdom and a spirit of co-operative endeavour.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN CHINA SOUTH AFRICA VIETNAM NORWAY SLOVAKIA YUGOSLAVIA ETHIOPIA KUWAIT GREECE JORDAN SAUDI ARABIA TURKEY NEPAL CANADA BURMA AFGHANISTAN LAOS UGANDA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA

Date : Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Indo-Hungarian Joint Communique

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, His Excellency Mr. Gyula Kallai, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic, paid a visit to India from February 20 to February 28, 1966. At the conclusion of the visit a joint communique was issued in New Delhi on February 28.

The following is the text of the joint communique :

His Excellency Mr. Gyula Kallai, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic, paid an official visit to-the Repubic of India between the 20th and 28th February 1966 at the invitation of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India. During their stay in India, Prime Minister Gyula Kallai and the Hungarian Government, delegation visited New Delhi, Chandigarh, Agra, Bangalore and Bombay and saw industrial establishments, scientific institutions and historical monuments. These visits gave them the opportunity to get an insight into the life of the Indian people, their creative work and age-old culture.

The Hungarian Prime Minister was received by H.E. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India. They exchanged views on matters of common concern.

Prime Minister Gyula Kallai and members of the Hungarian Delegation had talks with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and other Ministers of the Government of India in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual confidence about questions of developing relations between the two countries and about current international problems.

From the Hungarian People's Republic the discussions were attended by the Minister for Foreign Trade, H.E. Mr. Jozsef Biro, the Minister Chairman of the National Committee for Technical Development, H.E., Mr. Arpad Kiss, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, H.E. Mr. Karoly Szarka, the Deputy Minister of Communications and Posts, H.E. Mr. Rudolf Ronai, the Deputy Chairman of the National Planning Board, H.E. Dr. Vilmos Saghy, the Administrative President of the Institute for Cultural Relations, H.E. Dr. Endre Rosta, the Ambassador of the Hungarian People's Republic in India, H.E. Mr. Janos Nagy, the Head of Department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, H.E. Dr. Peter Kos.

From India the discussions were attended by the Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh, the Minister of State Shri Dinesh Singh, the Foreign Secretary, Shri C. S. Jha, the Indian Ambassador in Hungary, Shri S. V. Patel and the Director in the Ministry of External Affairs, Smt. Rukmini Menon.

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic expressed high appreciation of the unremitting efforts of the Government and people of India towards the achievement of social and economic progress', maintenance of peace and peaceful settlement of international problems.

The Prime Minister of India also spoke with deep appreciation about the successes of the Hungarian People's Republic attained in the course of socialist construction, as well as about Hungarian foreign policy which makes its contribution to world peace, based as it is on the principle of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems.

Both the Prime Ministers stated their satisfaction at the successful development of relations between the Hungarian People's Republic and India. They agreed that meetings between leading personalities of the two countries contribute effectively to the strengthening of friendly relations based on mutual understanding.

During the visit, the Parties discussed questions concerning the development of economic relations between the two countries. Both Prime Ministers expressed the view that cooperation between the Hungarian People's Republic and the Republic of India makes an important contribution to the successful attainment of the aims of the two countries in the field of economic development.

Both Prime Ministers expressed their keen desire to develop further the relations between the two countries in various fields. A new longterm trade agreement, an agreement on civil aviation, and an agreement on scientific and technical cooperation which were signed during the visit, will make a valuable contribution towards this end.

The Parties noted with satisfaction that Hungarian-Indian cultural relations were developing favourably on the basis of the annual cultural exchange plans within the framework of the Cultural Agreement of 30th March, 1962.

The two Prime Ministers exchanged views on the international situation and found that their positions concerning fundamental questions were identical or similar. They agreed that the relations between States should be based on the principles of respect for independence, sovereignty, equality and mutual benefit. They reaffirmed their belief in peaceful co-existence and denounced the use of threats and ultimatums and interference in internal affairs. They stressed the need to settle disputed questions, including border disputes, between States without the use of force and through peaceful negotiations.

The Parties agreed that the many-sided political, social and economic relations between the developing and socialist countries arc important factors in international peace and security and serve mutual interests.

The Prime Minister of India informed the Hungarian Prime Minister of the progress of the implementation of the Declaration signed at the meeting between the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan held in Tashkent through the good offices of the Soviet Government. The Prime Minister of Hungary appreciated the significance of the Tashkent Declaration and the positive role played in its adoption by the Indian Government and personally by the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, who suffered a tragic and untimely death. They expressed the hope that the governments of the two neighbouring countries would succeed in solving outstanding problems in the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration on, the basis of non-interference in internal affairs and renunciation of the use of force.

30

The Parties expressed deep concern at the aggravation of the international situation and agreed on the need for concerned action by all forces of peace to normalise international life in the spirit of peaceful co-existence.

Both Prime. Ministers stressed the need for continued efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They welcomed the UN resolution on the convening of a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States. They expressed support for the concept of atom-free zones and agreed on the urgency of an international agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The two sides expressed serious concern over the grave situation in Vietnam and the danger of its developing into a major international conflict. They reviewed the various efforts which had been made to achieve a peaceful settlement and stressed that the solution of the Vietnam problem should be found within the-framework of the Geneva Agreement of 1954.

In the course of the review of the international situation, the two Prime Ministers also discussed the question of peace and security in Europe and stressed the necessity of peaceful settlement of the German problem.

Both Parties condemned imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism. They denounced the apartheid policy of the South African Government, and the illegal declaration of independence by the white minority regime in Rhodesia, both of which constitute a danger to world peace and security and violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. They reiterated their full solidarity with and support to the African people and expressed the hope that Britain would urgently take all necessary steps to restore to the people of Rhodesia their inalienable right to freedom, equality and independence.

The two Prime Ministers emphasised that the United Nations has a very important role to play in the maintenance of international peace and security and in the development of cooperation among countries. They agreed on the necessity to conduct international relations in accordance with the UN Charter.

The visit to India by the Chairman of the Hungarian Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government is an important landmark in the development of close and friendly relations between the two countries and a valuable contribution to the strengthening of international understanding and friendship among peoples.

Prime Minister Gyula Kallai thanked Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and the Government and people of India for their warm and cordial reception, and invited the Prime Minister of India to visit Hungary. The Prime Minister of India was happy to accept the invitation.

Date : Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Indo-Hungarian Trade Agreement Extended

His Excellency Mr. Joszef Biro, Minister of Foreign Trade, of the Hungarian People's Republic, who is now visiting India with the Hungarian Prime Minister, had talks with the Union Minister of Commerce, Shri Manubhai Shah, during which the progress of Indo-Hungarian trade and economic cooperation was reviewed. The two Ministers expressed satisfaction at the rapid increase in the volume of two-way trade from Rs. 31 million in 1960 to Rs. 180 million in 1965-an almost six-fold growth in five years.

They agreed that there was considerable scope for further expansion and finalised Trade Plans for 1966, 1967 and 1968 which envisage trade of the order of Rs. 270, Rs. 290 and Rs. 310 million respectively.

The items to be imported by India from Hungary will be machinery and equipment, dumpers, machine tools, scientific and laboratory equipment, heavy chemicals, pharmaceutical intermediates, drugs and medicines in bulk, X-ray films, cinema films (raw), rolled steel products, special tool and alloy steel, dye-intermediates, aluminium ingots and wire rods etc. Hungary has also agreed to supply fertilizers to India.

India's exports will consist not only of traditional goods like iron-ore, tea, coffee, spices, deoiled cakes, mica, etc. but also several manufactured items like cotton textiles, hosiery knitwear and garments, leather footwear and various engineering items such as refrigerators, compressors, air conditioners, kelly filters, petrol pumps, storage batteries etc.

The Government of India and the Govern-

ment of the Hungarian People's Republic have also signed a Protocol extending the' validity of the existing Trade and Payments Agreement between them for 2 years beyond the end of 1968. The Agreement will now provide a framework for trade relations between India and Hungary for the entire period of their economic Five-Year Plans for 1966-70. This will facilitate the planning of production in the two countries to meet each other's requirements.

31

Hungary is also extending co-operation in India's industrial progress in many fields. Two major public sector projects in which Hungary is extending its assistance are the Aluminium Project in Korba and the National Instruments Project in Calcutta. A detailed project report for the former is being prepared by Hungarian experts and Hungary has offered credit for financing the supply of such machinery and ancillaries for it as cannot be fabricated in India. Another important state-owned enterprise, the Orissa Mining Corporation, have placed an order with Hungary for an Ore Dressing Plant and other equipment for the Daiteri Mining Project on easy terms of payment.

In the private sector, the Hungarians are interested in a collaboration arrangement in India for producing dumpers which are now supplied by the Hungarian enterprise, MOGUTA, to many parts of the world. They are also considering the possibility of fitting their own dumpers with engines made in India. Another modern factory which has been set up with Hungarian collaboration is the Chandigarh factory for meters and instruments.

A delegation of industrial experts from Hungary visited India two years ago and made a complete study of the fields in which they could extend co-operation to India. They also located sectors of industries which could supply highly sophisticated equipment to Hungary. In particular, they found the possibility of importing chemical filters from India for their aluminum and refinery projects. The possibility of import of railway wagons from India on sizeable scale is also tinder consideration and an annual order of about 500 wagons is likely to be placed on Indian manufacturers shortly. The Government of Hungary has offered to the Government of India a credit for a total value of Rs. 25 crores. The offer is partly of Government-to-Government credit for financing public sector purchases and partly by way of suppliers' credit to finance supplies to private enterprises in India. The Government of India has expressed appreciation of this offer.

HUNGARY INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Indo-Hungarian Air Agreement

An Agreement between the Government of India and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic for the operation of air services between the two countries was signed in New Delhi on February 23, 1966. His Excellency Mr. Rudolf Ronai, Deputy Minister of Communications and Posts, Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, and Shri V. Shankar, Secretary, Department of Aviation, Government of India, signed the Agreement on behalf of Hungary and India respectively in the presence of the Ambassadors of the two countries, Their Excellencies Mr. Janos Nagy, and Shri S. V. Patel.

Under the Agreement an Indian airline will be entitled to operate air services to and through Budapest and a Hungarian airline will be entitled to operate air services to and through Bombay.

The Agreement is expected to facilitate and promote closer contact between the peoples of India and Hungary and thereby contribute to the furtherance of existing friendly relations between the two countries.

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Indo-Hungarian Agreement for Scientific Collaboration

An agreement for scientific collaboration between India and Hungary was signed in New Delhi on February 23, 1966 between the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research and the Institute of Cultural Relations of the Hungarian People's Republic. Shri M. C. Chagla, India's Education Minister and the Vice-President of the C.S.I.R., signed on behalf of the Council and H.E. Mr. Andre Rosta, Administrative President, signed on behalf of the Hungarian Institute.

According to the agreement 3-member scientists delegations will be exchanged between the two countries this year to explore the fields of research in pure and applied sciences which may be of mutual interest to both the countries or may promote their technical development. Visits of a few outstanding scientists may also be exchanged for giving lectures and for familiarising themselves with the scientific work in each other's country.

Both the Council and the Institute will support the publication, exhibition and commercial release of scientific and technical books and films in each other's country.

The agreement also provides that both the parties will keep each other informed of the

32

themes of international scientific congresses,

conferences and symposia hold in the two countries, about their date and the conditions of attendance well in advance.

The Indian National Scientific Documentation Centre and the Hungarian Central Technical Library and Documentation Centre will establish direct contacts. Both these organisations will exchange bibliography, publications, documentation material, photocopies and microfilm copies.

Co-operation of the appropriate organisations like the Hungarian Academy of Sciences will be sought by the Institute of Cultural Relations for the implementation of the agreement in Hungary. Similarly the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research will seek collaboration from the appropriate organisations in India to see that the agreement is fully implemented.

HUNGARY INDIA USA **Date** : Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri K L. Ghei's statement in the Ad Hoc Committee of Finances

Shri K. L. Ghei, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to examine the finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, on February 9, 1966 :

Mr. Chairman,

It was not my intention to make, what in U.N. parlance, is called a general statement. However, as my distinguished colleagues, the Experts representing Canada, USSR, UAR, UK, Hungary, USA and Brazil have made certain general observations, I thought it might have some marginal value if I too made some general observations, on matters which the General Assembly's Resolution 2049 has asked us to examine.

My country and my delegation have been concerned with almost everything which lies behind the work we are attempting to do here. It is not my intention to recount the history of our participation in the U.N. operations in the Middle East and the Congo or the record of the workdone by our contingents in these two operations. Nor is it my intention to mention the details of the part played by the Indian Delegation in the Working Groups of Fifteen and Twentyone or even in the Special Committee on Peace-keeping, the Committee of Thirtythree. The interest of my delegation in the work of the Committee on Contributions and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Question is also well known and I would not enlarge-upon it here. I am merely mentioning, in passing, those Committees and organs of the U.N. which have had a hand in the various areas of U.N.'s work affected by the task currently assigned to us. It is generally agreed that the road which led the U.N. to asking our Committee of Experts to do a specific piece of work was a long and winding one. It is, I feel, no use, at this stage, to pretend that we are such financial experts who, unconnected with everything that lies behind us, can give some peculiarly lofty advice to the Secretary General and to the General Assembly of the United Nations, as well as to all the Executive Heads of the Specialized Agencies and their Governing Bodies, to solve at one go all the financial problems which the U.N. is faced with. The mandate given to us in Resolution 2049 is a clear one. This mandate attempts to isolate the financial aspect of the problem from all the other various aspects and in the words of the Resolution, we have been asked to examine the document delivered to us by the Secretary General i.e. Document A/AC. 124/1, to ask for any additional information we might consider useful and by 31st March 1966 to transmit our comments to all the member States of the U.N., through the Secretary General. To put it in another manner, we have been asked to cut through the jungle of figures and statistics and data and arrive at some agreed quantum of money which can be considered as that sum which, if the U.N. were to have it, would restore the U.N. Treasury to solvency. The financial acts in the performance of the various aspects of work of the U.N. have resulted in the creation of a certain deficit in the U.N. Treasury. What the size of the deficit is, is a point on which different people have got varying points of view. On a quasi-actuarial basis the United Nations Secretariat has given us certain figures in Document A/AC. 124/1, more specially in Table IV of this Document. What is essential for us is to arrive at an agreement round this table of Experts, as to the sum required by the U.N. Treasury so as to eliminate the

33

possibility of Organisation facing financial cmbarrassment.

While attempting this we would necessarily have to trim the figures given as "unliquidated obligations". My delegation would only hope that there would be no further sacrifices demanded from those developing countries which have already done more than their fair share by way of providing services which have been most expensive to themselves and least expensive to the United Nations. And this they have done in addition to meeting in full all the obligations and assessments imposed upon them by various organs of the U.N.--in the pursuit of our common goal of peace. We would also necessarily have to look at the statement made by our distinguished Controller in our meeting on Monday, the February 7, when he said that it would be difficult for the U.N. to make any precise Statewise allocation of the surplus accounts relating to the UNEF and ONUC Special Accounts. While the theoretical basis of the credits in these two surplus accounts is easily understood, the actual basis on which these computations were made may be a little more difficult for us to follow. It would appear to my delegation, in the light of what we have heard in the formal meetings, on this subject, that the entire thing may be within the realm of possible negotiations and consultations amongst the principals.

Unfortunately, in the process of doing this, we may be faced with the prospect of incorporating certain recommendations with a view to ensuring that there is not again a possibility of our being faced with another financial crisis arising out of the residual effects of the present crisis. If I may put it in plainer language. we must consider all possible alternatives of some agreed arrangements regarding Section 12 of the Regular Budget. Between July 1, 1962, and June 30, 1963, the peace-keeping expenses of the U.N. were met out of the Bond issue. The proceeds from the Bond Issue itself were somewhat in excess of the expenses on peace-keeping during that period. This available excess amount was utilised as a sort of augmented Working Capital Fund and, in the interim, a certain amount of amortization of the Bond Issue and Payment of interest upon it has taken place out of the U.N.'s Regular Annual Budgets, as approved in the XVIII, XIX and XX Sessions of the General Assembly. The problem becomes more intricate due to the fact that certain member States have objections of principle to the expenses met out of the re-sources produced by the Bond Issue and also to payments towards amortization of these bonds. However, at the same time, the excess produced by the Bond Issue is being utilized to cover a certain quantum of our overall deficit. All this points to the need for having a simple agreed factual statement of finances without involving ourselves, in the first instance, to the method of solving the crisis. Once such an agreed statement has been produced, it would, be amenable, we hope, to a process of consultations and negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, we hope that a certain amount of the work of our Committee will be done not in the course of formal question-and-answer sessions with the Secretariat or even in the formality of this room, but that a certain amount of informal consultations and negotiations would be possible amongst the principals, and that all the rest of us here would be able to make these consultations and negotiations easier, smoother, and more fruitful. it is for this reason that I would not say very much more than what I have already said as regards the first part of the task assigned to us in operative para 5 of Resolution 2049.

I would not turn to the second part of our task, which has been outlined succinctly in para 6 of the Resolution 2049. I represent a country which has the lowest per capita income in the world; I represent also a country which in the area of endeavour that was covered so far by the Special Fund and the Technical Assistance board, now merged as U.N. Development Programme, has been both a major donor as well as a major beneficiary country. The same is true of our association with the UNICEF and the various Specialised Agencies, in some of which peculiar as it may sound we have been paying our contributions at a rate higher than the percentage we pay into the, U.N. Budget. India has all along considered international cooperation as an exciting experiment in two-way traffic of help and assistance-a traffic which would ensure that the world would grow as one, and that this growth would eliminate these disparities in power --both economic and military-which have in the past produced wars as well as famines.

Mr. Chairman, the various agreements concluded between the UN on the one hand and the Specialised Agencies on the other indicate that as far as the budgetary norms, methods and procedures are concerned, there should be close coordination among the UN and all those agencies which form part of the UN Common System. Since the date the UN was founded not only has its membership as well as that of its specialised Agencies more than doubled, but also the activities of the UN family have multiplied. It should not, therefore, surprise any of us that the budget of the UN has grown from an annual housekeeping budget of 25 million dollars for 1946 to a budget of approximately 120 million dollars for 1966. Similarly, the budgets of all the Specialised Agencies have also increased. We hear, from year to year, complaints that there has been an undue proliferation of meetings and conferences; there is a feeling that there is a

34

certain amount of duplication in comparable or parallel areas of work done by some two or three agencies; there are allegations of a certain amount of wasteful and infructuous expenditure. In para 6 of the Resolution 2049, this Committee has been asked to look into these matters. Ensuring savings, rationalising the work of the Agencies, avoiding duplications, attaining a more thorough coordination of the activities of these organisations, obtaining means of comparing and standardising the different budgets; and generally making certain that Articles 57 and 63 of the Charter as well as various Articles which exist in the agreements concluded by the UN with these Agencies, do not remain unutilizedall this-Mr. Chairman-we wholeheartedly support. However, any attempt to question the absorptive capacity of the UN or of its Specialised Agencies as far as developmental activities which are of interest and benefit to the developing countries; any attempt to establish restrictive ceilings, this my delegation would not be able to agree to. We cannot agree to this because for the first time in human history, in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations the concept of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war his been considered as bearing a direct connection with promoting social progress and attempting to improve standards of life in all the united nations, rich and poor. We cannot agree, to it, Mr. Chairman, because on all of us who have singed the Charter and thus entered into a multilateral international covenant, has devolved the obligation to do all we can, through the United Nations, to promote higher standard of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development, to provide solution of international economic, social, health and related problems and to ensure international cultural and educational cooperation. I would submit that as there is greater expansion in the social and economic activity of the U.N. and of its Specialised Agencies, it merely provides greater evidence that we are attempting to do more adequately what we had set out in 1945 to do. After all, let us not forget that as Professor Gunnar Myrdal has calculated, in the world today, while 40 dollars per annum, per head is being spent on armament, only 4 cents per head per annum is spent on the maintenance of the United Nations and its Specialised Agencies.

INDIA CANADA UNITED KINGDOM USA BRAZIL HUNGARY CONGO MALI

Date : Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NORTH VIETNAM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement about President Ho Chi Minh's Letter to Dr. Radhakrishnan

The following is the text of a statement made by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, in the Lok Sabha on the 17th February, 1966, regarding the letter from the President of North Vietnam to the President of India and the reply thereto:

A letter dated 24 January from President Ho Chi Minh addressed to the President of India was received through our Consul General in Hanoi. In this letter President Ho Chi Minh, besides reiterating the D.R.V.N. position, has expressed the hope that India as Chairman of the International Commission for Supervision and Control will fulfil its obligations under the Geneva Agreements. We have learnt that letters have also been sent by President Ho Chi Minh to other Heads of State.

In his reply to President Ho Chi Minh, the President of India has expressed sympathy for the sufferings of the people of Vietnam and for the aspirations of the Vietnamese people. The President has expressed disappointment that our hope that the stoppage of bombing would lead to a lowering of tensions and eventually to a negotiated peace in Vietnam has not materialised. He has reaffirmed India's objective to work for the reduction of tensions and elimination of conflict. The President has also reiterated India's resolve, as always in the past, to endeavour to secure the implementation of the provisions of the Geneva Agreement as far as it is possible in the present situation, impartially and with despatch.

The Government of India have always been of the view that a peaceful solution should be found to the Vietnam problem within the framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. To this end, the Government have been in touch with other countries interested in seeing the establishment of peace in Vietnam. It must be admitted, however, that so far it has not been possible to help those principally concerned in the reconciliation of their views.

VIETNAM INDIA SWITZERLAND USA

Date : Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Defence Minister's Statement in Parliament on Withdrawal of Armed Forces under Tashkent Agreement

The following is the, text of a statement made by the Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, in Parliament on February 17, 1966 :

I would like to inform the House that the Chief of the Army Staff, India, held discussions with the C-in-C, Pakistan Army, at Rawalpindi, on February 9 and 10, 1966. Honorable Members recall that the C-in-C, Pakistan Army, had conic to Delhi on January 21 and held discussions with the Chief of the Army Staff about the arrangements to be made for the withdrawal of armed personnel in pursuance of the Tashkent Agreement. The visit of the Chief of the Army Staff to Pakistan was to continue discussions regarding further arrangements in the same direction.

Under Article II of the, Tashkent declaration, the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan had agreed that all armed personnel of the two countries should be withdrawn not later than February 25, 1966 to the positions they held prior to August 5, 1965, and both sides should observe the cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line. In accordance with the arrangements arrived at on the 21st, the forces on both sides have become disengaged and defences on either side of the cease-fire, line all, along the western sector are in the process of demolition. Exchange of prisoners has also made substantial progress. In the agreement that has been now arrived at by the Chief of the Army Staff with the C-in-C, Pakistan Army, it has been agreed that "in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the quantum of regular troops, paramilitary forces and armed civilians who may be considered to constitute a military potential, to be located in the State, will not be more than as accepted by UNMOGIP in the context of the 1949 Karachi Agreement. The bringing down of armed personnel to these numbers will be completed by April 1, 1966 and be certified as having been done by UNMOGIP."

This arrangement is to give effect to the provision in the Tashkent Agreement to observe cease-fire term on the cease-fire line. It is expected to reduce tension all along the cease-fire line 'and prevent a recurrence of the sequence of events which led to infiltration and armed clashes last year. The provision under which in the context of the Karachi Agreement regular troops, paramilitary forces and armed civilians are restricted should be of great value in establishing a state of affairs which will prevent a recurrence of the events of last year.

PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TASHKENT MEETING

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Tashkent Declaration

The following is the text of a statement made by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in the Lok Sabha on February 15, 1966 regarding the Tashkent Declaration :

As the House is aware, at the initiative of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Kosygin, there was a meeting between Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri and President Ayub Khan of Pakistan in Tashkent. The Prime Minister and the President met in a plenary session in the presence of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. on January 4, 1966. Thereafter, there were a series of informal talks between the Prime Minister and the President. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. remained in close touch with both the Heads of Government. On January 10, 1966, the Prime, Minister and the President signed the Tashkent Declaration.

The greater part of the discussions in Tashkent centred round the basic question of renunciation of force. Prime Minister Shastri made it clear that the main, point was whether or not the two countries wanted to live in peace and settle their dis-

36

putes without resort to force. The President of Pakistan raised the question of Kashmir as the basic issue which had to be settled before the two countries could live peacefully and as good neighbours. Prime Minister Shastri, in his talks with President Ayub Khan, made it clear that it was not possible for India to deviate from its position that Kashmir was an integral part of India and India's sovereignty over Jammu and Kashmir was not negotiable. Eventually, there was agreement as embodied in Article I of the Declaration.

For many years in the past India had emphasised the importance of the two countries agreeing that all disputes and differences between them should be settled peacefully, without resort to arms. Unfortunately, no agreement could be reached on such a declaration between the two countries. The success of the Tashkent Declaration consists in the fact that both countries have now agreed not to have. recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means. This has been done by a categorical reaffirmation in the Declaration of the obligations under the Charter of the United Nations to refrain from the use of force in settling international disputes. In the Tashkent Declaration, India and Pakistan have chosen to turn away from mutual conflict and have resolved to base their relations on peace, friendship and good neighbourliness.

Article II of the Declaration provides the withdrawal of all armed personnel of the two

countries, not later than February 25, 1966, to the pre-August 5 positions, as required in U.N. Resolutions. The fullest consideration was given to all aspects of the question of withdrawals before agreeing to this clause. In his letter of September 14, 1965, to the U.N. Secretary-General, Prime Minister Shastri had stated--

"that when consequent upon the cease-fire becoming effective further details are considered, we shall not agree to any disposition which will leave the door open to further infiltrations or prevent us from dealing with infiltrations that have taken place."

Under the Declaration, Pakistan has not only agreed to withdraw all armed personnel, but also undertaken not to resort to force for the settlement of any disputes and to respect the cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line. There is the further provision of non-interference by either country in the other's internal affairs. Armed infiltrations across the cease-fire line. would be wholly contrary to the Tashkent Declaration. The conditions laid down in the late Prime Minister's letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations have thus been met.

The discouragement of hostile propaganda and encouragement a propaganda which promotes the development of friendly relations, will be a positive factor for the promotion of good neighbourly relations. It is hoped that propaganda of the kind which caused resentment in India and marred relations between the two countries, will be, a thing of the past.

The Declaration provides for the normalisation of relations between the two countries and for bilateral discussions, in a friendly atmosphere, to resolve various problems between the two countries.

Steps have already been taken towards the implementation of the, Declaration. Agreement has been reached between the Chiefs of Armed Forces in both countries in regard to the withdrawal of forces on the west and for the avoidance of tensions. It has also been agreed that armed forces of both sides among the eastern borders will withdraw from forward positions and will not in any circumstances resort to firing. The High Commissioners of both countries have returned to their respective posts and normal diplomatic relations have been resumed. Over-flights of scheduled air services of both countries across each other's territory have. been resumed. Exchange of prisoners taken by either side has been completed to a large extent. The Government of India have proposed a Ministers' level meeting at which various other matters concerning the normalisation of relations and further steps towards the implementation of the Declaration could be discussed. Restoration of posts and telegraphs and telecommunications between the two countries is being arranged.

India and Pakistan have now the opportunity of living in peace and friendly co-operation. The Tashkent Declaration, sincerely observed and implemented, will, it is hoped, contribute to the prosperity and progress of the 600 million people of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent.

In conclusion, I would express the deep appreciation of the Government of India of the initiative and good offices of Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, which made the Tashkent meeting a success.

UZBEKISTAN USA PAKISTAN INDIA MALI **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TASHKENT MEETING

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lek Sabha initiating the Debate on Tashkent Declaration

The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on February 16, 1966, while initiating the debate on the Tashkent Declaration :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Tashkent Declaration be taken into considedation."

I must confess that I might have been able to give a little longer statement at this stage, but the insistence on the part of the hon. Members to ask questions about the tragic circumstances under which we lost our Prime Minister has brought vividly back to my mind-and I am sure to the mind of my colleague, Shri Chavan, alsothe very tragic and touching circumstances that were prevailing at the time we heard in our own hotel about the sudden illness of our late Prime Minister.

Sir, after this lapse of time and perhaps in an atmosphere which is different when we have got our own countrymen around us, we can look back with perhaps a little critical eye and with certain objectivity. But we would not be human beings if it were expected that we would be able to face all that in the fortitude that is normally expected from us...

Mr. Speaker, Sir the circumstances and the back-ground in which the two Heads of Governments of India and Pakistan, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and President Ayub Khan, met in Tashkent are well known. The late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, before the House adjourned on the last occasion, did make a statement about his intention to go to Tashkent and several hon. Members belonging to different parties and different groups made some observations on that occasion. He responded to the suggestion made by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of U.S.S.R. to go to Tashkent and he agreed to have discussions with President Ayub Khan, so that the relations between the two neighbouring countries, India and Pakistan, might improve. It is not for me to take any time on the description of those relations. I can say that, ever since Partition, in spite of our best efforts at the governmental level and even at non-governmental level, the relations between the two countries, India and Pakistan, continued to be highly strained and this culminated in a clash of armed forces. India faced the aggression and India valiantly ought to maintain the integrity and sovereignty of the country. Our thought first of all goes, when we talk of this conflict, to the valiant soldiers, the valiant airmen and the valiant members of the security forces,

police and others, who fought so valiantly and so bravely to save the honour and dignity of our country and to repel the aggression. The spontaneous co-operation offered by the civilian population in actual sustenance of the efforts which had been made by the armed forces and also the Psychological impression and feeling of cohesion, of unity, that was created in the country will always remain as the most heart-warming experiences of all of us.

At this stage, it is not my intention to go into the details thereof. When we went to Tashkent, the cease-fire which had been agreed upon by Pakistan and India was very uneasy, and there were violations and violations almost every day, and tens or dozens of these violations sometimes took place in the different sectors in which the two Armies were confronting each other. If my memory helps me aright, we have already lodged protests against something like 1600 or 1700 violations of the cease-fire, before the UN Observers; and there were shootings sometimes by civilians and sometimes by Army men. This was the state of affairs even after a formal declaration by the two Governments, that they had accepted the ceasefire in response to the resolution and the appeals issued by the Security Council and the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

There was no agreement and there was not even a purposeful discussion about the withdrawal of armed personnel. The two Armies were interlocked. I myself had occasion to go to some of the forward areas, as I am sure many hon. Members of this House must have done; we had soldiers on either side in trenches and the like, facing each other in the fields with desolation all round, and everyone in a grip of tension. This was the state of affairs when we went to Tashkent.

Before going to Tashkent, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri had taken this august Home and the country into confidence about his way of thinking. On the political question, namely, about Jammu and Kashmir. he had made a very cleat statement inside the House and outside that this is an integral part of India, and the sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir is not negotiable. About this stand, he said that this is our stand on Jammu and Kashmir. I can say without the least hesitation, and with great sense of pride that he stuck steadfast to this position all through these talks in Tashkent, and he did not budge an inch from that stand. He had said when he was there that if the, other side said anything about Kashmir or suggested that this was the Pakistan attitude about Kashmir, he would not run away from that meeting or conference or he would not say that he was going to shut his ear. to that; but he said in his own inimitable way That when any such question was raised, he would reiterate the Indian position in unmistakable terms, and this was the promise which he redeemed throughout these talks, and this is reflected in title Declaration itself. In the Declaration itself it is clearly mentioned that each side reiterated its position on the question of Jammu and Kashmir. Therefore, there is no doubt that this position was very clearly reiterated.

It is true tat Pakistan did not accept our position just as we do not accept their attitude on this, and if I may say so, there was agreement to disagree, and this was not left to chance or speculation but was mentioned in the Declaration itself

38

that each side reiterated its respective stand on the question of Jammu and Kashmir.

On the question of restoration of peace which was the main objective before Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri when he went there, and about which he made no secret, he very patiently, very gently, but very firmly pursued that line from the very begining of these talks.

I was glancing through the very clear statement that he had made in the plenary session at the time when this conference opened. As the House is no doubt aware, the conference opened at Tashkent in the presence of Mr Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR with his other distinguished colleagues, President Ayub Khan with his Ministers and other senior members of his delegation, and we were also present at that time. It is very important to note that in the very initial stages, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri clearly spelt out the objectives that were before him when he entered these talks and discussions which came later.

I would like to remind the House about one or two significant passages in the opening speech of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. I am referring to this only to show that what he said in the initial stages really he achieved towards the end when the Tashkent Declaration was actually finalised, and some of the ideas which he had projected in the initial stages were actually embodied in one form or the other in the final Declaration itself. I shall not take long over this, and I shall read out only the most important parts of his speech.

One of the things that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in his statement on January 4th, at the time of the plenary session said, was this :

"I know there are many unresolved differences between our two countries. Even between countries with the best of relationship there are differences and even disputes. The question which we have both to face is whether we should think of force as a method of solving them or whether we should decide and declare that force will never be used. If other countries, even those with vast resources and much deeper differences, can avoid an armed conflict and live together on the basis of peaceful coexistence, should not countries like India and Pakistan whose main problem is the economic betterment of their people give up the idea of solving any problems by recourse to arms ?"

I shall not read out the subsequent parts, though they are important, but I shall refer to one other part, which was as follows :

"The foundation of good neighbourly relationship should be, as I have said, the acceptance of the policy of peaceful coexistence. In pursuance of this, action will have to be, taken on several fronts."

He even enumerated those fronts. He said :

"For instance, the atmosphere of cold war has to be removed. If through propaganda in the press or by radio, a feeling of animosity or distrust is generated and sustained between the two countries, whatever we as Heads of' two Governments might say, there will always exist the danger of a conflict. Our aim should be to improve the totality of the relationship between the two countries. Our trade has been shrinking; it should prow instead. Many rivers flow between India and Pakistan; instead of being a source of controversy, they could through co-operative endeavour enrich both our countries. There are many other areas of economic co-operation which goodwill and understanding can be developed to our mutual advantage."

I am referring to this in order to show that when Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri went, the immediate objective before him was that of reversing the trend that unfortunately bedevilled the relations between India and Pakistan. Not only was he conscious that without reversing this trend, good relations and good neighbourly relations would not develop and would not be strengthened between the two countries, but he had a positive picture before him of developing and strengthening the economic relations so that the normal relations between the two countries should develop and prosper and get strengthened.

When he said that, immediately thereafter, being a great realist, he had said :

"In saying all this, I am not trying to suggest that we could shut our eyes to the many points of difference that exist between the two countries. I do not want to enumerate them. But what I do say, however, is that all these problems must be resolved through talks and negotiation's and not by resort to force. An armed conflict creates more problems than it solves. It is an impediment to understanding and agreement. On the other hand, in an atmosphere of peace, we can make real progress towards solving the differences between us."

I am sorry I read this out, but I could not find better words really in support of the basic philosophy behind the Tashkent Agreement than the words of our late Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. These words he did not utter after the finalisation of the agreement, but they were something prophetic in the opening address that he made.

39

All the essential ingredients of the Tashkent Declaration are embodied in these sentiments which were so vividly and so touchingly expressed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in his opening speech.

If this Tashkent Declaration is examined in that background, I am sure that every section of this hon. House and I hope our countrymen at large-will be convinced that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri went to Tashkent with certain clear objectives before him; and we are very happy and very proud, in retrospect, to recall that he succeeded in a very large measure in reversing the trends that existed between the two countries and in generating an atmosphere of peace and in stabilising peace between our two countries. I am a realist enough, having been involved in these Indo-Pakistan problems ever since the unfortunate partition took place and Pakistan was created as a separate country; I myself had to deal with various problems, very painful problems, even when I was in Punjab, the huge problems that were created by migration of people, division of assets and the like and all the tensions that got built up. It is very easy for people sitting and taking a very theoretical view and trying to scrutinise each and every word and attempting to point out that an 'i' could be dotted or a 't' could be crossed, but it is easily forgotten that if the objective to be achieved is the reversal of the unfortunate trend, that has to be done an a somewhat reciprocal basis. It was also his objective, which he did not at any time hide, that 'while sticking to my basic stand, while sticking to the realisation of the basic objective, I am flexible enough to see the viewpoint of the other party also', because he was not a person who would like to adopt an attitude where at the end he could say, 'I have turned down all the points that were suggested by the other side and I have achieved all that I wanted to'. That was not the spirit in which he entered these discussions.

I am mentioning this because it is very easy to criticise these things. If I alone were the author of that document, if an Indian representative had probably had to draft this Declaration, its language could be different, its content could perhaps be stronger. But let us always remember that this was a document which was evolved as a result of very elaborate discussions, and the attitude on our side--I will be quite frank in saying that--was not to take a rigid stand. We were fully aware---I and my colleague, Shri Chavan, were assisting our late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, assisted by our advisers--we were always conscious of, and kept before us, the basic objective. Sticking to our basic objective, we did not want to take such a rigid attitude that no option was left to the other side except to say 'no'. Also, we were anxious; to achieve a solution which should be broadly acceptable not only to the two Governments or the heads of government but to the people of India and to the people of Pakistan.

Therefore, I would beg of this hon. House to scrutinise this agreement in that background also. It is not a document of which I alone am the author. It is a compromise document. You may find that there are adjustments at several occasions, adjustments which we very carefully scrutinised to meet the viewpoint of the other side I was submitting that there are portions in this document which can be regarded as compromise proposals or proposals which are the result of a compromise between two different viewpoints. In fact, I am happy that we were able to achieve this agreement in which either side, when they would go to their country. could project to their own people that this is something in which there is no defeat for any party, but there is this gain because both sides have gained peace and our efforts on both sides have to be directed to stabilise and strengthen that peace and to give real content to that concept of peace which is the king-pin of the Tashkent Declaration.

Having said that, I would now like to mention some of the points which have been worrying certain hon. Members of this House and even people outside. Before doing that, I would very humbly urge, and very earnestly appeal to, all sections of the House and my countrymen at large not to view this as a party issue. This is a national issue and we have to look to the interests of the country as a whole, to the interests of the people as a whole. I would appeal to hon. Members not to make political capital of it but to view it as an issue which concerns all of us.

One of the points of criticism in the statements of some hon. Members in the press and elsewhere is about the withdrawals. On this, I would not like to say much. I would only draw attention of the House to the stand that the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, had taken when he was approached by the UN Secretary-General for a cease-fire and for withdrawals. In response to that, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in his letter to the UN Secretary-General of 14 September 1965 had stated this :

"Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Secretary-General, that when consequent upon the 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."

40

This was the, criterion, that, be had enunciated. This he had repeated in different forms in the House, in the other place and also in his statements to the press. We have to examine whether the Tashkent Declaration, judged in the light of these statements, answers some of the doubts that have been raised. May be, the doubts had been raised about the wisdom or propriety of the withdrawals of the armed forces without appreciating the various aspects.

In this connection, without going into details, I would mention three salient points. In the Tashkent Declaration there is the agreement signed by the two Heads of government that they will not have recourse to the use of force for settlement of any dispute between the two countries. Secondly, they have agreed that there will be non-interference in the internal affairs of each other. Thirdly, that in the Jammu and Kashmir State cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line will be observed. Now, if these conditions are faithfully carried out by each side, the basic condition that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had made when he wrote to the Secretary-General, and which he repeated in different forms in the House and outside, is satisfied. I claim that these three conditions fully answer any doubt that may arise in the mind of any hon. Member here.

Sending of infiltrators, armed infiltrators, as was done by Pakistan and under their inspiration and guidance, when they sent people in this manner into the State of Jammu and Kashmir, that was obviously use of force. What else is use of force if sending of armed infiltrators into another territory is not use of force ? This is obviously use of force.

Observance of the cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line is another important thing. Then non-interference in international affairs. I am conscious. I know that some of the doubts that have been raised in the minds of the hon. Members and other persons with the best of intentions---I do not say anything against any individual-may be due to some of the interpretations which have been put in an onesided manner by commentators or sometimes even by public men, even Ministers of Pakistan, but it will be a very unsatisfactory state of affairs if we are deflected from an objective interpretation of something which is in writing, and if we get excited about the onesided interpretation that might be put on any provision on the other side. The obvious course that is open to us at that time is to clearly state that their interpretation is incorrect, and that we have taken care to clarify on various occasions. That is why I am saying that our interpretation, which is borne out by the text and by the background and by the circumstances, is guite clear and guite unambiguous that these three conditions definitely take care of infiltrators. I would like to add one thing more I was saving that the three conditions that are embodied in the Declaration Provide fully the necessary guarantees, the necessary agreement, and this definitely covers the infiltrators.

I would like to remind the hon. House that even Pakistan does not claim that they have the right to send infiltrators. They have never owned any responsibility for the infiltrators. We have always tried to pin down the responsibility on them. It is something which is not even claimed by them that by this agreement they have the right to send infiltrators. So, why should we say something which is not even suggested or claimed by them? It is quite obvious that non-use of force, observance of the cease-fire terms, non-interference in internal affairs, these three are very important points, and this is the real basis for our interpretation, which is fully borne out by the background and the circumstances, that infiltrators are covered.

About withdrawals, the occupation of Kargil, Haji Pir and Tithwal, as was stated by my colleague, Shri Chavan in the House and also by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri on several occasions, was necessitated by the military situation that faced us. Here were these large numbers of armed infiltrators coming in. We approached Pakistan that they should own responsibility and withdraw them. They did neither of the two. We had, therefore, to defend our territory, and to prevent infiltration we moved to these places. We went to Kargil because we had to protect our lines of communication to the Ladakh arm All those actions had been taken with the object of safeguarding our integrity, safeguarding our sovereignty over these areas, and therefore, after these three conditions have been agreed upon that cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line will be observed, non-use of force, which. I have said, covers infiltrators, and non-interference in internal affairs, our continuance in those areas was a question about which we did not take a decision lightly. We were faced with this position (Interruptions).

At this stage I would say both withdrawal and the question of infiltrators are. linked with the three conditions, the three important decisions that had been agreed upon between the two Governments, and this explains the withdrawal.

We were in Haji Pir, we were in Kargil, we were in Tithwal. We were also in the Lahore and Sialkot sector, and Pakistan was in the Chhamb sector; they were also in Amritsar District in the Khemkaran area and they were also in certain parts in Rajasthan. So, the question that was before my colleague Shri Chavan and myself was this. Shri Chavan gave a great deal of consideration to the military aspect, and all of us had to take a decision as to whether

41

there will be justification for us to continue to stay in Haji Pir, in Tithwal and in Kargil and to face also the situation that Pakistan continues to stay in Chhamb and in Khemkaran and Rajasthan, and we continue to stay in Sialkot and Lahore after these three conditions had been agreed upon. I may make it clear, and I am sure that any person who dispassionately exammines the situation will agree with me, that after these three conditions are fulfilled, it does not stand to reason that this military confrontation between the two countries should continue, that our soldiers should continue to lie in the trenches and in the fields facing each other at a distance of 50 to 100 yards, with sniping going on all the time, with cease-fire violations and killings going on, with civilians on either side in the grip of tension and the 600 million people of India and Pakistan always under this tension.

I would most earnestly appeal to the hon. Members to view it in that background. We were fully convinced that after these agreements we must accept this disengagement and must withdraw. It was in pursuance of this very careful examination that Lal Bahadur Shastri came to the conclusion that notwithstanding the agreement on these three issues, if we continue confrontation we would not be acting in the best interests of the people of India and Pakistan and we would also be creating the impression all over the world that notwithstanding these reasonable arrangements these countries were determined to carry on the policy of confrontation and tension. So, we have to view this question of withdrawals in the background of these observations that I have made.

There are other positive features of this agreement. Some people say that this might affect our military preparedness. That is a subject on which Shri Chavan with his intimate knowledge and the way he has handled our defences at a very crucial and difficult moment is more qualified to give any further detail. He had applied his mind very carefully and he and his advisers were of the view that far from affecting our defence preparedness any lessening of tension in one area obviously adds to the defence potential. There is an arrangement here that them will be various meetings at Ministers' level and official level so that this polarisation, this unfortunate cutting of all lines of communication that has taken place as a result of the conflict and the mounting tensions--these should disappear. People at various levels and directly concerned with all aspects of governmental and public life should meet each other and try to resolve the problems that require to be solved, for the two countries have to live in good neighbourly relations.

Tashkent Declaration can broadly be divided into two parts. The first part that I have touch-

ed upon gave a great deal of attention to undoing the many complications that had arisen as a result of the conflict. Diplomatic relations had virtually, though not formally, been snapped; the missions were not functioning; there was no communication between the two; overflights were not there. A number of other things have happened. There were internees and prisoners on either side. All these problems that had been thrown up as a result of the armed conflict were sought to be normalised and normal neighbourly relations between the two neighbours were sought to be restored. The central philosophy was the insistence on peace. The actions that were taken really follow from that. It is not my intention to go in greater detail. I have confined myself to certain broad aspects and a broad approach and the main structure of the Tashkent Declaration. I want to make it clear that we on our side are determined to implement very faithfully and very conscientiously this agreement which was, if I may say so, the last gift of our late Prime Minister Shastri to our country. He led the country in an admirable manner when our country faced aggression and the honour and dignity of the country was raised by the heroic manner in which we defended our country under his leadership. I am sure that the path of peace is really our normal way of thinking and it is a path which we ourselves have asked other countries to follow because we genuinely believe in the path of peace. The return to the path of peace should be a matter of satisfaction rather than a matter of criticism or concern to any section in our House.

UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TASHKENT MEETING

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Lok Sabha Debate on Tashkent Declaration

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following speech in the Lok Sabha on February 21, 1966, in reply to the debate on the Tashkent Declaration:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to bon. Members who, while participating in this debate, lent massive support to the Tashkent Declaration. I am very happy that this support came not only from hon. Members belonging to this side of the House but several hon. Members from the Opposition Benches also supported the Tashkent Declaration, and have given on many occasions more

42

reasons and arguments in favour of acceptance of the Declaration by the country. This expresses the determination of our people to treat this as a nonparty issue, as a national issue.

My task in replying has been greatly lightened. It is very much easier as several hon. Members who have already participated and have lent their support to the Tashkent Declaration have given various arguments and reasons to remove some of the doubts that had been raised by those hon. Members who criticised the Declaration. I will not, therefore, be long in my reply. I will try to confine myself to meeting some of the specific points that have been raised by hon. Members who criticised the Declaration.

At this stage, I would like to say that a desire has been expressed by hon. Members that the Prime Minister should also make some statement on the Tashkent Declaration in the House. I am sure that this request, this wish that has been expressed on the floor of the House, will be conveyed to the Prime Minister, and in her intervention in the debate on the President's Address, she can include her own statement on the Declaration. (interruption).

The question of withdrawals of armed personnel from Haji Pir, Tithwal and Kargil has come tip for comments; it has also been criticised by certain hon. Members, The question of infiltrators has also been mentioned. As a matter of fact, these two points are inter-connected, and I would like to say something on these two points together. We have first to see the objective that we had before us when the Indian armed forces moved to Kargil, the Tithwal and to Haji Pir. It is very important because we were facing aggression, and this massive aggression originated in the form of a large number of armed personnel crossing over to that part of Jammu and Kashmir which is in the actual possession and control, administrative and the rest, of the Government of India.

When we took up this matter with the Pakistan Government and pointed out to them the serious situation created by these armed infiltrators coming across into Indian territory, the Government of Pakistan did not accept any responsibility. It then became necessary for us to take defensive measures to check infiltration, because the responsibility in this respect was not accepted by the Government of Pakistan. It was in that context that the Indian armed forces moved into these two passes, Tithwal and Haji Pir, and we moved into Kargil because our line of communication to the Ladakh area was under constant threat by the sniping and other provocative acts which were indulged in by the Pakistan forces. These were the objectives before us when we moved to these passes.

We have now to see whether, when we agreed to withdraw, our objective had not been realised, whether the reason for which we moved to these passes still persisted at the time we agreed to this withdrawal We gave very careful consideration to the various aspects. This was a very serious matter, and we attached a very great deal of importance to it. It was necessary for us to give the most careful consideration to the implications of the step that we were taking in agreeing to the withdrawal from these areas.

As I said when I initiated this debate, three conditions were agreed to by Pakistan. Firstly, both countries agreed that the use of force would be abjured in the settlement of any dispute, secondly that cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line would be adhered to and respected by the two parties, and thirdly that there would be noninterference in each other's internal affairs. Even one of these considerations or conditions is enough to correct the mischief that can be created by the movement of infiltrators.

Sending armed infiltrators, for instance, is obvi-

ously use of force, and if both parties agree that force will not be used for the enforcement of any claim or the settlement of any dispute, obviously they cannot say that they will send these infiltrators in the exercise of their right to enforce a claim or to settle a dispute. It is quite another thing, a separate issue to which I will come, as to whether they will respect this or not, but my point is : is the sending of infiltrators protected or call it be resorted to by any loophole that is there in the agreement ? My contention is that we should keep these two things separate, the interpretation of the agreement and their intentions or the question whether they will respect the terms of the agreement or not. At this stage, I am on this question whether the agreement itself covers armed infiltrators or whether, notwithstanding the terms of this agreement and even if they adhered to this agreement, they can make out a ease that they can send infiltrators Pakistan has at no stage said that they have got the right to send infiltrators. AU along they have denied having sent infiltrators, and even now they do not say that they have the right to send infiltrators. It is an important point. One of the first conditions of the agreement is not to use force, and sending armed infiltrators is use of force. That is what I am trying to contend. It is quite clear that even Pakistan has not said that they are entided to send infiltrators or to use force even if Kashmir is not an internal matter of India. We do not accept the Pakistan contention that Jammu and Kashmir is not an integral part of India, and any interference by sending infiltrators, even by whipping up agitations there or trying to support those who are not accepting the writ of the local government there, is very much interference. We do not accept their interpretation of Jammu and

43

Kashmir not being an internal problem or an internal responsibility of the Government of India (interruptions).

The important point that I was mentioning at this stage was that this question of infiltrators and their being sent is covered by this condition which has been agreed upon between the two sides. I will not repeat it.

The second point that has been mentioned is that they do not accept Jammu and Kashmir as the internal problem of India, and therefore there may be a loophole for sending infiltrators. My reply to this is two-fold. Firstly, it is our interpretation, it is our very firm stand, that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India, and that its sovereignty is not negotiable. In these circumstances, we do not accept this interpretation that they have got the right to interfere in this. So far as the question of armed infiltrators is concerned, whatever may be their position with regard to Jammu and Kashmir, even if they are keeping up a dispute on that issue which we do not accept,--we clearly say that there is no dispute--even then I contend that the clause relating to non-use of force covers this completely and any step that they take to interfere with the established administration on one side of the ceasefire line is a clear violation of the Tashkent Declaration, and is therefore something about which we need not have any doubt in our minds....

The late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri had also said : if the other party says that it wants to discuss Kashmir or they want to ram some point, all that I have to do is to state clearly that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India; that is the position to which India, he said, would steadfastly adhere. In this context, at the meetings in Tashkent between our late Prime Minister and President Ayub Khan, it is a fact that President Ayub did raise the question of Kashmir.

Our late Prime Minister made a clear and categorical statement that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and that is the position to which he strongly adhered; we are not going to alter that position. As to what President Ayub said, or their Foreign Minister said, they are well known; they say from time to time that the people of that area should be permitted to express their desire about their future. If in reply to that we categorically reject any such claims and reiterate our stand on Jammu and Kashmir, it is not discussing the question of Kashmir, it is only reiteration of the position and that fact, Mr. Speaker, is clearly enunciated in the Declaration. The Declaration says that the two sides reiterated their position. Prof. Hem Barua is hurling the declaration at us. We went through every word of it. Shri Dwivedy raised a point that the position and manner in which this sentence is used perhaps might cast some cloud on our assertion. It is

not at all correct. Article I says that the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agree that both sides will exert all efforts to create good neighbourliness between India and Pakistan in accordance with the U.N. Charter. It is unexceptionable. They reaffirm their obligation under the Charter not to have recourse to force but to settle their disputes through peaceful means. I would very strongly urge that this is a very clear and categorical reaffirmation of the obligation not to use force. This should not be lightly dismissed; this is a clear affirmation of their obligation. They considered that the interests of peace in tire region, particularly in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent and indeed the interests of the people of India and Pakistan were not served by the continuance of tension between the two countries. They also said that our attitude should be to develop good neighbourly relations, to discontinue tension. It was in this context and in this background that Jammu and Kashmir was discussed and each side set forth its respective position. I have already said what our position was : namely, that it is an integral part of India. The other party said that they have got their own claim. They agreed to disagree on this issue. To bring about good neighbourly relations, they said there were other matters which should be attended to and the rest of the declaration proceeds to mention some of these other matters. The mention in this background under which Jammu and Kashmir was discussed is a point which clearly brings out our clear statement and position of Jammu and Kashmir. I would also like to mention that in the course of my talks with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and his colleague, talks during which on our side my colleague Shri Chavan and other members of the delegation were present, I reiterated our position and our stand on Jammu and Kashmir in unmistakable terms. Some hon. Members here and some outside had mentioned that the country should be told as to what was talked between the two sides. I would like to clarify the position.

The Indian position on Jammu and Kashmir was not whittled down in the slightest and we reiterated in clear and unmistakable terms our stand and Pakistan is in no doubt about our stand. No newspaper, no critic or supporter of the Tashkent Declaration from Pakistan has ever asserted that India has deviated from its stand on Jammu and Kashmir. On an issue on which even Pakistan does not claim that we have changed our stand on Jammu and Kashmir, it is not wise or in our national interest to continue to agitate these points and unnecessarily to create doubts even when the other party is in no doubt.

I do not want to go into the whole history of how this wave of infiltration started and how we took preventive action by moving into some of

44

the passes and how vigorously our security forces took very stern and effective measures to deal with the infiltrators who were operating in the Jammu and Kashmir territory...(Interruptions).

The infiltrators who had crossed over were being dealt with and our security forces and out police made a very thorough job of it. If ultimately we were able to control the situation it was due to the effective steps that were taken by the security forces. I would also like to add that the government of Jammu and Kashmir and, it I may add, the people there, acted very strongly and they fully cooperated with these steps taken by the authorities in dealing with the infiltrators. It was this support given to us, the lack of the response which mistakenly Pakistan thought they would get front the people, which was mainly responsible in thwarting the designs of the infiltrators. We are grateful to the people who gave information to the local authorities. We had a large number of non-officials who traced the movement of these people and supplied information to the authorities which ultimately led to the mopping up operations and in providing the necessary security to the areas and to the targets which unfortunately had been aimed at by the infiltrators.

I would also like to add that after the ceasefire operations, alhtough Pakistan did continue to keep this posture that they had never sent these infiltrators, and continued to disown their responsibility, we have definite infomration that they called upon these people, who had been sent across, to return to that area. We had definite information on that score, and a large bulk of these people actually crossed over into the other territory. (Interruption). Our security forces also have been stepping up their efforts which continued after the cease-fire, because our Prime Minister had made it absolutely clear that any cease-fire agreement that is arrived at or any cease-fire arrangement that is accepted does not mean that our efforts to deal with the infiltrators or to deal with them effectively would in any way be influenced by the cease-fire. We made the position clear that this is an internal, law and order matter, and we had to function effectively. It was the combined effect of these two things: the continuous drive by our security and armed forces, the civilians and the civilian governmentall this combined effort put so much pressure on them and they found, particularly after the cease-fire, that there was no point in their staying on, and a large number were actually thrown out and pushed back into the other territory. Out of the total number of infiltrators who were in thousands, a good bulk has been thrown back. A large number of them were killed; some of them were also arrested. The number that might be left there might be very, very small. It is very difficult for me to give any number, but it cannot be more than a few adds and ends, say half a dozen or 10 people in one remote area or the other, I have not got the census or the list. If I knew the exact number, I will get hold of then, or kill them or shoot them, those who come here without any authority. But the point is, the Pakistan Government, naturally from the very beginning, had taken the attitude that they are not concerned with them, that they have not sent them; we have information that they had done so and they had sent across these people. We had information that they were receiving messages and we intercepted some of those messages, and it was on that basis that we kept the country and this House fully informed about their activity; that they were sent across and they were supported. We had also information--we had definite information-that they were withdrawn after the cease-fire. So, this was a combined effect of the two-pronged operation, pressure by us, by our security forces, and also their attitude that they wanted to withdraw. In a matter like this, we have to see the results and need not insist on a public statement that they have withdrawn. I am sure that even oil this statement of mine they might say, "No; we never sent anyone; we have not withdrawn anyone." They may say as in their earlier statement that "We have not sent any man even in the initial stages". So, we have to look to the situation on the ground and view it realistically, and realise that in future, these conditions are accepted : that non-use of force is accepted; noninterference in one's internal affairs is accepted; and that observance of the cease-fire terms the cease-fire line is accepted for after that, sending in armed personnel across the cease-fire line is a clear violation of the cease-fire terms and the cease-fire line. So, in actual fact also, based upon this agreement that they have entered upon, we were. fully satisfied that the question of infiltrators hereafter is not likely to arise and it is covered by the agreement because it was thereafter that we agreed in respect of Haji Pir and Tithwal, the passes through which we had moved in order to check further infiltration ... (interruptions).

We are clear that if the terms of the agreement are adhered to, then, the question of sending infiltrators does not arise. It is a very pertinent question and a practical question: that is, if they do not adhere to the obligations that they have undertaken, then what is the guarantee? It is a very pertinent question. But the reply to this is linked up with all the other agreements that have been entered into between the two countries. In a matter like this, if we start with this attitude that any agreement that is entered into is not likely to be adhered to, they will find sonic excuses to go back upon the agreement, then, the reply is that we know bow to deal with the situation. Then a new situation develops altogether. The agreement is clear. If they do not adhere to

45

it, if they go behind the agreement and they do not faithfully carry out their obligations under the agreement and surreptitiously take resort to something else then it is a clear violation of the agreement; then a situation arises, and we will take the sternest measure to meet the situation, and of that we have never made any secret. I would beg of this House to see that the agreement is very clear, and that the ultimate protection in this case is provided by the agreement and by their adherence to this agreement. If the agreement is not adhered to, it depends upon our capacity to deal with the situation. Many of our foreign friends, sympathetic friends, have many times mentioned to us that a country of 45 crores or 48 crores of people hardly needs to go to the international community to say that this is a nuisance by the infiltrators and that there should be some solemn agreement on their part that they will never send the infiltrators. They have admitted their responsibility, though not in these clear words, that if the terms are adhered to, it is covered. If they do not observe the terms then it is a situation where our strength and our capacity to deal with them will be the real guarantee. That is something which we should not lose sight of (interruptions).

Sending the infiltrators is a clear interference in our internal affairs. Even if they unilaterally do not accept it, it cannot be an explanation of the declaration terms. Thirdly, this is a contravention of the cease-fire terms. Sending in armed personnel across the cease-fire line is contravention of the cease-fire terms.

The other broad political issue which Mr. Nath Pai raised is vital. In fact, that is the most important issue which cuts across anywords that might be used : What is the ultimate guarantee in these cases ? For that the reply is, we have to depend upon our strength and we have to tell the world, As they have told us on many occasions, if the infiltrators come, notwithstanding this agreement, the answer is, shoot them; hang them in the passes. That will be the biggest deterrent. Even on this occasion, although they started in a surreptitious manner, although it caused some worry to us, the way we dealt with this problem effectively is the biggest guarantee that they will not try again. What have they gained by this, except that they have lost hundreds of people and they had eaten their words? When Pakistan embarked upon this misadventure, they had all types of flamboyant statements to make : "We are doing this with this object or that object". It is not for me to remind the Pakistani leaders, but without introducing any element of criticism of their earlier statements on this issue, I would certainly ask, whereas Pakistan had embarked upon this to realise certain objectives, viz., to get a solution of the Jammu and Kashmir problem which they thought fits in with their pattern, have they succeeded ? No; they have not.

Ultimately the terms of the agreement are such that any action of that nature will be covered. Will they do that again? It they adhere to the terms of the agreement, they would not do that. But it they do not adhere to We terms of the agreement, a new situation arises, which the country will have to deal with, with all determination. I am sure that the full support of this House and of the country will be with any steps that are taken to deal with that situation.

The date 5th August is important, because on 5th August this infiltration started. Withdrawal of all armed personnel to positions which obtained prior to 5th August definitely covers the infiltrators also.

Another point which has been mentioned was that it appears as if some pressure was exercised on the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, I am very sorry that any such suggestion directly or indirectly was made About this alleged pressure, those of us who were in touch with Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri can say that the actual volume of his work; the actual physical pressure, in those days was much less compared to the work he used to do in India where his responsibilities were so great, meeting a large number of persons from all sections of the House and leaders of various political parties, apart from his administrative work. But in Tashkent, we had gone for a special purpose. Myself, my colleagues and even the Press people who were there at Tashkent everyone knows that, judged in terms of sheer volume of work, it was much less as compared to his normal routine in Delhi.

Regarding the second point whether the functioning of the Soviet leaders and the Soviet delegation was such as to create the slightest feeling in our mind that they were trying to sell any particular idea, I would like to say categorically that the attitude of the Soviet leaders in this respect was one of full understanding of our position. Even before going to Tashkent, I had paid a visit to Moscow and had long talks with the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Mr. Kosygin and also with their Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko. I had explained in full detail our stand on the various issues that were likely to come up during the Tashkent talks. Our stand on all these issues was fully known to the Soviet leaders. There was a great deal of understanding and they were quite objective. It will be absolutely wrong to suggest that they exercised any pressure directly or indirectly. It will be wrong on our part to suggest anything of that nature.

I would like to reiterate, the expression of our gratitude to the Soviet leaders for all the understanding that they showed. If you look at the circumstances what could be the pressure ? I fail to understand. Our late Prime Minister had gone to Tashkent as a great hero. He had the will and support of the entire country with him. Our army was standing on the outskirts of Sialkot and Lahore and we were occupying strategic passes. In the Security Council this matter has been agitated and we demonstrated very clearly that India will not brook any interference--we know what our case is and we will adhere to it steadfastly. So, what was the circumstantial pressure on him? Here was a person who was more or less in command of the situation. To suggest that there was any pressure either circumstantial or otherwise which impelled him to adopt this attitude is absolutely unjustified. There was some pressure on him in the sense that he saw as to what was in the best interests of the 600 million people of India and Pakistan. He, as a great leader, who could fight bravely the battles, also knew that India's general attitude of peace also is something which requires all possible support and nursing. Therefore, if he acted in the interest of peace, when he was in that strong position, when he had this support, you cannot say there was any pressure of any kind, direct or indirect, on him. He acted in a very brave manner in reversing past unhappy trends by signing the agreement and in a sincere effort to reverse the trends without yielding on any essential matters. Therefore, I would like very categorically and clearly, to reiterate that there is no question of any pressure either factual or circumstantial. He knew what he was doing and he did it with a great gesture, with great strength and it is for us really to honour that.

The Indian objective, when we had to face this armed conflict, was to repel aggression. That objective had been fully realised. We successfully met this aggression on the ground and also in signing this agreement. Now, some test of this can be the reactions of other countries. This is one of those rare agreements which has been welcomed by all countries excepting one, our northem neighbour, China or some critics on the other side. It is very interesting to see how the Chinese leaders looked at it. Even their reaction was not very spontaneous to start with. They started building up their attitude and they took some weeks before they actually gave out as to what was in their heart of hearts with regard to this. Apart from their hostility to India, about which we know, the House knows and the country knows-it is not that aspect that I want to put forward so much at this stage-unfortunately, China is one country which continues to bold that this doctrine of peaceful co-existence or the efficacy of peaceful means for resolving disputes is not good. All these are doctrines which, are not accepted by China. They saw in the Tashkent Declaration a clear vindication of these two very important principles of international behaviour, namely, the importance and the efficacy of peaceful co-existence and determination to solve their dispute by peaceful means. On both these grounds the official Chinese reaction is against this Declaration. They say the Soviet Union want to demonstrate that by bringing India and Pakistan together, and by asking them to abjure the use of force for settlement of any dispute, notwithstanding differences they can co-exist and they can persevere in a patient manner to resolve their differences-the very doctrine which China is out to destroy. This is precisely their comment in their official newspapers. They say, by doing this the Soviet Union wanted to demonstrate that peaceful coexistence is possible and that settlement of disputes by peaceful means is also possible. As you know, the Chinese believe in the inevitability of war. They steadfastly hold this view that nothing can be resolved except through violence and resort to force. That is a doctrine which we have never accepted, which the rest of the world does not accept, and I would very humbly but very strongly place this aspect, not in any spirit of animosity against China because that relates to a matter which we can square-we have got our problem-but let us take it at a higher level-their adherence to the doctrine of the inevitability of war-this Declaration is a clear blow to their doctrine. For that reason also, this is a vindication of the general code of behaviour which the international community has embarked upon and is going assiduously to follow.

I would, before ending, earnestly appeal, now that we have had the debate, now that we have had our full say on this issue, let us now hereafter bring about a general support for this in our country so that the unfortunate trends of deteriorating relations, continuous friction and continuous tension might be reversed. I know that the process is difficult. I know that there may be difficulties which may also be created by statements from the other side, may be that there may be some difficulties on our side. But I would appeal that this Declaration is something worth working for; war and armed conflict is to be resorted to only if necessary in order to safeguard our security and integrity, but if peace can be restored by peaceful means and peaceful approaches, howsoever impracticable these efforts may appear to resolve all differences, it is something which is worth trying, and it is in that spirit that we should view this Tashkent Declaration.

47

UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA CHINA **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TASHKENT MEETING

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha initiating the Debate on Tashkent Declaration

The Minister of External Affairs Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on February 17, 1966, while initiating the debate on the Tashkent Declaration Madam, I beg to move :

"That the Tashkent Declaration be taken into consideration."

I have already placed on the Table of the House a copy of the Tashkent Declaration. While placing that copy here I also made a brief statement giving the salient features of that Declaration. I would not like to take much time at this stage. With your permission I would like to confine my remarks to putting before this House some important aspects and I will endeavour to reply to the further points that might be raised by the bon. Members in the course of my reply which I will give when this discussion is wound up.

This Tashkent Declaration is a document which was evolved as a result of long discussions and very careful consideration. There are several ways of looking at it. One way, which some bon. Members either here or some critics outside, might adopt is to examine it purely from a critical angle and to try to project these points of view which might create a feeling or an impression that this does not safeguard all the basic or the fundamental interests. Any document, even a perfect document, is capable of such criticism and some of us who have, in our other avocations, to do with the task of examining propositions from a purely critical or legalistic point of view, can always muster a number of arguments. I would like to appeal through you to the hon. Members of this House and to my countrymen that we should look at this document, at this Declaration, from a national point of view and we should try to examine it from the point of view to find out if it safeguards our basic positions or fundamental interests. Then again, I would like to say in the beginning that there may be portions of this Declaration which might give an impression or feeling that they are compromise provisions, they are compromise formulae, that they have been evolved as a result of understanding each others point of view. If I may venture to add, this will be the picture of this Tashkent whether you view it from Delhi or you view it from Rawalpindi. (Interruptions).

It is an incidental benefit I should say that the Tashkent Declaration has the support of a large number of countries. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that barring one or two countries, principally one country-I do not want to start any controversy--this agreement has been welcomed by a vast number of countries, almost all countries in the world and therefore, if it is welcomed by a large number of political parties in the country, if it is welcomed by a large number of other countries in the world, that should be a matter for satisfaction and not for excitement or for complaint.

An Hon. Member: Not only that but the entire world will welcome if you hand over Kashmir on a platter to Pakistan

External Affairs Minister: This is a suggestion which I think is most unfounded. No Congress Government, which has always made its position clear, will do anything of that type and it is very unfair, very wrong to make any such suggestion. We have reiterated times out of number that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and I do not know who will be satisfied if we part with an integral part of India.

I cannot think that any country in the world, which has got any respect for our territorial integrity, or for our honour, would ever think of feeling happy if we handed it over. I do not know at all wherefrom. the hon. Member has got this impression that the world would be happy if we were to hand it over to Pakistan. The whole world does understand what our position on this issue is, and it is absolutely wrong to put forward such ideas. Now this is the type of fear complex that I want my countrymen, more so critics like the hon. Member to shake off. Now, which are the other countries and why should other countries have an interest in snatching away something which is part of India? Nobody is asking us or suggesting to us to do that. It is wrong to develop a fear complex and to imagine that the world is conspiring against us and that the world would be happy if we did this or we did that. We know what our national interests are and we steadfastly stick to the pursuit of our national policies which are in our best national interests, unmindful of other peoples, annovance or other people being pleased or displeased. We should steadfastly pursue such policies. That has been our consistent line, and if by doing a correct thing, which we think is the right thing to do. we also get the approbation, approval and happiness of a vast variety of countries, that should not unnecessarily create a fear complex and suspicion in our mind. That will indicate lack of confidence in our own thinking and in our own ways of approach, and it will be a very very dangerous sentiment if we were to think that, if there be any decision which receives the approval of a large number of countries, there must be something wrong in it. That will be a very very dangerous approach and I would therefore very earnestly appeal to all sections of this House that the approval by' a vast majority of countries should not excite any suspicion in our mind. It will be very had for us psychologically and

48 the like, and if we develop a complex as if other people are happy when we are unhappy or that when we are happy the rest of the world would be unhappy. This is a Proposition which we should not touch, and we should shake ourselves off from mentality or complex of that nature. Now it is true that we have to take care about international opinion, and I am one of those who always try to explain our basic stand to all countries and enlist their confidence in and sympathy for us, but the overriding consideration is always our own national interest.

Madam, the Tashkent Declaration has to be viewed from the point of view of the central theme in that Declaration. The Tashkent Declaration, I claim, is a very great step, a very solemn undertaking, an agreement between the two countries mutually to reverse the deteriorating trends between the two countries, trends born of suspicion, born of the complex of fear, which have always been gripping our mind, that the other party is going to put us down, or that the whole world has combined against us. Now this corollary, necessarily flows from a complex which is born of lack of confidence, born of fear, born of suspicion. After this Tashkent Declaration we have to stave off that complex, and we have to look at our relationship with Pakistan, just as Pakistan has to look at their relationship with us, in this new spirit to reverse those trends, those distressing trends, which cause tension, cause suspicion, cause fear, cause lack of mutual understanding. Those trends have to be reversed, and the central objective that has been achieved by the Tashkent Declaration is a solemn agreement signed by the Heads of two Governments that they are determined to reverse those trends and are now and in future pledged to develop friendly relations, good neighbourly relations, and to strengthen mutual relations in the economic field, in the cultural field and so on respecting the integrity and sovereignty of each country. Thew am very important basic principles and we should appreciate fully their significance.

If I may put it in a slightly different form. it is not a matter in which we need to count that this is the one thing that we have got, that these are the things 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and so on, that we have got or not got. Well, those things can be enumerated and will be enumerated, but I do appeal, Madam, that while appreciating the outcome of this agreement, we have to view it from a somewhat broader perspective and to see as to whether it is not a real determination, a real effort, a firm resolve subscribed to by the Heads of two Governments on behalf of their people, six hundred million people of this sub-continent which stands divided between India and Pakistan. It is a solemn determination to reverse those trends and to live in future in an atmosphere which is free from this suspicion, which is free from fear, and to look at each other in that spirit, in that good neighbourly spirit. Now I know that a very powerful speech can be made to show that all this is something which may be idealistic, but from a practical point of view we have to see what the relationship was and whether it can really be suddenly reversed or not. I myself am conscious that the process itself is likely to he a difficult one. It is likely to be, perhaps, a protracted one, a long one requiring a great deal of patience. There will be detractors in our own country, there will he detractors in Pakistan also. But we have always to keep this in mind whether the direction, the orientation in thinking that is sought to be given by the Tashkent Declaration, whether that orientation is in the right direction or not. If that orientation is in the right direction then, whatever may be the difficulties, whatever may be the doubts, whatever may be even the suspicion, we have patiently to work in a consistent manner to get over that feeling, and by our conduct, by our speeches and in every other way, to foster that new spirit, to develop something in the relationship between the two countries that had been lacking, and this will have to be a process which we will have very patiently to follow.

Now, in the course of this discussion I know that quotations will be made from the speeches of Pakistani leaders, from some of their opposition leaders, some of their governmental leaders pointing out their own interpretation of this document. We ourselves have carefully examined those points of view which have been projected, but the more we have examined the document, the more we have become convinced that, on all essential points, on all fundamental issues, on all basic principles, our basic stand, our essential interests have not in any way been compromised and have not at all suffered by this Declaration. So that, apart from the higher objective of reversion to a path of peace and conciliation, our national interests, our own points of view, our own stand on basic points also, have been fully safeguarded in this agreement. Now what were those basic stands of our own.? One of the most important things, which has been a very important issue before us, is the question of Jammu and Kashmir.

About Jammu and Kashmir our late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, had made it clear beore he went to Tashkent, and even before he accepted the invitation to go to Tashkent, that the Indian position is clear and categorical. namely, that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and the sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir is a matter which is not open for negotiation. That position was steadfastly adhered to by the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. This matter came up even at other

49

levels and the Indian representatives at all levels fully reiterated this position which had been clearly stated in this House, in the other House and also in the country and there was no compromise on that basic issue.

The other point, which was of great importance for the strengthening of the position between the two countries, was to see what were the paints of irritation, what were the points of conflict which had been bedevilling their relations. In this respect the most important thing was the large volume of complications that had cropped tip as a result of the armed conflict. I do not want to go into the origin of that conflict. Our country faced an aggression and the manner in which out brave soldiers and airmen, our armed forces and security forces, our railwaymen, our workers, in fact our entire population rose to meet that aggression, will always remain a glorious chapter in our history. We are rightly proud of the response that was forthcoming in Such a spontaneous manner, not only from those on whom the main responsibility of safeguarding the integrity of the country rested but also from all sections of the civilian population. Madam, I belong to one of the border States and I have visited those areas. I know there may be other people who might be making highly critical speeches on various occasions. But I know how our people really treated as a threat to their own hearths and homes, how even women, old

women and children, everyone in all walks of life, functioned spontaneously and with such great discipline and with such great enthusiasm that they did not consider any sacrifice too great to make in order to meet the threat that faced the country. I am aware of the glorious record of the services. though they do not boast about it. The most important thing is that those people who suffered most, who have put in their very best efforts and who have suffered most, they do not boast about what they have done. They have in a dignified and quiet manner felt that they have done their duty to the country, and this is the biggest satisfaction from their point of view. So the unity of the country and the bravery of our people have been very fully demonstrated and if I may venture to say so, by this our prestige, our honour have been greatly enhanced not only in our own country but throughout the world. The world knows now, even the big powers and the small powers, everyone, even those who might have been critical about us, they know that India is strong, that if India says something then India has got the capacity and the determination to implement it and to go through the biggest sacrifices. And the stage has come when the other countries have started taking a realistic view of our postures and they know that the stage is gone when India could be pushed about this way or that way. If India takes a particular attitude they know that we have taken that attitude not in a huff or in excitement. We weigh all our words before we utter them and the attitudes that we take are not taken in any excitement but in a cool and calculated manner. Also, when we say something on particular matters, for instance, we say that Jammu and Kashmir form an integral part of India, we mean what we say, And other countries also feel that if India says something, she means that and they should not take that statement lightly.

Even in the course of this conflict, statements were made by the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, I will not mention my own name, and other government spokesmen also made statements. All those statements were made with sonic care and sonic caution. All those statements that we made even in relation to this conflict, I am happy to say, we were able, with the United support of this House and all the parties and all the people of this country, to redeem the essential parts, of those statements in all these issues.

In this connection why I am saying all this is because it comes to my mind that even when the Secretary-General of the United Nations came here, at that time there was black-out in Delhi. Air ranks were taking place in both countries and actual fighting and conflict was going on. Our forces were fighting. There was the call from the United Nations that the fighting should end and that there should be a cease-fire, there should be withdrawal and all that. That Resolution was there. Even at that time, even at the height of our conflict, what was written? I would only appeal to hon. Members that they should read carefully the letters that had been written by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and compare them with the letter that was written by President Ayub Khan. I do not want to criticise President Ayub Khan. He acted on behalf of his Government and in the best interest of his country. Who am I to criticise Pakistan ? But I would request you to see the attitude that we took to the question when the Secretary-General called for a cease-fire. That is contained in Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's letter. He said that be was prepared to respond straightaway to the call for a cease-fire, but he added that he had to take care that, as a result of the cease-fire, in any dispositions arising therefrom or in any withdrawals or any other readjustment that had to take place care was taken that a situation would not arise which might involve India in the same type of trouble or conflict which she had had to face in this aggression. We did not make any claims at that time. For instance, we did not even say that we will not accept the cease-fire or we will not withdraw unless we got that part of Jammu and Kashmir which is under Pakistani occupation. We did not say that we would do

50

this or we would do that, We took a very careful and a very honourable stand, safeguarding our essential interests and took a certain posture. Now I would strongly urge that the Tashkent Declaration even on this question of withdrawals and disengagement should be examined with the background of the position that was taken by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri in his reply to the Secretary-6eneral, calling for a cease-fire and withdrawal. All that he said on that occasion has been fully complied with. He had said that, in any disposition, he had to make sure that infiltration and such thing did not occur again. Has that been secured ? I submit that it has been very well secured.

There are three provisions in this Declaration which I would like to bring to the notice of this honourable House. Number one is the agreement between the two countries not to have recourse to the use of force for the settlement of any disputes. Number two is that they will not interfere in the internal affairs of each other. And the third is that in Jammu and Kashmir, the ceasefire terms and the cease-fire line will be respected. It these three conditions are followed by both sides, namely, that we do not go to their side and they do not come to our side; then the nonuse of force for settlement of disputes; and then non-interference in the internal affairs of each other-then this is a complete answer and a complete vidication of the stand that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had taken when he wrote his letter to the Secretary-General. Nothing is left.

It is quite another thing that people may say, "Well, these assurances are there and this agreement is there. But what is the guarantee that these will be adhered to?

In a matter like this, in international affairs when Heads of government sign a document, it would be very very unfair for us to harbour the suspicion that the other side, having appended its signature in the presence of such a distinguished statesman another Head of a government of a friendly country like the Soviet Union, would treat it lightly or would have apended its signature with reservations. I would very respectfully appeal to hon. Members of this House not to have these reservations and suspicions in their minds. After all, in international affairs, what can be the additional guarantee that could be required when the Heads of the two governments pledge their people for this idea? Then it becomes the duty of everyone really to attune himself to these assurances that had been given on their behalf by the Head of their government and then function in pursuit of the implementation of those assurances rather than function in this manner with this feeling that somehow the other side is bound to take a posture contradictory to the terms which have been agreed upon

and that we should, in anticipation, also try to take postures which are critical of, and which are not in consonance with, the basic objectives achieved by an agreement of this nature.

Another point generally mentioned is about the withdrawal of the armed personnel. I do not want to go at any great length into this issue. Why did we go to Haji Pir? Why did we go to Tithwal? Why did we go to Kargil? To Kargil we went because Pakistan was assuming postures which posed a real threat to us and our line of communication to Ladakh was in jeopardy. Therefore, we moved into Kargil to protect our line of communication to Ladakh which was facing the Chinese threat. We went to Tithwal and Haji Pir. Before actually going we approached the Pakistan Government asking them to stop the menace of infiltration, the thousands of persons crossing with arms and equipment. We wanted them to take action and to ensure that this type of infiltration did not take place. We also wanted them to withdraw these people. It was only after they disowned their responsibility with regard to these infiltrators that we had to take limited preventive action in going to these areas to prevent this type of infiltration. Thereafter there was this attack on Chhamb, a largely populated area near Jammu. This went into the possession of Pakistan and we had to take defensive action when our line of communication, our life-line was threatened. Our line of communication to the Poonch area and to Srinagar was threatened and the Pakistani forces were pressing us near Akhnoor. There was no option left for us but to take further defensive action to relieve the pressure on our lines of communication and to protect them. This was done in the exercise of our right of self-defence. After this agreement which says that in future force will not be used, that the cease-fire line will be respected and that there will be no interference in international affairs, is there any further justification left either with us or with Pakistan that they continue to occupy Chhamb, Khem Karan and parts of Rajasthan, that our brave soldiers should be in Sialkot sector or the Lahore sector, or that we should continue to be in those passes which we had taken earlier? Even when we went into those territories, we did pot go with a view to reoccupying parts of Jammu and Kashmir which had been in illegal occupation of Pakistan. The actions we had taken at that time were purely defensive and strictly limited in character, forced on us much against our will, but once our honour and integrity was challenged, we had to act and we acted firmly and we are never sorry for that.

There is one other thing which sometimes confuses us. We are unnecessarily worried about the position at the cease-fire line and at the international boundary. We have made the position absolutely clear from the very beginning. Our

51

late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, had made statements more than once that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and that any attack on Jammu and Kashmir will be deemed as an attack on India and will be met wherever India thinks that she should meet it. When the time came, India demonstrated this. By any international, standard, and by any scrutiny, this position is absolutely, clear. What is the difference between the cease-fire line and the international boundary so far as violations are concerned? We somehow or the other seem to have this exaggerated notion that there is some slight difference. in the case of the cease-fire line, both the parties expressly agree that it will not be violated by either party. There is an express agreement between the two countries but in the case of the international boundary, there is this implied agreement, the international obligation, that the international boundary will be respected. So, even if the cease-fire line is violated, it is as much a violation of the integrity of it country as the violation of an international boundary; this violation takes place in a territory which is part of India. Pakistans to say unilaterally that Kashmir, according to them is a disputed territory and therefore they have got the right to interfere. is something which is absolutely untenable and we should not accept this unilateral interpretation. That interpretation is absolutely wrong and we reject it straightaway and we will not look at any such interpretation. Jammu and Kashmir is part of India, an integral part of India. and the Government which is functioning there is a government elected by adult franchise, a government established by law and by the constitution. Any interference in the functioning of that government in any form is interference in our internal affairs and no kind of interpretation put by any party can take away our basic stand. We steadfastly adhere to that stand.

Therefore, let us not get excited if other people put interpretations on this agreement either on the question of interference or on the use of force or on the question of the observance of the terms of the cease-fire line, leave aside everything else. I am placing the whole matter before this bon. House in a very dispassionate manner. There are distinguished lawyers present here. There is here a distinguished former Chief Jusitce, Mr. Chagla and there is Mr. Gopal Swarup Pathak. Sending armed infiltrators into any territory by any definition is obviously use of force. Even if there is any dispute, use of force is abjured by each party. It is said that they will not resort to the use of force. For what will they not do so? Not for wrestling or for any other purpose, but for the settlement of any dispute. Even if you take, for the sake of argument, that they have any semblance of a dispute or they keep this alive, that there is a dispute which we reject, even for that it is agreed that force will not be used. So, their unilateral statement that this is disputed territory need not make our people here unnecessarily put interpretations against our interests. This is neither borne by the circumstances of the case nor is it warranted by the realities of the situation. It I may be permitted to add, this is not even in our national interests to raise doubts in a manner adverse to our own interests and to try to import interpretations on the agreement which are bound ultimately to be quoted against us. In our enthusiasm, in our efflorescence we are prone to use extreme language. I will not quote it but I know such statements have been more damagingly used against us earlier and so we should be very cautious when we put interpretations of this type on documents which are so clear, which are so explicit. They have to be viewed in the spirit in which they have been entered upon, and any type of quibbling and trying to put interpretations of that nature is unwarranted and is definitely against our national interests. I would, therefore, appeal that we should not put interpretations of this type. There are, Madam, other positive features of this agreement. There is agreement that it will be the endeavour, it will be the determination of the two countries to develop relations in other spheres, in the economic sphere, in the matter of trade, in the matter of communications which stood absolutely disrupted when we went to Tashkent. We had ourselves to undertake a journey in a Boeing in which we were in the air for about eight hours before we reached Tashkent

from Delhi although the direct flight is only two and a half hours. While going from Calcutta to Gauhati and Tripura we had to go round Pakistan and when people from Rawalpindi had to go to Dacca they had to go over the high seas, go to Cevlon and then go to Dacca. When the Prime Minister and I went to Burma we first went on the high seas and then went on to Burma. There are thus mutual interests and when mutual interests arc involved we should not measure them in terms of inches or feet or actual gains but we should look at them as to whether they are in the mutual interest of the 600 million people of the subcontinent. We should see whether, with these things, these irritations which come in the way of betterment of relations, a time has not come when a serious effort should be made to incorporate in our thinking something of that spirit which is the central theme of this agreement. So I would appeal that this is the only approach, the only sensible approach, even from our own national interests, to adopt. Suspicion will always result in suspicion from the other side. Confidence begets confidence. Therefore, notwithstanding the various obstacles, the various difficulties, we have very assiduously to persevere and to implement this agreement in the spirit and in the manner in which we entered into it.

Now, I would like to deal with some reactions. We talk of other countries having reacted favourably to it. An hon. Member (Jana Sangh) has

52

reacted to it and I think very needlessly reacted to it. There are various areas in the country. I do not know whether the hon. Member or his colleagues have gone to the areas in Amritsar or in Ferozepore or in the Khem Karan area after this Declaration or even in Jammu or in Chhamb where about 70,000 people are still in the camps --they are still in the camps----or in the area of Rajasthan. In all these areas there is great deal of satisfaction. I myself was amazed when I found in the city of Amritsar, which I visited a few days after this declaration was signed, there was uniform satisfaction amongst all sections of the people in Amritsar and other border areas about this agreement, not even excluding the members of the Jana Sangh there. Their local people have not got the courage to tell the people in Amritsar that this agreement is not in the best interests of the country. Let us react to

the reaction of the people and not just argue in the air or argue in a theoretical manner. We have seen the reactions to this in West Bengal, in Assam, in Tripura and other, places and you represent all these areas. You please go there and find out what sigh of relief is there. And the same is the reaction in Pakistan, in East Pakistan and in West Pakistan. There will be some criticism no doubt but if the basic objective is kept before us, I am sure that we will be on the right path.

I would also like to say that the State of Jammu and Kashmir is being run by a Government elected by adult franchise. It is very very important for us to know the reactions of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Have you met even one man in Jammu and Kashmir who has not supported this? Every person, from the Minister to the Opposition, every Member of their Assembly, everyone in Jammu and Kashmir has welcomed the Tashkent Declaration.... And if we take an overall national view of the situation I have no doubt in my mind that the 600 million people of this sub-continent have greatly welcomed this Declaration.

UZBEKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN INDIA BURMA **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TASHKENT MEETING

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Rajya Debate on Tashkent Declaration

The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on February 22, 1966, while replying to the debate on the Tashkent Declaration :

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the hon. Members who, while participating in this debate, have given very weighty reasons, very cogent arguments. in support of the Tashkent Declaration. I am particularly happy, Mr. Chairman, that this support has cut across patty lines and there has been massive support for the principles of the Tashkent Declaration not only from hon. Members sitting on this side of the House but also from important Opposition Parties. This has lightened my task to a great extent as many of the points that were raised by way of criticism have been answered by the hon. Members who participated in the debate and who gave such impressive support in favour of the Declaration. I will endeavour, Mr. Chairman, to confine my remarks as briefly as possible to some of the salient points and also attempt. to answer some of the points of criticism.

Mr. Chairman, I am conscious of the fact that the Tashkent Declaration seeks to herald a new spirit. Whenever such a thing happens there may be critics, there may be those who may have honest doubts as to whether there is a real reversal and a real change of heart. These doubts are not unnatural if we look at the past unfortunate state of relations between the two countries. It is also not unnatural if we look at the actual state of affairs on the ground when the Indian Delegation went to Tashkent. What was the condition in the battle-field where an uneasy ceasefire prevailed? The two Armies of India and Pakistan. were interlocked and there were numerous violations of the cease-fire line.

Our troops were in advanced positions in the Sialkot sector, in the Lahore sector and also in certain parts of Jammu and Kashmir across the cease-fire line. The Pakistan forces were occupying parts of the Chhamb area, the Jaurian area, also the Khem Karan area in the Punjab and certain parts in Rajasthan. It was not only a question of the actual presence of these troops in the other country but also their proximity to each other; they were facing each other at short distances of 100 yards, 200 yards and 300 yards. I myself had occasion to visit those areas and see the atmosphere of extreme tension and mistrust and the shooting that prevailed there. The Tashkent Declaration has not only brought about disengagement but has also created a new spirit and a new atmosphere.

It is true that there are critics of the steps

that have been taken by the Government of India. I would only add that there are critics in Pakistan also. Are the two countries and the people of this subcontinent living in India and Pakistan to turn a new leaf and to look away from the bitter past with a new hope or are they for all times to come condemned to live in fear and

53

suspicion? I would plead with those whom I have not been able to convince that the objective before the Declaration is a laudable one, is in the best interests of the people of India and Pakistan and is also consistent with the high traditions and the great objective for which India has always worked, namely, the maintenance of peace with a determination to resolve all differences and disputes by peaceful means. From that point of view this Declaration opens up the possibility of a new approach and a new outlook. This process is likely to be a difficult one, as all processes of consolidation, as all processes of maintaining peace arc difficult. It is easy to excite, but much more difficult to calm ruffied feelings. And what is true of individuals is more true of nations where millions of people are involved on either side and where there arc acute differences and elements of suspicion. There has been betrayal of confidence in the past, so it is all the more difficult and it requires greater patience to change this atmosphere and to think with some confidence about the development of future relations on the basis of peace and trust. I would earnestly suggest that difficult though the process is it is worth trying, because if we do not succeed, then we risk eternal conflict, eternal suspicion and eternal bitterness. This is something which is not in the interests of either country and is not in the interest of peace in this part of the world.

Now, we have to look at some of the specific points that have been raised. I would like first to confine myself to the twin problem of withdrawal of armed forces and the infiltrators. The two arc linked up with each other; they are so much interconnected that it is not possible to consider one as divorced from the other. I would like this hon. House to go back to the stage at which we had to move to Tithwal, Haji Pir Pass and Kargil. What was our objective in moving to those areas ? We were faced with a situation, Mr. Chairman, when the mass movement in an aggressive manner of armed infiltrators took place into our area of Jammu and Kashmir from the Pakistan side across the cease-fire line. We approached the Pakistani Government and pointed out to them that they should own responsibility for this and stop this infiltration because this amounts to aggression, veiled aggression, creeping aggression. They did not own responsibility. The duty was cast on us; therefore to defend our sovereignty and our integrity, we took this preventive action of moving our forces to those passes which were mainly used by the armed infiltrators to cross over into our area, into the area which was in our possession and control on the eastern and southern side of the cease-fire line. This was the objective that was before us when we took that action. Thereafter-I do not want to go into details, since the House is fully aware of it-Pakistan marched their armour supported by heavy artillery and also by air into the Chhamb-Jaurian sector and were threatening our lines of communication to the entire area of Jammu and Kashmir; then we had to ask our troops, in the exercise of our right of self-defence and to relieve pressure in the Akhnoor sector, to go into the Sialkot and Lahore sector. Thereafter the cease-fire came. I have already mentioned before this hon. House the attitude that our late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri took when the Secretary General made an appeal for a cease-fire and for withdrawal. I will not go into that because I have already said enough on that issue in my opening remarks. I would only like to mention that the stand that had been taken by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in his communications to the Secretary General and later repeated in the Houses of Parliament has been vindicated in the Tashkent Declaration. He had said that in any future arrangement for withdrawals and for keeping armed personnel in various sectors, it will have to be ensured that there is no danger of infiltration of the type that our country faced when we had this problem about which I made a reference a while ago. The question arises, has that arrangement been ensured by the Tashkent Declaration which Prime. Minister Shastri had mentioned in his letter to the Secretary General and later repeated in the Houses of Parliament? It is my contention that it has been fully safeguarded.

Now I have only to refer to three points and I would reiterate them because they are impor-

tant. They are not just sentences or words but there is some content and concept behind those ideas. They are firstly the agreement between the two countries not to take recourse to the use of force for the settlement of any difference or dispute between the two countries; secondly, the agreement between the two countries that the cease-fire terms and the cease-fire line will be respected by the two countries, and, thirdly, the agreement that there will be non-interference in the internal affairs of each other. Judged by any one of these three conditions--what to talk of all the three conditions-our stand has been safeguarded. Sending of armed infiltrators by Pakistan into our territory contravenes each of these conditions. Any one of these conditions, if adhered to, will ensure that Pakistan does not send these armed infiltrators. Sending of armed infiltrators obviously is use of force and both Government have agreed that whatever may be the differences, whatever may be the disputes, they should be settled peacefully and not by resort to the use of force. Sending armed infiltrators is such blatant use of force that no stretch of imagination can convert it from this obvious exercise of something which is forbidden by the Tashkent Declaration. Again, what are the cease-fire terms which have to he respected? If armed

54

people either from the Indian side go into the part west or north of the cease-fire line or if armed people come from Pakistan side into the area east or south of the cease-fire line, it is obviously non-observance of the terms of the ceasefire line.

Thirdly, it is it clear interference in the internal affairs. Now, it is true that some hon. Members pointed out that Pakistan does not accept that Kashmir is an internal affair. I will come to that point a little later. I categorically state that this interpretation by Pakistan leaders that our authority in and control over Jammu and Kashmir is something which is disputed by them does not mean that we accept their interpretation. Jammu and Kashmir is part of India and it will remain so, notwithstanding any interpretation that might be put on this by Pakistan leaders or by any other country in the world. Let there be no doubt on that score. If one party says that they do not accept that there is no dispute about it, or if they want to keep up an atmosphere of dispute about this territory-even if there were some truth in their contention, which I totally repudiate; and it is not my case that they have got any basis to say that they have a dispute or that they are in a position where they are keeping tip this dispute--even then, sending of infiltrators is a clear use of force. Even if there is a dispute, it has to be settled by peaceful means if the terms of the Declaration are to be adhered to. Therefore, there is no question of any justification for sending in infiltrators.

Again, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. House to a very crucial date, namely, the 5th of August. What had happened on the 5th of August? The only change in the situation in Jammu and Kashmir or, in fact, in the relations between India and Pakistan was this sad phenomenon of a large number of armed infiltrators crossing into our side of Jammu and Kashmir. Now, if all the armed personnel are to withdraw to positions that they occupied before the 5th August, it obviously refers to armed infiltrators because no other party, either the Pakistan armed forces or the Pakistan armed police, no one else had crossed into our territory. It was these people who, though not in uniform, were heavily armed, equipped with modem means of communication, automatic weapons, hand grenades and the like. Obviously, when we talk of the 5th of August, it relates to the armed infiltrators. So, from whatever point of view we examine it, the question of withdrawal is very much linked with the question of infiltrators and the conditions that have been agreed upon cover any threat by way of infiltration into India. Therefore, the essential condition that had been laid down by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri has been complied with and has been fulfiled in the Tashkent Declaration.

The question arises, after this condition is fulfilled, should we have continued to occupy Haji Pir, Tithwal or Kargil? Why had we moved in there? We had moved in there to stop further infiltration, because Pakistan was not owning responsibility. Now, they moved into Chhamb and we had to take counter action to relieve pressure in the Akhnoor sector. Also, to safeguard our sovereignty and integrity we moved into the Sialkot and Lahore sectors. Now, both sides agree that in future force will not be used to settle any dispute. They have also entered into arrangements which clearly provide a very sure safeguard against armed infiltration. So the objective with which we had moved into Kargil, Tithwal and Haji Pir disappears. Kargil is slightly different, because we had to move into Kargil as our lines of communication to the Ladakh sector were threatened by the aggressive postures of Pakistan. If the cease-fire terms on the ceasefire line are to be adhered to, then, by hostile, provocative action, armed or otherwise, on our territory comes within the mischief of this agreement that has been entered into and the necessity for out continuing to occupy Kargil disappears. This was a very vital question to which all of us gave our very earnest consideration.

One of the hon. Members from the Opposition Benches-and he was joined by some other Members also from the Opposition Benchesreminded us about the talks that our late Prime Minister Shastri had with the Opposition leaders. I have already mentioned here that in his letter to the Secrtary-General, in his statements to the Houses of Parliament and on several other occasions, he had laid down certain conditions, which come fully within the scope of all the arrangements that have been arrived at as a result of the Tashkent Declaration.

Now, was adherence to Haji Pir, Tithwal or even Kargil something by way of a particular posture that he-had adopted? And was he to insist on our remaining in those areas no matter if other developments occurred? That is not a correct interpretation of Lal Bahadur Shastri's talks with the Opposition leaders. I am aware of those talks, because I was present during almost all of them. He made it clear on more than one occasion that the whole situation about withdrawal would change if there was agreement between India and Pakistan on the non-use of force. He used the expression at that time 'if a no-war pact is entered into'. It is true that this is not a non-war pact in the sense that it is not described as a no-war pact. But the substance and the essence of the solemn agreement between the two countries is to reaffirm their obligation not to have recourse to the use of force for the settlement of any disputes. It is a clear arrangement whereby force is agreed to be renounced by the leaders of the two Governments,

by the Heads of the two Governments. It is a clear enunciation of the principle of abjuring force for the settlement of any dispute and agreeing to resolve all differences by peaceful means. Now, an agreement is ail agreement. It is asked why it is not described as a pact. You may describe it as a pact or you may not describe it as a pact. The title does not change the content of any agreement. The content of the agreement is absolutely unequivocal, namely, a very clear reaffirmation of the obligation of the two countries not to have recourse to the use of force for the settlement of any dispute. This is the essential point. If there is agreementand as I have pointed out there is agreement--that the cease-fare term will be respected, then the question of infiltrators is covered. The reason why our late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri asked the Armed Forces to move into Jammu and Kashmir was to check this infiltration, because Pakistan did not own responsibility. In view of the provisions, to which I have made a reference, this threat is fully met and the arrangement that is made safeguards this in future. It is, therefore, necessary for us to view the question of our withdrawal against this background. (interruption).

It is wrong to mention certain bits of statements that might have been made by the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, torn off the context in which they were made. We have to view it against this background and judge from this background. There is no doubt left in the mind of anyone that the objective with which he had embarked upon this had been fully achieved by the Tashkent Declaration. There was no point in keeping the armies in that state of tension and facing each other.

It has been asked what would have happened if we had not signed the declaration ? Obviously the continuance of that state of affairs, where thousands of cease-fire violations were taking place, when shooting was going on, where our people from Khem Karan were in camps to the number of 50,000 or 60,000, where our people from Chhamb were in camps numbering 60,000 or 70,000, where there were people in Pakistan in camps numbering about 2 lakhs or 2 1/2 lakhs or 3 lakhs, where the soldiers on either side were facing each other at short distances, is not good. An hon. Member lightly said that the cease-fire had been agreed upon and it continued. Is that a natural and normal way of looking at this very difficult and very intricate problem which is fraught with such dangerous potentialities? Two armies facing each other at this short distance with that state of tension, that would have been had from' any point of view. It is not good even for the morale of the army on either side. This was the state of affairs. If it had continued. it is surprising that people can lightly say that even if we had not signed the declaration, the heavens would not have fallen. It was a very grave situation that faced the country. It was an extremely uneasy and very unstable cease-fire, and any step that was taken to consolidate this and to restore the conditions to normalcy should be welcomed rather than that any attempt should be made to just explain it away as something inconsequential or something unimportant.

Another aspect I would like to mention. On this question of Jammu and Kashmir it is mentioned in the Declaration itself that each side reiterated its position. There is no giving in on this issue on the Indian side. The Pakistan side stated their case. We stated our case. Notwithstanding this unbridgeable difference of stands on Kashmir the two sides agreed to take steps for normalising relations and consolidating peace. There is no question of change of attitude on the question of Kashmir.

Another point. Mr. Chairman, which has been described sometimes in veiled, indirect language and sometimes directly, is that there was some sort of pressure upon Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to sign this declaration. I would like to state very categorically that there was no question of any pressure on Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was there at Tashkent to explore the possibilities of restoring peaceful relations. In fact, even in his opening speech at the plenary meeting of the leaders of the two countries and also in the presence of the Soviet leaders, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri enunciated certain principles. He said: 'I have come to seek the ways of peace. I have Come to seek agreements for non-use of force notwithstanding the existence of differences'. And he said: 'Differences may be there. Differences may be acute. They may not be capable of easy solution. But that does not mean that the two countries should not agree to resolve those differences by peaceful

means and to abjure the use of force.' This was the keynote of the Prime Minister's speech in the opening session. He achieved that objective. He sat at the conference table, with clear ideas as to what was to be achieved, and those ideas are contained in his opening speech. The final declaration at the end of the Conference contains to a very large extent all that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had mentioned in his plenary speech. Was he under some pressure even when he went fresh from all his talks with the opposition leaders and others, and when he enunciated the Indian stand there ? Under what pressure was he ? Ultimately the Tashkent Declaration achieved practically all he had mentioned in his opening speech.

From the very beginning he took up a constructive stand, a positive stand, a stand which was imbued with motives of peace and of restoring normalcy notwithstanding the existence of

56

differences, and that is precisely what he achieved. As a matter of fact there was no pressure of any kind, not even of work on him. We were with him. We were discussing most of the time these and other problems with him, and I can testify to the fact that in terms of the sheer volume of work Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in Tashkent was less pressed than in his normal routine in Delhi. We know how he used to put in long hours of work in Delhi, with all the interviews and all tire. other pressures of Delhi life. There he had less work on his hands. He had clear ideas as to what he had to do. He had this good fortune of being in a position when both militarily and diplomatically India was very strongly placed. What could be the pressure under these circumstances? I would go a step further. To suggest that a person of the mattle, that a person of the courage and determination of the late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri could be subjected to any pressure, I think, is most unfair to us and to Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. He was a man of iron determination. The country saw how he reacted when it faced danger. To imagine that at the height of his glory when be had achieved on the battle-front what he wanted to achieve--because he had not entered this war to grab any territory which was in Pakistan's occupation it was a purely defensive war which be was compelled to fight and be fought this war

courageously-to say that he could be pressurised is unfair. As soon as he felt sure that the honour and dignity of his country, the sovereignty and integrity of his country will be safeguarded by these arrangements, be immediately and courageously sought the way of peace which really was according to the best traditions of our country and to the way of thinking of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. For a renowned leader, that great leader who suffered so much at the time of the freedom fight, with the high values for which he always worked throughout his long career of public service-to think for a moment that he could be pressurised by anyone is, to say the least most unfair and most unkind and is not at all borne out by the facts of the situation.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, who was there to pressurise him and with what objective ? The Soviet Union is a great friend of our country. The Soviet Union has stood the test of friendship because in moments of difficulty, in moments of crisis the Soviet Union has stood on the side of India. There is no doubt about it. What was the occasion then for pressurising? I fail to understand why these notions, why these suspicions, why these doubts should be entertained. The Soviet Union arranged this meeting between the leaders of India and Pakistan with the sole object of reversing the past unfortunate trends and of exploring the possibilities of restoring normalcy and stabilising peace. They did not take sides in this issue. They were objective. They explained to the two leaders an assessment of the situation and left the leaders to take any decision for themselves. There was no question of pressurising by the Soviet Union, and any insinuation of that type that there was any pressure either direct or indirect is not borne out by the facts of the situation. We were intimately concerned there and we had the fortune of being led by that person of great determination, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

For any outside country, even though it may be a friendly and a powerful country like the Soviet Union, for any representative of any country, there could not be even the imagination that the Indian leader, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri could be pressurised. Those tactics might be in the imagination of certain countries. But the whole world knows that when we in India take a decision we take it after a great deal of consideration; we are not flamboyant in our expression, but when we take a decision, we have the determination to stick to that decision and any amount of pressurisation will not alter the Indian stand on vital issues. That is what we have demonstrated in the Security Council; that is what we have demonstrated in the battlefield; that is what we have demonstrated in Tashkent, and I hope that we will continue to display that to safeguard the honour and the dignity of our country. Any insinuation, therefore, of pressure is unfair to the host; it is unkind to the Indian Delegation and it is extremely unfair to that great patriot and leader, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

Then it is mentioned : What is the guarantee in future that these terms will be adhered to? An hon. Member rightly mentioned the normal guarantee when such arrangements are entered into and solemnly signed by Heads of government. It will be wrong for us, for a variety of reasons, to start looking at international agreements with an initial bias and suspicion; it will be wrong for us if, in future relationships and in future thinking, we were to give an impression to the world that while entering into any agreement with any other country we start with this initial presumption that the other side is going to back out from that agreement or that it is not going to carry out the obligation under any agreement. It will be bad for us, it will be bad for the international climate, it will be bad from every point of view, to adopt that attitude. We should not have that feeling. And we should also view the circumstances under which this agreement was entered into. Why did President Ayub Khan go to Tashkent? He knew the Indian stand on the problem of Jammu and Kashmir; he knew that he could not get Jammu and Kashmir or he could not get a solution of the Jammu and

57

Kashmir problem to his liking by going to Tashkent because we had stated our position very clearly. The Soviet Union's position on the question of Kashmir was also well known to the Pakistani leaders. We should give credit that each country knows what was the correct state of affairs. And if President Ayub Khan went to Tashkent--when he knew full well the Indian attitude on Jammu and Kashmir-then the only presumption that arises is that he went to Tashkent in search of peace; with the good offices of friendly persons of a friendly country which was taking an objective view, he wanted to seek the ways of peace.

Then it is said-suppose they deviate from this path of peace. Well, they did deviate from this path of peace in August. With what result? What did they achieve when they deviated from that path of peace? Did their scheme of armed infiltration succeed ? Were their borrowed expressions of liberation fight and revolutionary council, feigned expressions borrowed from an another country, and the so-called Azad Kashmir Radio ? Did they give them any success ? Certainly not. The people of Kashmir gave them the reply when they thought of the so-called war of liberation and the like. How can they generate any such thing when there is nothing in the field which they can exploit? The people of Kashmir gave information which led to the elimination, mopping up and arrest of these infiltrators. That was the real answer. Later on they tried with their heavy armour which they had acquired for some other purpose. Did they succeed ? Now, they did that even when there was no solemn declaration and they did not succeed. Do you think they are likely to repeat the same thing after a particular declaration, when they know full well that on an earlier occasion even without this restraining factor they did not succeed? This is something not possible. And-God forbid-if the circumstances are such that they take such a step, then India knows how to deal with that situation and India will certainly deal with it to safeguard her honour and her integrity. India made it clear that she has no claim for territory or any such thing against Pakistan. AN that we want is to live in peace and friendship as good neighbours and that is our objective. But we will not accept any claim against our territory on behalf of Pakistan. Whatever be the differences, whatever be the disputes, let us settle them as good neighbours and as people who at one stage were really one by blood, by history, by geography and an that. And it will not be correct therefore to decry the Declaration on the ground of suspicion that the other party may not adhere to this.

I have no intention of quoting but it was interesting that a similar reaction arose in Pakistan from the side of critics. And in one of the joint statements, a number of opposition leaders them in Pakistan said that now that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is no longer there, the Tashkent Declaration is dead. That was the type of suspicion that is there. There will be these people in both countries, people who will raise this suspicion. But solemn declarations entered into between countries and signed by their Heads of government are documents much too serious people in both countries, people who will raise take that attitude. But look at the problem in a realistic manner and not be deflected from the pursuit of the path of peace, which is the key philosophy and the key-note of the Tashkent Declaration.

Then, it was mentioned by another hon. Member opposite that there might be some secret clauses or pact. I do not know wherefrom such a feeling arises. I would like to say categorically that there is no question of any secret pact, there is no secret understanding, there is no secret agreement or clause, which was not known, which was not told to our country or to the world. And in a sense, does the hon. Member really suggest that the relation between the two countries is such, is so close, that they can enter into any secret arrangement and that both sides are sitting mum over that agreement and are not disclosing it? I wish there could be that type of relationship between India and Pakistan; may be at some future time, there may be that brotherly relationship when we could take--I am not opposed-to it some arrangements which need not be divulged to the world. But unfortunately that stage is not there. There is all this element of suspicion at the moment and to think that there could be a secret arrangement or a secret pact which we and also our friend, Mr. Bhutto, are hiding from the whole world and from the people of India and Pakistan, I think, is a compliment which, at any rate, I am not prepared to take. I would Re to state very clearly, very simply, that there is no question of any secret pact or secret agreement between the two countries. The agreement is very much before the world and it is to be judged by the text and not by extraneous considerations.

Let us see what the reactions to this in the world are. This is one of those fortunate agreements which have been blessed by almost all countries in the world with the exception of China. Why is China objecting to this ? China is objecting to this because it goes counter to the central philosophy of China's way of thinking these days. The Chinese are strong advocates of the theory that there cannot be peaceful co-existence. They are also strong advocates of the principle that war is inevitable. They do not believe that disputes between two countries, between two nations, or in international life can be solved by peaceful means.

58

They adhere to this philosophy that war is inevitable and that there is no such thing as peaceful co-existence. The Tashkent Declaration hits against both these concepts of the Chinese way of thinking. Incidentally, it also disrupts sonic of the growing ties between Pakistan and China. Some frantic efforts will continue to be made. I noticed that Mr. Bhutto has again tried to revive them by his recent statements when he says that he does not see any danger to the safety of India and Pakistan from the Chinese side. I cannot speak on behalf of Pakistan. I will accept if Mr. Bhutto thinks that he has no risk or no danger from China. But there is no substitute for experience, Mr. Chairman, and our experience is to the contrary. We have, therefore, to safeguard our interests and continue to strengthen our defences to meet any challenge that might face us.

We are not itching for a conflict. We are anxious that all our differences should be solved by peaceful means but with honour and dignity. And, therefore, we should continue to take serious notice of the policies that were being pursued by our neighbour China. Let us hope that in some distant future, or rather before long, the Chinese leaders may also see the wisdom of not keeping up this posture of sticking to their doctrine of the inevitability of war and being opposed to the principle of peaceful co-existence, because it is only then that tensions, not only in this part of the world but in the greater part of the world, will diappear. So long as this continues to be the attitude and posture of China, we will have to continue our efforts of building up strength and we will have to pay the price of freedom by being eternally vigilant.

UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA PAKISTAN MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU CHINA **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Food Emergency Loan Agreement

An agreement for an interest-free loan of 37.5 million (Rs. 10 crores) from the British Government to the Government of India was signed in New Delhi on February 11, 1966 by Mr. John Freeman, British High Commissioner, and Shri S, Bhoothalingam. Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs.

This loan represents Britain's immediate response to the request by the Government of India for assistance in tackling the current problems arising from the food situation. As in the case of other recent British loans to India, it is interest-free and is repayable over 25 years with a grace period of 7 years.

The British Government have suggested that the best contribution which they can make at present is one which combined urgent measures of direct emergency aid with encouraging the fullest possible deployment of India's industrial resources. Accordingly they have proposed that a part of the loan should be devoted to the hire or purchase of goods and services which will help immediately to relieve the food shortage, such as payment for shipping services in carrying grain from Commonwealth countries and for port handling equipment, pesticides and fertilisers. The remainder, to the value of not less than (pond)4 million, is intended to be used to purchase essential components needed to maintain industrial production and employment in the coming difficult months.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on her talks with Vice-President Humphrey

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following statement in Parliament on February 22, 1966 on her talks with Vice-President Humphrey of the United States :

59

Vice-President Humphrey of the United States, accompanied by Mr. Averell Harriman and other officials, arrived in New Delhi on the 16th evening and left on the 17th night.

During his stay, Vice-President Humphrey called on the President and the Vice-President. He had discussions on economic problems with the Finance Minister, the Minister of Food and Agriculture, and the Minister of Planning; on international affairs with the Foreign Minister and on the situation along our borders with the Defence Minister. Finally, he had talks with me which rounded up the discussions he had had with my colleagues.

On the food front, he was anxious to get, for President Johnson's information, an assessment of what further assistance we would need from the United States, as well as the kind of help we had been able to mobilise from other countries. He made enquiries regarding our efforts to step up our own agricultural production and expressed satisfaction, both in his talks with me and later in his press conference, with the picture that we had given him of our plans to allocate more resources to agriculture and the evidence which he himself had got of the effectiveness with which our plans were being implemented during his visit to the Punjab.

He further informed me that in order to help our industries to utilise their capacity more fully, the U.S, Government would extend a loan of \$ 100 million which would be available for the import of commodities which are in short supply. He indicated that during my visit to Washington President Johnson would discuss with me the question of further economic assistance and support for our Fourth Five-Year Plan. In this context, he pointed out and I fully agreed with him, that a country which receives aid from outside should do everything possible to mobilise its own resources to accelerate its rate of growth.

We had a full and frank exchange of views on the Vietnam situation. Vice-President Humphrey gave a resume of the U.S. position on Vietnam and of the outcome of the meeting of President Johnson with the leaders of the South Vietnam Government held in Hawaii recently. He affirmed the U.S. Government's wish to avoid a widening of the conflict and emphasised that they were anxious to see ail early restoration of peace which would enable the people of Vietnam to decide their own future through normal democratic processes. He mentioned the keen desire of President Johnson and of the South Vietnam Government to accelerate social and economic development. He appreciated that India's attitude regarding Vietnam was based on India's position as a non-aligned country and as Chairman of the International Commission for Control and Super-vision. He expressed the hope that we would do everything possible to facilitate a peaceful solution of the problem. We expressed our concern at the danger of the escalation of the conflict and our anxiety that a peaceful solution should be found for which the framework of the Geneva Agreement formed the best basis.

USA INDIA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND **Date :** Feb 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

WEST GERMANY

Indo-West German Shipping Agreement

An agreement on maritime transport relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and India was initialled in New Delhi on February 17, 1966. Dr. P. Macdonald, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Transport, signed on behalf of the West German Government, and Dr. Nagendra Singh, Secretary, Department of Transport, Shipping and Tourism, for the Government of India.

The agreement deals with measures to promote and encourage the development of maritime transport between the two countries who agree to abstain from discriminatory measures that might impair maritime shipping needed for the sea transport of the trade flowing between the two countries. Both the countries recognise the principle of shippers' choice of flag which should be freely exercised.

60

GERMANY INDIA Date : Feb 01, 1966

March

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1966 Vol. XII MARCH

No. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE

ARGENTINA		
Argentine Foreign Minister's Visit to India	61	
Indo-Argentine Trade Agreement	61	
AUSTRALIA		
Australian Foreign Minister's Visit to India	62	
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on President's A	Address 63	
JORDAN Indo-Jordan Trade Arrangement	64	
PAKISTAN Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Anti-Indian Propaganda by Pakistan 65		
Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on Indo-Pakistan Ministerial Talks 65		
POLAND Indo-Polish Agreements for Scientific Cooperation	67	
RHODESIA Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on Rhodesia	. 67	
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS India's Acceptance of Soviet Project Report on Bokaro Steel	l Plant 71	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Prime Minister's State Visit to the United States	72	
Prime Minister's Address to the National Press Club	74	
Indo-U.S. Joint Communique	77	
Prime Minister's Speech at the Economic Club in New York	k 78	
Prime Minister's Address to Asia Society and other Organisa York 81	ations in New	

WEST GERMANY Indo-West German Agreement for Technical Cooperation		85
YUGOSLAVIA Prime Minister's Speech at a Dinner in honour of Mr. Petar S	tambolic	85
Reply by Yugoslav Prime Minister	87	
Indo-Yugoslav Joint Communique	89	
Indo-Yugoslav Agreement for Scientific Collaboration	91	

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

ARGENTINA INDIA AUSTRALIA USA JORDAN PAKISTAN POLAND GERMANY YUGOSLAVIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

ARGENTINA

Argentine Foreign Minister's Visit to India

His Excellency Dr. Miguel Angel Zavala Ortiz, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship of the Republic of Argentina, paid an official visit to India from March 25 to March 28, 1966. At the end of his visit, a Press Note was issued by the Ministry of External Affairs in New Delhi on March 28, 1966. The following is the text of the Press Note :

At the invitation of the Government of India, H.E. Dr. Miguel Angel Zavala Ortiz, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship of the Republic of Argentina, accompanied by Madame Ortiz and an official delegation paid an official visit to India from March 25 to March 28, 1966.

The Argentine Foreign Minister and his dele-

gation had a special audience with His Excellency the President of the Republic of India, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan on Sunday the 27th March 1966 at 5.30 p.m.

The Argentine Foreign Minister was received by the Minister of External Affairs and the Minister of State with whom he had an exchange of views on world problems in a cordial and friendly atmosphere. The Indian Foreign Minister explained to the Argentine Foreign Minister, India's basic approach to the conduct of her external relations. This is characterized by her conviction that international problems can and should be resolved through peaceful means only. He added that in her dealings with other countries, India has consistently adhered to this approach, and has always eschewed the use of force.

The Foreign Minister of Argentina expressed his country's appreciation of the Tashkent Declaration and the statesmanship shown by the leaders of India and Pakistan in its adoption.

The Foreign Minister of Argentina conveyed his Government's invitation to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of India to attend the 50th Independence Anniversary of Argentina. The Foreign Minister warmly thanked the Argentine Foreign Minister for this invitation, which he accepted on behalf of the Government of India. He stated that he felt sure that Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi would like to accept this invitation and visit Argentina. However, if domestic pre-occupations prevent her from going, a high-level delegation would represent India on this occasion.

The Foreign Minister of Argentina and the Commerce Minister of India signed a Trade Agreement with India on March 26, 1966 which is expected to usher an era of expanding commercial relations between India and Argentina.

Both Ministers agreed on the desirability of creating a Special Committee to meet at least once a year for the purpose of reviewing the trends of bilateral trade. The representatives of the business community of the two countries that met simultaneously also agreed to this intention. The Committee will be created as soon as possible through diplomatic channels and will meet in Buenos Aires and New Delhi alternately.

In order to establish more extensive cultural contacts on an organised basis between India and Argentina, the Argentine side proposed that a Cultural Agreement should be concluded as early as possible. This suggestion was warmly received by India and assurance was given that the draft of the proposed Cultural Agreement earlier received would be given the most earnest consideration by the Government of India.

ARGENTINA INDIA USA UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

ARGENTINA

Indo-Argentine Trade Agreement

His Excellency Dr. Miguel Angel Zavala Ortiz, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship of the Republic of Argentina, called on Shri Manubhai Shah, Union Commerce Minister, in New Delhi on March 26, 1966. During their meeting the Foreign Minister of Argentina and the Commerce Minister of India discussed questions relating to Indo-Argentine trade and problems of world trade and economic development. They noted that only through expansion of trade and greater economic cooperation amongst developing countries would it be possible for them to accelerate

61

their rates of economic growth. Both India and Argentina face common problems of underdevelopment and are striving to raise the living standards of their peoples by means of planned economic development.

India and Argentina have worked in close cooperation in international forums like the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Along with other developing countries, they have been strongly urging that developed countries should allow access to their markets for products of developing nations to enable them to increase their foreign exchange earnings. Argentina and India are signatories to the Joint Declaration of the Seventy-seven Developing Countries issued at the conclusion of the first Trade and Development Conference at Geneva. The Joint Declaration recognised UNCTAD as a significant step towards creating a new and just world economic order which would permit international division of labour to be oriented towards the accelerated industrialisation of developing countries.

A Trade Agreement between Argentina and India has been signed today (March 26) by the Foreign Minister of Argentina and the Commerce Minister of India. This is the first Trade Agreement between India and Argentina and provides for reciprocal extension of most-favourednation treatment by the two countries in matters of trade, tariffs, shipping etc. Lists of items available for export in the two countries will be exchanged periodically.

Argentina is India's most important trading partner in Latin America and ranks fourth among importers of our jute manufactures. Our trade with her averaged about Rs. 7 crores a year in the period from 1960 to 1965. The Trade Agreement between the two countries is an expression of their common desire to forge closer economic links. It is hoped that it will contribute to an expansion and diversification of Indo-Argentine Trade and strengthen the traditional friendship between the two countries.

ARGENTINA INDIA USA SWITZERLAND RUSSIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

AUSTRALIA

Australian Foreign Minister's Visit to India

The Rt. Hon'ble P. M. C. Hasluck, Minister of External Affairs, Government of Australia, paid a visit to India from March 20 to March 27, 1966. During his stay in this country, Mr. Hasluck had talks with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and several other Ministers of the Government of India on matters of common interest. After Mr. Hasluck's visit, a Press statement was issued in New Delhi on March 29, 1966:

The following is the text of the Press statement:

At the invitation of the Government of India the Rt. Hon'ble P. M. C. Hasluck, P.C., M.P., Minister of External Affairs, Government of Australia, arrived in India on 20th March, 1966 accompanied by Mrs. Hasluck. He had discussions with the Indian Minister of External Affairs, Shri Swaran Singh, on a wide range of matters of common interest to their Governments.

Mr. Hasluck also had meetings with the Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Minister of Food and Agriculture, Minister of Education, Minister of Commerce and the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs. He was also received by the President and the Vice-President.

These discussions held in a frank and friendly atmosphere have served not only to acquaint the two Governments with each other's points of view on various matters of national and international concern but have also helped in promoting understanding and strengthening the friendly relations already existing between the two countries. No particular negotiation was contemplated in these ministerial talks. The purpose was to reach a better understanding by each of the two Governments of the viewpoints of the other and to exchange information about the problems each country faces in world affairs.

The talks were held on the basis that India and Australia each has an interest in the maintenance of both countries as independent progressive nations and also in the advancement of the whole of the region of South and South Fast Asia and in the preservation of the national independence of the States of that region. The Ministers discussed the threats to peace in Asia and particularly those resulting from the aggressive policies of People's Republic of China of which India has already been and continues to be a victim.

62

It was explained on behalf of India that they would carry out the terms of the Tashkent Agreement. Hopes were expressed by the Ministers that there would be a good outcome from the implementation of the terms of the Tashkent Agreement.

It was accepted in the discussions between the Ministers that Asia faced vast and urgent tasks of reducing want, of finding the best means and methods of strengthening the economies of Asian countries and of assisting beneficial social changes. In these tasks the cooperation of countries of the region with each other and with non-regional countries would be needed and it was recognised that substantial non-Asian assistance was required. Nevertheless any lasting progress would have to be the result of Asian decisions on the use of Asian resources, both human and material; and each country of the region must be able to shape and maintain its own political system and make it, own political judgment free from any coercion or subversion from outside.

Both the Ministers agreed that the situation in Vietnam was a matter of grave concern and that notwithstanding the great difficulties inherent in the situation, efforts should be continued to find a basis for talks so that a peaceful and just solution of the problem in accordance with the Geneva Agreements may be found.

During the talks, particular attention was given to the relationship between India and Australia. They revealed the remarkably close understanding by both the countries of the problems of Asia and a clearer appreciation of the possibilities that exist for working together more closely for the common good. It was agreed that both Governments would continue close cooperation in this regard. India and Australia are fellow members of the United Nations, of the Commonwealth and of a number of other international agencies including Regional Organisations, and when ratification processes arc completed they will become major regional contributors of capital to the Asian Development Bank. The Australian Government has taken a friendly interest in India's Efforts to build up her economy and has all along given substantial help. The Government of India particularly appreciated the prompt and generous assistance offered by the Australian Government to help tide over the current food difficulties.

It was agreed that increased cultural exchanges would offer further opportunities for closer constructive friendship between India and Australia. Already there has been, during the past decade, increasing cultural cooperation with exchange of students and scholars, participation in joint undertakings in the fields of science, medicine, agriculture and education, visits by artists and the study of the literature of each country. Both Ministers agreed to give immediate attention to developing further means by which these cultural exchanges may he usefully increased.

AUSTRALIA USA INDIA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UZBEKISTAN VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

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

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following observations on international affairs in the course of her reply to the Lek Sabha debate on President's Address on March 1, 1966 :

TASHKENT DECLARATION

The other question raised was about the Tashkent Declaration. The Tashkent Declaration has been endorsed by the Government and blessed by this House. As hon. Members know, it has been widely welcomed all over the world. It vindicates the principle which India has always championed and which, I believe, the rest of the world now believes which is the principle of coexistence. The basic principle underlying this Declaration is not a new one but the Declaration has given it a new validity and it has opened out a new door or way for better cooperation between India and Pakistan; it has opened a new chapter in the relations between our two countries.

Sir, I said that the Declaration has been welcomed by most of the world--all the world-except, of course, China. China continues to adopt a somewhat menacing posture on our northern borders and by its constant denunciation of the principle of co-existence is, I think, creating tension in the world. She is pursuing a policy which is not conducive to peace in the world.

MILITARY PACTS

There was also mention here as to whether Government would consider having pacts with other nations. The Government's policy on this

63

matter has been clear and it remains the same, which is that we believe that making such pacts does not only not lead to peace but may actually increase tensions; also, in certain cases it may impinge on our independence.

NUCLEAR DEVICE

Another question was about whether or not we should make a nuclear device. The mere fact that China has exploded a nuclear device, I do not think is sufficient reason for us to change our policy on this matter.

We are anxious not to do anything which will precipitate the crisis and lead to the development of nuclear weapons in many more countries. The policy of restraint which we have adopted must, therefore, continue. This is not because we believe that certain big powers should have a monopoly of these destructive weapons but because we are generally anxious to see total nuclear disarmament.

VIET NAM

The other question referred to was : Vietnam. Members are rightly concerned about the situation there which' continues to be very critical. India's position in this regard is also clear, that is, that we are distressed and concerned about the danger of escalation of the conflict and we feel that all efforts towards a peaceful solution, specially on the basis of the Geneva Agreement, should be pursued. We have a special responsibility as Chairman of the Commission for Control and Supervision which we shall wish to discharge fully...(Interruption).

RHODESIA AND ZAMBIA

Two other countries which figure in the debate were Rhodesia and Zambia. While the primary responsibility to settle the constitutional future of Rhodesia- remains that of the United Kingdom, we have to use all our influence to try to find a solution consistent with the dignity and aspirations of the people of Zambia.

We are very friendly with Zambia and we have tried to help her in any way we can by giving supplies and by sending a rehabilitation officer along with staff to help settle the people who have been dislodged from Rhodesia and who have hid to take refuge there.

COLONIALISM

We are also deeply concerned with and shall continue our efforts for the eradication of colonialism Wherever it exists and to bend all our energies to remove racialism and discrimination between man and man. The Union of South Africa still flouts the wishes of the world community and the resolutions of the United Nations. We, on our part, have fully implemented these resolutions. We hope that other countries will do so also.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the nation today faces a host of problems, national and international, political and economic. I reiterate that the Government will address itself with determination to the challenging task of overcoming these difficulties. We shall never forget that our ultimate objective is to serve the common man. We must provide relief and succour to our people, vast masses of whom are still in abject poverty. To millions of people mere political freedom has not brought prosperity nor can it do so unless we can translate political freedom into social and economic security. We shall, therefore, continue to devote ourselves to the task of building our economy so as to improve the living standards of our people.

Through the sacrifice of countless heroes, known and unknown, we have inherited freedom and the opportunity of creating a new pattern of living for generations yet unborn. In this task, hon. Members of Parliament, I seek your help and cooperation.

UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA PAKISTAN CHINA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND ZAMBIA

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

JORDAN

Indo-Jordan Trade Arrangement

Trade talks between India and Jordan concluded in New Delhi on March 9, 1966, with the signing of documents outlining the Trade Arrangement for 1966 between the two countries. The Arrangement envisages a substantially higher level of trade between the two countries this year than in 1965.

The Jordan delegation was led by Mr. Kemal Homoud, Ambassador of Jordan in India. Shri

64

D. S. Joshi, Secretary, Union Ministry of Commerce, led the Indian delegation.

The two delegations reviewed the working of the 1965 trade arrangement and considered the levels of trade for 1966. India has agreed to buy this year a larger quantity of rock phosphate, which is the main item of import from jordan. Jordan will buy Indian products like jute goods, tea and engineering items.

In addition to the level of trade envisaged under the Trade Agreement, the two delegations explored the possibility of increasing exchange of commodities between the two countries. From Jordan's side, potash was suggested as an item for export to India in future. The scope for Indian exports to Jordan of a number of engineering goods including steel pipes, steel bars and rods, was also discussed.

JORDAN INDIA USA

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Anti-Indian Propaganda, by Pakistan

The following is the text of a statement made by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, in the Lok Sabha on March 23, 1966, regarding anti-Indian propaganda by Pakistan's accredited representatives and others :

According to Article IV of the, Tashkent Declaration, both sides have agreed to discourage any propaganda directed against the other country and to encourage propaganda which promotes the development of friendly relations between the two countries.

Immediately after the Declaration was signed, we gave instructions to all Our Missions and to our information and publicity agencies to exercise restraint and not to undertake, any publicity, which might be considered as being directed against Pakistan. In the Pakistan Press and on the Pakistan Radio, we noticed a welcome abatement of anti-Indian propaganda. We, also received encouraging reports from our Missions in regard to Pakistani publicity abroad. However, this situation did not last too long. While in consonance with the Tashkent Declaration and with the Tashkent spirit we, have continued to avoid anti-Pakistan propaganda, Pakistani media of public information as well as their government agencies have during the past few weeks resumed propaganda of an anti-Indian character. A reading of the Pakistan Press and listening to Pakistan Radio broadcasts increasingly show a reversion by Pakistan towards the pre-Tashkent position in this regard. Several statements made by the members of the Pakistan Government also in recent days have been propagandist and must inevitably arouse, anti-Indian feelings contrary to the Tashkent spirit.

Recently, on the 10th March, 1966, Pakistan's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Ghulam Ahmed in a speech before the Chicago Council on World Affairs spoke about the recent Indo-Pakistan conflict and described his country's traditional view of the origin and development of the Kashmir issue. He also made some remarks about India's attitude towards Kashmir.

We have protested to the Pakistan Government against the deliberate and sustained violation of the letter and spirit of the Tashkent Declaration by Pakistan.

PAKISTAN INDIA UZBEKISTAN USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on Indo-Pakistan Ministerial Talks

The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following statement in Parliament on March 4, 1966 regarding the Indo-Pakistan Ministerial talks held at Rawalpindi on March 1 and 2, 1966 :

As the House is aware, the Tashkent Declaration provides for various measures to be taken and various issues to be discussed between India and Pakistan. Both sides have been taking action in fulfilment of some provisions of the Declaration, notably Articles II, V and VII, which relate to the withdrawal and disengagement of forces, the restoration of normal diplomatic relations, and the exchange of prisoners. There has also been

65

partial progress in respect of the restoration of communications envisaged in Article VI, as also under Article IV, which calls for the discouragement of propaganda directed against the other country. However, for further progress in pursuance of the Tashkent Declaration numerous other issues of immediate as well as of longterm importance need to be settled and as a result of exchanges between the two Governments it was decided that to this end a meeting be held at Ministers level between the two sides at Rawalpindi on March 1st and 2nd.

Accordingly, the Indian Ministers of External Affairs, of transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism, and of Commerce, accompanied by several advisers, had a brief format opening meeting with the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, of Commerce and of Communications of the Government of Pakistan and their advisers on the morning of 1st March. Thereafter many meetings, formal and informal, at Ministerial and official level, were held and a joint communique was issued on the evening of 2-3-1966. I place on the Table of the House a copy of the communique.

As stated in the Communique, the talks in Rawalpindi were of an exploratory nature and led to a useful exchange of views. During their exchanges with the Pakistan Government preparatory to the Conference, the Government of India had suggested that it be held to consider further steps towards the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration. The Government of India had added that, in particular, discussions take place on the questions of restoration of trade, economic relations and communications and the property and assets taken over by either side. The Government of Pakistan had proposed that Ministerial meeting should discuss six additional items which were briefly, according to them, the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir, the reduction of armed forces following settlement of the Kashmir dispute, the creation of conditions preventing the exodus of people, the so-called evictions, the Farakka Barrage and the implementaof existing agreements.

Eventually it was agreed that the meeting take place without any agenda, each side naturally being free to raise whatever issues it wished to. At the discussions held on March 1st and 2nd, each side explained to the other at length which issues they felt could most appropriately and usefully be discussed at this stage to achieve the purposes of the Tashkent Declaration. The Pakistan Delegation highlighted the question of Kashmir, which they appeared to consider as the root cause of all other Indo-Pakistan issues and which had to be tackled if progress were to be achieved in improving Indo-Pakistan relations. The Indian delegation reiterated the Government of India's views on the Kashmir question and explained that, as no useful purpose could be served by discussing it, the Conference should proceed to complete the normalisation of relations in the fields disturbed by the conflict and also take up some other major issues, the solution of which would lead to a better understanding between the two Governments and greater goodwill between the two peoples. We pointed out that the significance of the Tashkent Declaration was that on the one hand the two sides would not resort to force but would settle their differences by peaceful means, and, on the other, they would proceed with the settlement of various individual issues even though on some other issues their positions might remain far apart.

Both sides reaffirmed their resolve to adhere to the terms of the Tashkent Declaration and to discharge their obligations under the Declaration and, having exchanged views on the approach which each considered would best further this cause, decided to meet again at a later date.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued on March 2, 1966 at the end of the two-day Indo-Pakistan Ministerial talks at Rawalpindi :

A Ministerial meeting between India and Pakistan was held at Rawalpindi on the 1st and 2nd March to discuss matters of direct concern to the. two countries in further implementation of the Tashkent Declaration.

The Indian Delegation consisted of Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister for External Affairs; Mr. N. Sanjiva Reddy, Minister for Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism; Mr. Manubhai Shah, Minister for Commerce and their Advisers. The Pakistan Delegation consisted of Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Minister for Foreign Affairs; Mr. G. Faruque, Minister for Commerce; Khan A. Sobur Khan, Minister for Communications and their Advisers.

The two sides proposed for discussion and settlement subjects to which they attached high priority in the interest of peaceful and good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan. The Pakistan side pointed out the special importance of reaching a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. Both sides agreed that all disputes between India and Pakistan should be resolved to promote and strengthen peace between the two countries.

Considerable progress was made in clarifying the issues involved. The talks, which were of an exploratory nature, led to useful exchange of views. Both sides agreed to meet at a later date.

66

PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA MALI **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Indo-Polish Agreements for Scientific Cooperation

Two separate scientific cooperation agreements between India and Poland were signed in New Delhi on March 26, 1966. The one is an exchange programme for scientific cooperation, mainly in the fields of pure or fundamental sciences, between the C.S.I.R. and the Polish Academy of Sciences, and the other is a protocol for scientific cooperation, mainly in the field of applied sciences and technology between the C.S.I.R. and the Committee for Economic Cooperation with Foreign Countries by the Council' of Ministers of the Peoples' Republic of Poland.

Dr. S. Husain Zaheer, Director-General, Scientific and Industrial Research, signed on behalf of the C.S.I.R., and H.E. Przemyslaw Ogrodzinski, Ambassador, Peoples' Republic of Poland in India, signed from the Polish side.

The agreements provide for exchange, of scientists for a period of about two weeks to six months in order to ensure exchange of scientific experience, consultations, participation in scientific conferences and meetings, delivery of lectures and assistance in organisational and scientific matters. The number of experts and scientists may vary but the total man-days to be spent in either country would be limited, to 350 per year.

The parties will place at each other's disposal 3-5 fellowships in a year for younger scientists for it period varying from six months; to two years.

The agreements also provide for exchange of information on the organisation of scientific and industrial research, data about scientific institutions and scientists as well as information on materials of interest for development of technology and industrialisation in both countries. Cooperation among scientific libraries, information centres and scientific institutions in the exchange of books, periodicals and bibliographies is also envisaged.

According to both the agreements, the exchange programme will remain in force for a period of two years.

According to the protocol for scientific cooperation between C.S.I.R. and the Polish Committee for Economic Cooperation with Foreign Countries, the two parties will exchange this year a 3 to 4 member delegation of experts for a period of four to eight weeks to familiarise with industrial research in each other's country and prepare reports on the fields of mutual interest which could be a basis for future concrete programme of cooperation.

POLAND INDIA USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

RHODESIA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on Rhodesia

The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following statement in Parliament on March 9, 1966 on Rhodesia :

Honourable Members have shown considerable interest in the situation in Rhodesia and I should, therefore, like to take this opportunity to give them further information. Since my last statement made in the House on 12th November, 1965, following U.D.I. which should more appropriately have been called I.D.I., illegal declaration of independence, by the White minority regime in that colony, several developments have taken place.

It will be recalled that in my earlier statement I gave expression to Government of India's strong condemnation of the illegal seizure of power and offered full cooperation to the Security Council, the General Assembly and the OAU in whatever steps they may propose to deal with U.D.I. Further, in addition to having already withdrawn our

67

Mission from Salisbury, as a manifestation of India's adherence to basic principles and solidarity with the African people We imposed a total embargo on all trade and economic relations with Rhodesia. The reaction of the Government of India to U.D.I. and the unequivocal expression of full solidarity with, and support for the people of Rhodesia in the present situation created a very favourable impact among the friendly countries of Asia and Africa in particular, and the world in general.

Our late Prime Minister, Shastriji was also in correspondence with Mr. Wilson on this subject. He laid stress on the gravity of the situation and reiterated that it was Britain's responsibility to end the rebellion and create conditions for a democratic regime to function in that country. He stressed that the susceptibilities of the Afro-Asian members of the Commonwealth on this explosive question deserved the most serious consideration by Government of Britain. Moreover, he expressed the fear that the imposition of partial economic and financial measures may not have the desired effect and may indeed give the illegal regime time to consolidate itself. Our late Prime Minister had also been in correspondence with his Commonwealth and other colleagues on this important issue.

The situation in Rhodesia and the failure of Britain to bring about an early termination of the illegal regime has naturally had a powerful reaction among African countries, The Organization of African Unity has been seized of this question and we understand that at the Addis Ababa meeting on 3rd December, 1965, a recommendation was made to member states to break off diplomatic relations with Britain if the illegal regime was not brought down by December the 15th, 1965. Since that O.A.U. meeting nine African countries have broken off diplomatic relations with Britain of which Ghana and Tanzania belong to the Commonwealth. It was to consider these serious developments of a farreaching nature that the late Prime Minister of Nigeria, Mr. Balewa, proposed a conference of Heads of Commonwealth Governments in Lagos. The Honourable Members are aware that India participated in this meeting on the 11h and 12th January, 1966, where all Commonwealth Governments were represented except Ghana and Tanzania, Australia chose to be represented only by an observer. Shastriji could not attend this conference due to his pre-occupation with the Tashkent meeting where my presence was also required. He was represented by Shri A. K. Sen. At Lagos the Indian delegation while welcoming Mr. Wilson's statement that the action of the Smith regime was treason reiterated our view

that the primary responsibility for ending this rebellion continued to rest with Britain. It was also stressed, and in this we had the- support of the majority of other Commonwealth Governments, that partial economic sanctions against Rhodesia had not had the desired result and that there was the need for a total embargo on all trade. Hon'ble Members are already aware that India was one of the first countries to impose a total embargo on our trade with Rhodesia even though this has been at a considerable sacrifice to our economy. The Indian delegation in Lagos stressed that the present evils in Rhodesia stemmed from the unwise policies followed by Britain since 1923 culminating in the imposition of the 1961 constitution against African opinion and interests. That Constitution should now be abrogated; it is the objectionable feature of this Constitution which have created the present situation, and there should be no attempt to revive it. The Indian delegation further stressed the need to enforce effectively the embargo on oil urged by the Security Council and to keep under review the impact of trade and economic sanctions already imposed. It stressed that if within a reasonable. Period, say 6 to 7 months from U.D.I., the trade and economic sanctions do not Produce any decisive effect further measures must be undertaken not excluding the use of force. the use of force, if necessary, was a kev to the problem because this ultimate sanction alone would undermine the confidence of the rebels and hasten the end of the illegal regime.

The difficulties resulting from the economic sanction against Rhodesia faced by Zambia with which country we have the friendliest of relations, have naturally been a matter of concern to us. We have indicated to the Government of Zambia our readiness to render necessary assistance within our means for Zambia's Contingency Planning. We have provided the services of an expert on relief and rehabilitation of refugees and arrangements have also been made for the supply of steel drums for transportation of petroleum products by air. The Sanctions Committee set up during the Lagos Conference has since met in London on 25th January and the Government of Zambia hive indicated their requirements under Contingency Planning which will be examined by individual Commonwealth Governments. Government will remain in direct touch with the Government of Zambia on the

question of further aid on a bilateral basis.

The text of the communique issued at the conclusion of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in Lagos is laid on the Table of the House. I may summarise the results of the Lagos Conference as follows :

(1) re-affirmation that the primary responsibility for guiding Rhodesia to independence lay with Britain, but acknowledgement by Britain that the problem was of wider concern to Africa the Commonwealth and the world. The British view

68

that the, economic and financial sanctions would bring the rebellion to an end within, a matter of weeks rather than months was noted but many participants had misgivings in this regard. It was agreed that "the Sanctions Committee will recommend the reconvening of the Prime Ministers meeting when they judge this necessary."

- (2) acceptance that the use of military force in Rhodesia could not be precluded if this proved necessary to restore law and order;
- (3) agreement to hold another Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in Jury, 1966, it the rebellion has not ended by then, or even earlier it recommended by the Sanctions Committee;
- (4) appointment of two committees composed of representatives of all Commonwealth Governments to :

(a) regularly review the effect of sanctions and steps taken to give concerted assistance to Zambia, and

(b) co-ordinate a special programme of Commonwealth assistance in training the African people of Rhodesia.

(5) finally, expression of the hope in the context of the worldwide problem of race relations that a just solution to the Rhodesian question would be found thereby promoting greater harmony between nations and recognition of the dignity of man.

The Honourable Members may be interested to know that following the Lagos Conference the Sanctions Committee has started functioning in London and the British Government have announced from February 2nd a total economic ban on imports and further curbs on exports to Rhodesia. The exceptions made in the case of British exports as stated by U.K. Government pertain to goods for essential needs of services operated jointly by Rhodesia and Zambia or for essential humanitarian purpose. We earnestly hope that these measures along with any further steps that may be taken will be successful in bringing the illegal regime to a speedy end so that a representative Government of the people of Rhodesia based on the principle of one man one vote can be established as early as possible in that country. Any attempt by Britain to negotiate with the existing illegal regime resulting in or to otherwise bring about the imposition of another period of white minority rule in Rhodesia would be wholly unacceptable. Neither would we favour any delay in the convening of a Constitutional Conference representative of all sections Of the, people of Rhodesia nor the re-imposition by Britain of the 1961 Constitution after the termination of the rebellion. Government are closely watching the situation and will continue to take such measures as may be called for in collaboration with other friendly powers, specially those in Africa.

FINAL COMMUNIQUE

The following is the text of the Communique issued at the conclusion of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in Lagos on January 12, 1966 :

The Meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government under the Chairmanship of Alhaji The Right Hon. Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of Nigeria, ended today in Lagos. Cyprus was represented by its President and Zambia by its Vice-President. In addition to Nigeria, Britain, Canada, The Zambia, Malawi, Malta, Sierra Leone, Singapore and Uganda were represented by their Prime Ministers; Jamaica was represented by its acting Prime Minister; while Malaysia, and Trinidad and Tobago were represented by their Deputy Prime Ministers; Ceylon was represented by its Minister of Justice; India by its Minister of Law and Social Security; Kenya by its Minister of Finance; and New Zealand and Pakistan by High Commissioners. There was an Australian observer.

On the eve of the Meeting news was received of the death of the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri. The Prime Ministers paid tribute to the work of the late Mr. Shastri and a message of condolence was sent by the Chairman on behalf of the Meeting.

The Prime Ministers welcomed Singapore to their discussions as an independent member of the Commonwealth.

The expressed their especial appreciation of the invitation from the Prime Minister of Nigeria to meet in Lagos. Observing that this was the first meeting to be held in Africa, they agreed that to assemble from time to time in a different Commonwealth capital would underline the essential character of the Commonwealth as a free association of equal nations, spanning all races and continents.

The Prime Ministers noted that this was also the first Meeting to be held after the establishment of the Commonwealth Secretariat and were glad to welcome the Secretary-General.

This was the first meeting called to deal with a single political issue and was devoted entirely to the question of Rhodesia. The Prime Ministers discussed in particular the ending of the rebellion; the need for cooperation with and assistance to Zambia; and the future of Rhodesia under constitutional rule. A Working Party of officials discussed in greater detail the nature and efficacy of economic measures against the illegal regime in Rhodesia; ways in which Zambia could be

69

helped in its cooperation in these measures; and the question of Commonwealth assistance in training Africans in Rhodesia. They reported their conclusions to the Meeting.

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed that the authority and responsibility for guiding Rhodesia to independence, rested with Britain, but acknowledged that the problem was of wider concern to Africa, the Commonwealth and the world.

The Prime Ministers recalled their statement, first made in 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".

They further recalled that in their 1965 communique they stated that "the principle of 'one man one vote' was regarded as the very basis of democracy and this should be applied to Rhodesia".

They expressed their concern at the danger to aft multi-racial communities in the Commonwealth, particularly in East and Central Africa, and at the danger to the future of the, multiracial Commonwealth itself if the situation in Rhodesia were to continue.

Objectives

The Prime Ministers declared that any political system based on racial discrimination was intolerable. It diminished the freedom alike of those who imposed it and of those who suffered under it. They considered that the imposition of discriminatory conditions of political, social, economic and educational nature upon the majority by any minority for the benefit of a privileged few was an outrageous violation of the fundamental principles of human rights.

The Meeting agreed that the goal of future progress in Rhodesia should be the establishment of a just society based on equality of opportunity to which all sections of the community could contribute their full potential and from which all could enjoy the benefits due to them without discrimination or unjust impediment.

To this end several principles were affirmed. The first was the determination of all present that the rebellion must be brought to an end. All those detained for purely political reasons should be released. Political activities should be constitutional and free from intimidation from any quarter. Repressive and discriminatory laws should be repealed. The Prime Ministers noted the statement of the British Government that a period of direct rule would be needed, leading to we holding of a Constitutional Conference. This Conference representing all sections of the Rhodesian people would be for the purpose of recommending a Constitution leading to majority rule on a basis acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole.

Ending the Rebellion

The Prime Ministers reviewed and noted the measures taken by Commonwealth and other countries against the illegal regime. Some expressed concern that the steps taken so far had not resulted in its removal. They called on all countries which had not already done so to act in accordance with the, recommendations of the Security Council Resolution of 20th November. 1905, making at the same time necessary arrangements to provide for the repercussions of such further measures on the economy of Zambia.

The Prime Ministers discussed the question of the use of military force in Rhodesia and it was accepted that its use could not be precluded it this proved necessary to restore law and order.

In this connection the Prime Ministers noted the statement by the British Prime, Minister that on the expert advice available to him the cumulative effects of the economic and financial sanctions might well bring the rebellion to an end within a matter of weeks rather than mouths. While some Prime Ministers had misgivings in this regard, all expressed the hope that these measures would result in the overthrow of the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia within the period mentioned by the British Prime Minister.

The Prime Ministers decided on the following measures of Commonwealth action, starting now :

(1) To appoint two continuing committees composed of representatives of all Commonwealth countries to meet with the Secretary-General in London. The first will review regularly the effect of sanctions and also the special needs which may from time to time arise in honouring the Commonwealth's undertaking to come to the support of Zambia as required. The second will co-ordinate a special Commonwealth Programme of Assistance in training Rhodesian Africans as set out below.

- (2) The Sanctions Committee will recommend the reconvening of the Prime Ministers' Meeting when they judge that this is necessary. In any case, the Prime Ministers agreed to meet again in July if the rebellion has not been ended before then.
- (3) The Sanctions Committee will advise the Prime Ministers if it considers action by the United Nations is called for.

70

(4) Some Prime Ministers indicated that they reserved the right if need arises to propose mandatory United Nations action under Articles 41 or 42 of Chapter VII of the Charter. This statement was noted by the other Heads of Government

Cooperation with Zambia

The Prime Minister of Britain informed his colleagues of British actions in support of Zambia. The Prime Ministers welcome the effort made by Commonwealth and other countries in organizing the emergency transport of oil and vital supplies. The Meeting agreed that members of the Commonwealth should give full consideration to concerted assistance to Zambia and that this assistance should be extended to include Malawi if necessary.

Assistance in Training Rhodesian Africans

The Prime Ministers were agreed that planned assistance to be lawfully constituted Government of Rhodesia should begin at once. They therefore approved the establishment of a special Commonwealth Programme to help accelerate the training of Rhodesian Africans and directed the Secretary-General to arrange as soon as possible a meeting of educational and technical assistance experts to consider detailed projects of aid by Commonwealth countries, including the early establishment of an administrative training centre in Rhodesia.

Conclusion

Finally, the Prime Ministers saw the Rhodesian question in the context of the worldwide problem of race relations. They reaffirmed the declaration made in their Communique Of July 1964 and expressed the hope that a just solution to the Rhodesian question would light a ray of hope for men and women of all races throughout the world for a future giving assurance of greater harmony between nations and recognition to the dignity of man.

USA INDIA ETHIOPIA GHANA NIGER NIGERIA AUSTRALIA TANZANIA UZBEKISTAN ZAMBIA UNITED KINGDOM CYPRUS CANADA MALAWI MALTA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE UGANDA JAMAICA MALAYSIA TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO KENYA NEW ZEALAND PAKISTAN

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

India's Acceptance of Soviet Project Report on Bokaro Steel Plant

A letter indicating Bokaro Steel Limited's acceptance of the detailed Russian Project Report on Bokaro was handed over to the Vice-president of Tjazhpromexport, Mr. Y. N. Kalashinkov and Mr. Goubert, Director of Gipromez. Soviet Design Organisation, in New Delhi on March 29, 1966.

The acceptance was made at a formal ceremony at Hyderabad House this afternoon. Shri N. N. Wanchoo, Chairman, Bokaro Steel Limited, handed over the letter of acceptance. Mr. Kalashinkov handed over a letter confirming the acceptance. Shri T. N. Singh, Minister for Iron & Steel and Mr. N. I. Smirnov, the Soviet Chargede-Affaires, were present on the occasion.

The project report follows an agreement signed

in January, 1965, between the Governments of India and the Soviet Union for Cooperation in the construction of an integrated iron and steel works at Bokaro-and a contract dated the 6th February, 1965, between Tjazhpromexport and Bokaro Steel Limited.

The project report was submitted by Tjazhpromexport on December 22, 1965. It has been examined and scrutinised by the Bokaro Steel Limited and the Government of India and also discussed in detail with the Soviet Technical Team which is currently in India. As a result of these discussions the Detailed Project Report has been accepted subject to the modifications agreed to by the Indian and the Soviet skies. It is stated that the Project Report incorporates many recent developments of the Soviet and world practice, comprehensive mechanisation and automation of the technological processes and transport systems. The iron and steel works at Bokaro will have a capacity of 1.7 million tonnes at the first stage with a provision for continuous development up to 4 million tonnes. The first stage will now include the Cold Rolling Mill Complex and the construction is expected to be completed by the end of 1970 as against the original period of 5 1/2 years envisaged in the Project Report for the first stage (without the Cold Rolling Mill). The Cold Rolling Mills Complex was to take another 1 1/2 years to complete. The galvanising plant will not be installed at the first stage but if the Bokaro, Steel Limited want to set up an Aluminising Plant

71

instead, the Soviet side will have no objection to the installation of these lines from elsewhere.

The cost of the plant at the 4 million tonnes stage is estimated at Rs. 8,087 million and for the complete project at Rs. 9,213 million. The corresponding figures for the 1.7 million tonnes stage are estimated at Rs. 5,597 million for the complete plant and Rs. 6,265 million for the complete project. It may also be noted that the plant design provides an inbuilt capacity for expansion from 4 to 5.5 million tonnes at the comparatively low cost of Rs. 900 million. As the cost of the Project appears to be apparently high to the Indian side, the Soviet side have agreed to consider possibilities of cost reduction during the course of detailed engineering and preparation of drawings. In doing so they will give due consideration to any concrete technical suggestion which may be made to them by the Indian side. The Soviet side will continue to explore further possibilities of cost reduction during the course of detailed implementation of the Project.

Discussions have been held with the Soviet parties regarding the division of design and engineering work as well as supply of equipment between Indian Organisation and Soviet organisations and the draft contracts submitted by them are being considered.

According to the Agreement, the Soviet organisations are to supply such equipment as is not available in India, during the period 1966 to 1969. The commissioning of the plant in 1970 will contribute in a significant manner to the development of steel industry in the country in the Fourth Plan period and is another example of Indo-Soviet friendship and cooperation.

INDIA RUSSIA USA ITALY

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's State Visit to the United States

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid an official visit to the United States of America from March 28 to April 1, 1966. On March 28, President Johnson gave a dinner in honour of Prime Minister Gandhi at the White House.

Speaking on the occasion, shrimati Gandhi said:

Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, Your Excelleneies, ladies and gentlemen: Your words, Mr. President, were exceedingly moving You have spoken of India and her wide variety. We who live there are naturally deeply conscious of it, while at the same time we are fully aware of the underlying and the basic unity which binds together an our people.

You have quoted some words of my father. I should like to quote something which you yourself have said. You said, Mr. President, Reality rarely matches dreams, but only dreams give nobility to purpose.

In the United States, you have matched your dreams in many ways. Yet you still seek, and rightly, to offer the American people a better and a more purposeful life. You have called this idea The Great Society'. In India, we also have our dreams, which may seem trite to you who sit here, because they appear so simple-food barely sufficient to keep one from hunger, shelter to keep out the wind and the rain, medicine and education by which to restore the faith and the hope of our nearly 500 million people.

But everything in life is relative. There is an old proverb in my country. A person says, I complained that I had no shoes until I met a man who had no feet.'

CHANGING INDIA

Mahatma Gandhi said once, and it is something which my father often repeated, that we in India had to work to wipe the tear from every eye. That of course is a big task and I doubt if it can be done in any country. And yet we have been trying to do that for eighteen long years. Two centuries of subjugation cannot be washed away so easily. It takes time. It takes work. It takes courage. India is changing, as no doubt your advisers who have been to India have told you, Mr. President. Nowhere in the world can the contrast be so striking. We have not only different levels of development between the different States, but even within each State, we have often several centuries existing side by side. We have some of the greatest irrigation 72

works in the world, and yet in parts of out State of Rajasthan, desert families store precious water under lock and key. During a tour of some of these border areas a couple of months or so ago, I myself experienced the great hardship of doing without water and measuring the miles from well to well. Some 12 million or more of bullock carts still churn the dust of our village roads. Yet in other parts of India, we are building three, nuclear power plants.

Average agricultural yields are low, and at the same time there are areas where we obtain sugarcane yields that compare favourably with those in Hawaii or in Java.

A third of the illiterate people in the world are in India. Yet we are steadily conquering illiteracy.

In our State, of Maharashtra, village after village strives to achieve total literacy. Parents learn from their children so that the honour of the village is upheld. In Madras, people have banded together to improve their schools. They have given 100 million rupees beyond what the Government spends on their schools.

In the Punjab, little workshops make, lathes and pumps that have revolutionized the countryside.

The seeming inconsistencies and conflicts of India are legion. The setbacks, and we have had many, are heart-breaking. Yet the signs of change are clear and constantly growing.

Sometimes critics point to an example of success and say, 'This proves nothing. This is a mere drop in the ocean of Indian poverty.' How wrong this is ! for, every success reinforces the prospect of further success. It shows that success is possible. The example and the confidence it generates radiates outward.

This, Mr. President, is really our major problem. Years ago, when we visited the villages to persuade people to try for a better life, they turned to us and said, There can be no better life. God wills it this way. This is our lot and we have to suffer it'. Today not a single voice will be heard like this. There IS only one-demand, that we do want a better life, we want better schools and more schools. We want bigger hospitals and more hospitals, and all the other signs of progress and signs of raising the standards of living.

This I think is a very big achievement.

You talked of democracy. May I tell you one more story which I shared with the Vice-President a short while ago. It happened during our first election. I had gone to speak in a village where just the day before the leader of an opposition party had spoken. When my speech was ended, an elderly gentleman got up from the audience, and said, 'We have listened very carefully to what you have said, but just the day before somebody came--so and so cameand he said the exact opposite. Now, which of you was telling the truth ?'

Now, this, you can understand, is an extremely tricky question to ask a public speaker. I said. "Well, I think that what I said was the truth, but I have no doubt that the gentleman thought that what he said was the truth. The whole point of democracy is that everybody should say whatever he thinks is the truth, and you, the people, have to really judge which is the correct version. and which is the right version or the right thing for you'.

Well, this was rather a difficult explanation for them, and they said, 'Now, you tell us, do you belong to the Congress Party?' I said, 'I do'. 'Is your party in power ? Is it forming the Government ?' I said, 'Yes, it is'. 'Then what business have you to send somebody here who tells us incorrect things. It is your business to keep them away.'

This was one of the stops where I was supposed to stay only ten minutes, but where I stayed for two hours trying to argue, the whole point out about elections, freedom of expression, and so on. I can't say that I got any further at the end of two hours.

But now, years later, we find that we have gotten further. Nobody today in India would put such a question. They know that the different parties have their points of view, and these points of view are put before the people, and the people judge, not always rightly, but I think they try to judge rightly. Certainly, from election to election they have shown a greater

maturity.

India very definitely is on the move. Mr. President, the United States has given India valuable assistance in our struggle against poverty, against hunger, against ignorance, and against disease. We are grateful for this act of friendship. But we also know that our own 'Great Society' must and can only rest securely on the quality and the extent of our own effort.

This effort we are determined to make; we owe it to our friends, and even more so we owe it to ourselves.

Nevertheless, I believe that it is of the greatest importance, to use your own words, to, bring into closer union the spirit and courage of both our countries. I welcome your intention to set up an Indo-American Foundation, which will give tangible shape and form to this union.

The present-day world offers the possibility of bringing together one people with another. The young men and women of your Peace Corps are

73

well-known and well-loved in our country. Every endeavour to sustain and enlarge this people to people partnership is a good effort and is welcome.

Friendship with America is not a new thing for us. Those of us in India who have been involved with the struggle for freedom have known from our earliest days your own struggle here. We have been taught the words of your leaders, of your past great Presidents, and, above all, we were linked in friendship because of the friendship which President Roosevelt showed us, the understanding which he showed during some of the most difficult days of our independence struggle. I have no doubt it was also this understanding and friendly advice given to the British Government which facilitated and accelerated our own freedom.

But there again the major effort had to be our own, and this is what we want today, that we should bear our burden, as indeed we are doing, but that a little bit of help should come from friends who consider it worthwhile to lighten the burden

INDIA'S PROBLEMS ARE WORLD'S PROBLEMS

Because, Mr. President, India's problems today are her own, but they are also the world's problems. India has a position in Asia which faces an explosive situation. India, if it is stable, united, democratic, I think can serve a great purpose. If India is not stable, or if there is chaos, if India fails, I think it is a failure of-the whole democratic system. It is a failure of many of the values which you and I both hold dear.

That is why, Mr. President, I welcome your words and I welcome this meeting with you, which has been most valuable to me.

I invite you, ladies and gentlemen, to join with me in drinking a toast to the President and Mrs. Johnson, our friends, the American people, and the Great Society, not just for America, but for all who dream of it. for all who struggle to transform those dreams into reality.

USA INDIA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Address to the National Press Club

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following speech at a luncheon given in her honour by the National Press Club, Washington, on March 29, 1966:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am delighted to be here today in this gathering of newsmen and representatives of mass communication media. Need I say that I am specially happy that the women members of the profession are also present.

I am grateful to the President and to Mrs. Johnson, the members of the United States Government and the people of this country for their kindness, hospitality and warmth of welcome to me. I have had frank and friendly talks with President Johnson and have profited from an exchange of views on many matters. We have asked nothing of each other. However I am confident that as a result of these talks the understanding between our two countries has been immeasurably increased.

This afternoon I should like to speak to you and through you to the American people. I should like to speak about India, an old country, a new country, a fast-developing country. India, where many centuries are telescoped into one. In our historical situation we have learned to live with internal strains and tensions. These we consider growing pains.

FOOD PROBLEM

This year we are also confronted with a difficult food situation caused by an unprecedented drought. There is acute scarcity in parts of the country but no famine or starvation as we understood the words in pre-Independence days. We may have averted deaths, but continued malnutrition is as dangerous. We are making every effort to ensure equitable distribution of available cereals including the wheat and other supplies which America and other countries are generously providing.

Nevertheless, 1966 will be a hard year. To the casual observer, the Indian scene, political and economic might appear distressing even ominous. Such a conclusion however would be wrong.

I do not underrate India's problems. It is an ancient country, reborn and striving courageously to make the tremendous transition from a traditional to a modern society. It is an effort which represents one of the most significant human experiments of our time.

Consider India. It is only one-third the geographic size of the United States. But when you talk of India you are talking of a country with more people than all the Americas, North and South. You are talking about one-seventh of the entire human race.

74

Obviously what happens to India is Of profound importance. Not because of the vote, India casts in the United Nations. Not because of any military prowess. Not because of its rich culture. But because it constitutes a Society of nearly 500 million people. Many faiths, languages and races exist side by side. India is the largest composite society in the world. This is an essential fact to which I would draw your attention.

DEMOCRATIC IDEAL

India like the United States, is wedded to the democratic ideal. Early next year an electorate of some 250 million people will go forth to elect freely and without fear their chosen representatives for the fourth time since Indian Independence.

But what does democracy mean in the raid-20th century ? Does it merely mean the right to vote, the rule of law, freedom of speech, association and worship ? Or does it mean more than, I suggest it does ? Today democracy inescapably implies social welfare, equality of opportunity, reasonable living standards, and the dignity of the individual. Man does not live by bread alone. But equally he needs bread to enjoy liberty.

This is the remarkable feature of democracy in India. It represents a striking historical reversal. Political democracy as we know it today was for the most part--certainly in Europe -the end-product of a long revolutionary process of industrial development and educational and social change. In India, democracy has been made the instrument of such a change. We firmly believe that democracy and development can and must go hand in hand and that the human being cannot be sacrificed in the name of material development.

Nonetheless with the grant of political rights to a huge and increasingly social and politically conscious electorate the people, like Oliver Twist, want more. They are right to want more, and better.

INDIAN PLANNING

This revolution of rising expectations, as it has been called, generates its own pressures. India has not escaped from these pressures and is subject to them. The rapid rise in population has aggravated our problems. We have added largely to our numbers since Independence. Every month there are a million more Indians to care for. We have, however, launched a vast family planning programme. The magnitude of our effort will be evident from just two statistics : 18,000 family planning centres are actually operating in the country today and we have increased the budget for family planning 20-fold. Poverty is our basic problem. It is our principal enemy. The per capita income of the average Indian is no mom than \$ 70 per annum. If a per capita monthly consumption of \$4 is regarded as a bare minimum, then half the population of India lives below the breadline. This lends urgency to development.

I find it difficult to understand the concern of those of our friends who feel that India's plans are too ambitious. Time is not with India but against it. With the increase in population we have to run fast to stand still. There was a 40 per cent increase in national income in the first decade of Indian planning. Of this only 16 per cent went into higher living standards. The rest was absorbed by population growth.

Many of our problems are problems of growth and often the result of success. Even the population increase is wholly rooted in improved health, better nutritional standards and the eradication of diseases like malaria. In 1951 we had 100 million cases of malaria, in 1965 only 100,000.

We have a foreign exchange crisis because we have a large and diversified industrial economy that just did not exist a decade ago. Today we make jets and computers and export machine tools to Western Europe. We have supplied heavy water to Belgium. We are among the leading nations in the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. If India faces a crisis today it is largely a crisis of development.

POLITICAL STABILITY

I do not say this in extenuation of our mistakes

or failures. I am conscious of the fact that we should and could have done better. But taking the record as a whole, what has been achieved is quite remarkable especially as it has been achieved in conditions of peace and political stability. In an unstable world India stands out as a rock of stability. We may quarrel among ourselves. But in times of crises the nation has time and again risen as one to face the challenge. Basically India is united and strong. There is an underlying strand of Indianness that cannot be torn asunder.

The impatient observer often gets an exaggerated sense of disunity on account of our regional, caste and communal pulls. These negative forces are there. They are manifestations of an unfortunate but only too natural desire to secure as large a slice of the all too small cake of opportunity that we can yet provide our people. They do not represent any fundamental division. And they are weakening with every passing year, although a contrary impression might be created by the violence of their death struggle. Indeed, considering the size of India, the diversity of its people and the immense problems of poverty with which it is grappling, the wonder is not that there has been strain and internal tension but

75

that there has been such an extraordinary degree of stability and orderly progress.

This achievement should not be understimated. It is useful to recall that even such old and prosperous countries as the United States, Canada and Belgium have problems of race, language and religion - by-products of history which they are trying to solve in their own way.

Development with democracy in conditions of stability has been a major Indian contribution to world peace and human welfare. Yet poverty remains our main enemy. We are dedicated to victory in this struggle and we are convinced that we shall win.

FOREIGN AID

In the task of economic development we have received crucial assistance from the United States, other friendly nations and various international agencies. We are grateful for this act of faith. Although India may have received substantial foreign assistance in absolute terms, our own effort has been four to five times as large. The aid received by India in per capita terms is also about the lowest on the international scale. Given a modest step-up in foreign assistance, better terms in trade, opportunities of repayment in kind, a re-scheduling of external debts, and improved plan implementation on our part, India can attain a stage of self-generating growth within the next decade. Even today I might add India is also a donor nation and has aided and is aiding a number of countries in Asia and Africa.

The present Economic difficulties confronting India constitute a passing phase. If our Third Plan has not done as well as we had hoped there are some external reasons for this, quite apart from any failures on our part: the Chinese attack in 1962 which resulted in a substantial diversion of resources and materials from development,.... the Indo-Pakistan conflict, the pause in aid, that followed and still continues, and, most recently, the unprecedented drought that has affected huge parts of the country and created problems of food, rising prices and balance of payment difficulties.

All these, I am convinced, are temporary difficulties and the Indian economy should resume its forward momentum within the year. Meanwhile, there is much that has been achieved that does not enter into the cold statistics of growth. Most important of these gains are changing attitudes and values, a changing social structure, the spread of education and health services, child care, including a fairly large and expanding school feeding programme, the development of many new skills, intellectual and scientific, the rise of a new class of managers, technicians and entrepreneurs and technological progress.

We have only made a beginning and have a long road to travel. We are conscious of this. But we are not deterred. We have adopted planning in a mixed economy as the means of attaining the objectives we seek, namely the wellbeing of the individual, 500 million individuals, members of a composite democratic society. If India succeeds the world will be a happier and a safer place for us all. If India were perchance to fail then the world will have cause for anxiety. But we shall not fail.

SECULARISM AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

Over the past 18 years of freedom, we have sought to evolve a purposeful and meaningful national concensus, based upon the principles of secularism and democratic socialism. We interpret these principles in the context of the Indian reality. We are at the same time conscious of living in an interdependent world. We want peace for its own sake as a human necessity. We also know that India's development can go forward as fast as we would like, only in a peaceful world. This outlook has influenced our independent foreign policy. We no longer live in a bipolar world. There have been significant shifts in alignments both in the East and the West. The Sino-Soviet rift, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the decolonisation of large parts of Asia and Africa have resulted in material changes in the international situation.

China's ideology cannot push outwards if its neighbours and other nations possess strong, independent, nationalist governments. They must also see a viable alternative to China. India can be that Asian alternative, an alternative model for economic and social change, a democratic socialist model. It is by its effort to develop in democratic socialism that India poses the most serious challenge to China. It is for this reason again that Peking tries to undo India's nonalignment.

The Sino-Indian problem in this context is more than a boundary question. It is a wider problem of relations between two giant Asian states and their future role in South and South East Asia. We seek no spheres of influence, but if the intention is to weaken us, to erode us politically or disrupt our federal unity, we shall not oblige.

VIET-NAM

We are, like, others, deeply concerned about the future of Vietnam, a near Asian neighbour. We share the world's regret that a peaceful solution has eluded that troubled land thus far despite many and varied efforts. Nevertheless we are convinced that all of us must keep trying. The Geneva Conference could offer a way out and might yet provide the machinery for a return to

76

the negotiating table. India is Chairman of the international Control Commission and we have been and are always ready to play a constructive role in the continuing quest for peace in Vietnam. I have been in my talks with Mr. Johnson impressed by the sincerity of President's desire for a peaceful settlement in that war-torn country.

The real battle in South East Asia and indeed in other areas of the developing world is one of development in conditions of social equality, freedom and stability. We believe that Asian development through the individual efforts of each country and through regional cooperation with friendly assistance from outside is eminently desirable. The Mekong River Project and the Asian Development Bank, in both of which our countries are participating, are pointers.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Though we have rejected Communism for ourselves we do believe in peaceful co-existence. As your President has said, "no man or nation is wise enough to prescribe a single economic system or a single set of political institutions to meet the needs of more than a hundred countries each with its own history, its own resources, its own culture and its own proud spiritual tradition". An idea can only be opposed by a better idea freely chosen by those concerned. Hence our friendship with the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and other countries of Eastern Europe. It is because we genuinely desire to promote peace and coexistence that we have not sought to join the nuclear arms race despite the fact that we possess the necessary technical capability. Here is testimony to our bona fides as a non-aligned nation.

TASHKENT AGREEMENT

I move nearer home to India. Only two months ago we signed an agreement with our neighbour, Pakistan. Through the Tashkent Declaration both our countries proclaimed their faith in peace and in peaceful methods to resolve differences between nations. Since that January day, we on our side have moved with sincerity and speed to deepen and enlarge the Tashkent spirit. It pains me to hear accusations made that India is not reconciled to the very existence of Pakistan. We want Pakistan to live and prosper. We want Pakistan to he stable and devoted to the path of peace. To this end we are prepared to open frontiers, to work out joint economic projects and to heal the wounds of partition.

I have spoken for longer than I had intended. But it was my desire-to put India in perspective. Let me repeat that the fate of India is of the greatest concern to The world and that a stable democratic and prosperous India will by itself be a force for peace and stability.

INDIA DESIRES FRIENDSHIP

India desires the friendship and cooperation of the United States. Though sometimes misunderstandings arise, I believe there is a far wider area of agreement than of disagreement between our two countries.

Both India and the U.S. need one another's friendship and cooperation in this troubled world. India is as important to the U.S. as the U.S. is to India. Let us both recognise this cardinal truth, and let us work together to strengthen the ideals in which we believe and for which we struggled for many years.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BELGIUM CANADA PAKISTAN CHINA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND YUGOSLAVIA UZBEKISTAN

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Joint Communique

The following is the text of the joint. communique issued in Washington on March 29, 1966 at the conclusion of the talks between President Lyndon Johnson and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi :

At the invitation of President Johnson, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, has been on an official visit to the United States of America. During her visit, Prime Minister Gandhi met the President and members of the United States Government.

The President, and the Prime Minister discussed India's efforts for the improved wellbeing of its people. Prime Minister Gandhi emphasized the high priority which India attaches to economic development. President Johnson assured Prime Minister Gandhi of the deep interest of the Government and the people of the United States in participating in international efforts, particularly those under the leadership of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to assist India in its own massive efforts to raise the living standards of its people within the framework of a Parliamentary democracy.

INDIA'S FOOD PROBLEM A CHALLENGE TO HUMANITY

The President and the Prime Minister discussed India's emergency foodgrain requirements resulting from last year's unprecedented drought. They agreed that the problem should be viewed not in isolation but in the context of an incipient worldwide food deficit, a challenge

77

to humanity as a whole that merits the sustained and serious attention of all nations.

The Prime Minister described measures which the Government of India is taking to achieve self-sufficiency in the nation's food production. The President assured her that, Congress willing, the United States will continue to participate generously in the international effort to alleviate India's immediate food deficit problem. The President told Mrs. Gandhi that he intended to send a special message to Congress shortly to seek its endorsement of such U.S. assistance. Both of them agreed that further participation of other countries in meeting India's emergency food needs is also highly desirable.

INDO-U.S. FOUNDATION

Prime Minister Gandhi welcomed the President's proposal for the establishment of an Indo-U.S. foundation to promote progress in all fields of learning. The President and the Prime Minister looked to this cooperative endeavour to develop new teaching techniques in farm and factory, to advance science and to increase research.

TASHKENT DECLARATION

President Johnson and Prime Minister Gandhi agreed that following the Tashkent Declaration there had already been considerable progress toward re-establishing the conditions of peace in the sub-continent and that it is necessary that this process continue in order that the peoples of both countries may concentrate their energies once again on the urgent tasks of national development. They also agreed on the importance of continuing full support to the United Nations objectives of refraining from the use of force and of resolving conflicts between nations through peaceful means.

VIETNAM

During their discussions, President Johnson and Prime Minister Gandhi reviewed recent developments in South and South-East Asia in the context of the universal desire of men and women everywhere to achieve peace that respects liberty, dignity and the pursuit of a better way of life. In this connection, the President explained the policies the United States is parsuing to help the people of the Republic of Viet-Nam to defend their freedom and to reconstruct their war-torn society. The Prime Minister explained the continuing interest and efforts of her country in bringing about a just and peaceful solution of this problem.

CHINA POSES THREAT TO PEACE

Prime Minister Gandhi affirmed the determination of her nation to defend the freedom and territorial integrity of India and explained the challenge presented to it by the aggressive policies of the People's Republic of China. The Prime Minister and the President agreed that such aggressive policies pose a threat to peace, particularly in Asia. The President and the Prime Minister consider that the visit has reaffirmed the strong bonds of friendship between the United States and India, based upon a shared commitment to constitutional democracy and a common revolutionary heritage. Their highly informative, frank and friendly discussions have contributed to a valuable personal understanding between their two countries and their two peoples.

Prime Minister Gandhi extended a warm invitation to President Johnson to visit India. The President expressed his gratitude for the invitation and his hope that be could visit India again.

USA INDIA UZBEKISTAN VIETNAM CHINA **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Speech at the Economic Club in New York

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, delivered the following speech at the Economic Club in New York on March 30, 1966:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very kind words of introduction. I come to the United States and to New York not as a stranger but as a friend. New York is the financial and cultural centre of your great country and I am aware that your Club is one of the best known groups in the business and banking community of this city. I am especially pleased, therefore, to be with you this evening.

PROSPECTS OF INDIAN ECONOMY

My theme today is the performance and prospects of the Indian economy, a subject in which, I know, you have long been interested, The basic fact about India is that she is at once a very old and a very young country. She has had a long history, a great culture and many traditions. But it is less than 18 years since she emerged into her own from the shackles of colonial rule. With the winning of freedom, we lost no time in adopting for ourselves a programme of economic development. Our First Five Year Plan was

78

launched in 1951. In a few days, we shall complete the third of these five year plans, and 15 years of development will be behind us. This period of time, so full of performance and achievement as well as of rising, but unfulfilled expectations, is a useful time-frame for taking stock.

The recorded facts of progress are certainly impressive in all spheres of economic activityagriculture, industry, infrastructure, health and education. I shall not repeat them in detail. Yet I cannot resist quoting some figures which will give you a broad-brush picture of what has taken place in India. In these 15 years the production of foodgrains went up from 50 to 88 million tons, Industrial production has been steadily rising at the rate of 7 to 8 per cent per annum. The generation of electricity has increased fivefold from 1.7 million kilowatts in 1950 to 8.5 million killowatts in 1965. Nearly 70 million children attend school today, as against 25 million in 1950. Malaria and small pox have been eradicated and the expectation of life has increased from 32 years in the 1940s to 50 years now.

In this tremendous endeavour, India has, been greatly helped by her friends abroad. We are grateful for the generosity and understanding with which this help has been forthcoming. Our own efforts in mobilising domestic savings have also been very substantial. In a country as poor as India, where the margin between income and consumption is necessarily narrow, it is rather remarkable that domestic savings have doubled from 5 per cent of the national income in 1951 to over 11 per cent in 1966. In the last 15 years, these internal savings have financed 80 per cent of our total investment. With patience and good cheer, our people have accepted the growing role of taxation in financing the rapidly expanding programmes for developmental and social services. As another measure of self-reliance, exports in the last five years have increased at the rate of 5 per cent per annum. The doctrine of self-help is therefore, not by any means new to us. From the very beginning, we have been committed to, and have steadily organised ourselves for self-reliance to as large a degree as possible.

The practical connotation which we have given to this concept of self-reliance is to undertake, early in the process of development, basic investments designed fully to exploit our human and material resources. We have built steel mills not because they are prestigious but because India has vast reserves of good iron ore and skilled and inexpensive labour. We can produce steel cheaply. We are organised for fabricating machinery and for designing plants using our own steel. We have coal, oil and bauxite which we have proceeded to exploit in the same way. Qualitatively, the last 15 years have seen, not only a growth but a diversification and sophistication of the industrial structure of India. this has meant that we now increasingly import raw materials and components. In many key commodities, the proportion of imports to total consumption is steadily going down.

I am sure you cannot be unaware of these broad facts. But unfortunately this is not the picture which lift been in the forefront of world news about India in the recent months. This is why I wished to draw your attention to them once again this evening.

STRAINS IN INDIAN ECONOMY

In recent months, in India as well as outside, there has been much public discussion on the strains which have developed in the Indian economy. It is not my purpose to take you through the detailed causes which have contributed to the phase of strain and tension which admittedly we are experiencing today. Qualitatively, it seems to me that much of our present difficulties in regard to food and foreign exchange are, in large part, a reflection of the fact that the rising expectations of the Indian people have overtaken the progress so far achieved. The greatest single lesson to be drawn is that in future plans we should aim to achieve decisively higher results than we have done so far.

In this context, the crucial sector is clearly

agriculture. Over the last 15 years, Indian agriculture has grown by nearly 4 per cent per annum. The demand has simultaneously gone up, due not only to the increase in population but also because people eat more, prefer better food and live longer. Even so, with the agricultural growth we have achieved, production might have been adequate for meeting minimum requirements if only food could be steadily produced in factories without any fluctuations beyond the control of man. Unfortunately, the vicissitudes of weather have greater impact in India than perhaps in other parts of the world. We have a high proportion of arable land, but less than a fifth of it is irrigated. Also, a large part of irrigation depends on the rains and, this year, we have had a drought exceptional and unparalleled in the last 70 years. It is a measure of the degree to which the world has become indivisible that in this crisis we have had the full understanding and assistance of many countries and most notably. of your own. With this support, I have no doubt that we shall tide over the famine without too great suffering.

We have drawn a long term and essential lesson from this famine. In agriculture it is not enough to aim at self-sufficiency, we Must produce more. This is the basic objective of the bold new agricultural strategy which has been evolved in India in the last year. This strategy has been based on an intense review for several

79

months preceding the present crisis. Basically, what we are attempting is to break within a short space of time, the vicious circle of poor incentives, inadequate inputs and low production in Indian agriculture and achieve a modernised agriculture, A few months ago, we adopted a policy of guaranteeing to the farmer an incentive floor price for his produce. This change is already producing tangible results. In the last few years, the Indian farmer has become thoroughly accustomed to the use of chemical fertilisers. The consumption of fertilisers has increased nearly twenty fold in the last 15 years, and the demand for it is double what we can produce in India at the moment. Building on this base, the new strategy concentrates on making available the whole package of inputs that the farmer needs, such as fertilisers, improved seeds, credit, pesticides, extension services, etc., to areas of assured

rainfall. We are confident that the additional yield expected by these means will enable India fully to replace food imports by 1970-71. The most encouraging development in this area is the adoption of improved seed varieties for wheat, rice and other grains which promise yields five to six times the present levels. In terms of priority, agriculture has been placed on top of the list of all developmental schemes, whether for allocation of internal or external resources.

POPULATION CONTROL

Of equal priority are our plans for population control. Our efforts have received a decisive impetus in the last year or so. Over 18,000 family planning centres are now functioning in the country and we started on the intrauterine contraceptive device programme last year. This device which is simple, inexpensive and harmless, has already become quite popular and, on an average there are 100,000 insertions a month. This number is rapidly increasing. In the current Plan, the expenditure on family planning will be over ten times that spent on the programme in the first two plans put together and more than three times this higher amount will be allotted for population control in the next five years.

What is important to remember is that in both agriculture and population control, we have to operate in the diffuse area where success depends on the extent to which individuals accept a change in attitude. At this point one can truthfully say that the Indian peasant as well as the Indian parent is being rapidly prepared to accept the changed attitudes demanded of them by modern society. But ultimately what will convince them to modernise is the example of modernisation itself. Nothing succeeds like success, and in the coming years, as examples of progress in India multiply, the pace of progress will certainly accelerate. What is important is that at every stage we should have the resources and the inputs to satisfy this demand for improvement in whatever form and whenever it arises, This them is the challenge for the coming period.

FOURTH PLAN

We are at present engaged in the formulation of the Fourth Five Year Plan. It seeks to take India on to a decisively higher stage of development in the next five years. The investment in the Fourth Plan will be \$ 45 billion, nearly twice the investment of around \$ 24 billion in the Third Plan. The strategy underlying this plan is a rapid reduction in the birth rate, an assurance to the agricultural sector of all the inputs it needs, an emphasis on rapid expansion of exports, and a rapid increase in domestic savings. In drawing up this plan, we have time and again been impressed by the extent to which agriculture, transport, power and industry are linked together. Fertilisers provide the most obvious example of these links. One of our most important targets is to increase fertiliser production capacity to 2.4 million tons of Nitrogen. We already have enough schemes on hand and under active negotiation which will ensure realisation of this target.

As I see it, India is well past the mid-point of a process of development which began in 1951. The next ten or twelve years, of which the Fourth Plan will be only the first milestone, will be a crucial period as it is within this time-span of the next decade or so that India plans to complete her emergence as a fully self-reliant nation. These years will certainly be crucial to the people of India, in terms of the effort and sacrifice which they will be called upon to make. They will also be crucial for our friends elsewhere in the world in that they will face the test of whether they intend to continue the support which they have given to India so far, decisively enough in the future so as to make a difference. The aid which we have received hitherto has been on a generous scale in absolute terms. But, relative to other countries, it has been somewhere at the end of the list on a per capita basis. To some extent, this is, perhaps, due to the enormous size of our country. Nonetheless, the fact remains that unless internal savings are supplemented to an adequate degree, by the import of capital, we 'cannot carry out the very investments which would render the further flow of aid unnecessary in the foreseeable future. I would venture to suggest that from the point of view of the aid giving countries themselves, it would be far better to render assistance on a scale that promotes early self-generating growth than to run the risk of giving too little. Such a policywould be self-defeating.

PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT

This concept of ultimate self-reliance means

that aid, which is an extraordinary form of transfer

80

of resources need not continue and our own export earnings could meet our import requirements. The flow of private investment would certainly continue; it would be welcome and indeed, receive greater emphasis. I am aware that most of you in this gathering are keenly interested in our policies in respect of private foreign investment and I shall, therefore, speak quite frankly on this matter. In India, we welcome private foreign investment not only for the capital it brings with it, but also for the transfer of modern technology and managerial and technical skills private investment facilitates. In the future, we shall continue to maintain our policy of treating foreign investors completely on par with national investors. Indeed, the foreign investors in India is "discriminated" only in the sense of being allowed certain advantages such as tax exemption for technicians which are not available to Indian nationals. Our fiscal structure contains sizable incentives to private investment, Indian and foreign, and these will be continued. We allow full repatriation of profits and capital freely and we intend to continue this policy. Most important of all, India has a large and growing market with a high degree of profitability. In the foreseeable future, it will be one of the world's largest markets; and enterprises established early in the process of development are bound to take a fail share in that prosperity. In India, we have a well-laid infrastructure of power and transport. Indian labour has demonstrated that, with proper training and good working conditions, its productivity can compare with that achieved in Western Europe. We have given high importance to technical education and! there is no dearth of technicians and engineers in India.

This is the brighter side of the picture. The other side which has been presented to us repeatedly is the existence in the Indian system of a number of controls and allocation procedures which, it is claimed, act as a major inhibiting factor to the smooth flow of private investment. To a large extent, these controls are a product of scarcity. When resources are limited, and have to be put to the most productive use within the framework of a system of priorities, it is inevitable that there should be selectivity about the fields in which one wants new investment. To give an obvious example, in the Indian context it would be irrational to assure freedom of investment in cosmetics or similar luxury goods. It is this need for selectivity which necessitates controls.

Having said this, I do fully agree with the plea for a rationalisation and simplification of procedures for operating these controls. In this area, wherever the supply situation has improved, such as in steel or cement, we have loosened the allocation procedures. We have also undertaken a number of steps to streamline the approval mechanism. As a major step in this area, I am meeting young Indain industrialists next month to explore with them possibilities for further improvement. Any suggestions which you might like to contribute in this matter individually or in groups are welcome and we shall give them our full consideration.

Ultimately, liberalisation of controls is possible only with a greater inflow of foreign resources whether from export earnings or foreign aid or foreign investment. We do not believe in controls for their own sake and, with an additional supply of foreign resources. we shall certainly be prepared to relax many of them. On exports, we continue to do all we can, but I must point out that the industrialised countries of the western world need to open up their markets much more than they have been prepared to do so far.

I have outlined our approach to private foreign investment. I feel confident that this approach supplies a framework within which we and you can do business together. In this country you have always believed in pushing back your frontiers. In the last century, you tamed the Wild West. My appeal to you today is that in the next few decades you should allow yourselves to be tamed by the Developing East. In this complex and troubled world of today, the greatest promise for a better future lies in the growth in science and technology and in modern means of communication which have brought this world, yours and mine, so close together already. We, in this generation, have the opportunity to use these marvellous tools to secure for the world peace through prosperity. In this quest, India is entirely ready and willing to be your partner.

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Address to Asia Society old other Organisations in New York

The following is the text of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's speech at a dinner given in her honour by the India Council of Asia Society. the Indian Chamber of Commerce, the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of commerce, the Far-East-America Council of Commerce and Industry, and the Business Council for International Understanding at the Plaza Hotel, New York, on March 31, 1966 :

Mr. Chairman, may I thank you for the kind words in which you have introduced me to the

81

members of your distinguished Club? There is little to be said either about India or about Indo-American relations with which you are not already familiar. But with your permission I should like to indulge in some loud thinking on matters of common concern.

India and the United States, share the values of freedom and peace, religious tolerance and goodwill, care of the weak and the neglected and opportunity for all without sapping the springs of initiative and enterprise. We also share a commitment to political democracy. On us rests a great part of the responsibility of carrying forward over the coming decades the traditions of progress with freedom and justice. As the most affluent democracy and the most powerful nation in the world, America has a place in world affairs which is easy to comprehend. India too will be judged by future historians in terms of her success or failure in enriching human dignity and in sustaining freedom among the emerging nations of the world.

EXPERIMENT IN DEMOCRACY

There is no parallel in history for what we are trying to achieve in India today. In a vast and ancient land steeped in extreme poverty and embracing within its borders a rich variety of cultures, languages and religions, we are, attempting to bridge, in a matter of decades, the gap created by a century and more of stagnation. This we are doing within the framework of an active and highly articulate democracy. For we believe that development can be achieved with consent and with increasing welfare.

The Indian experiment gains meaning and significance in its relevance to two-thirds of humanity for whom the virtues of freedom and of the rule of law have yet to be proven and tested. Neither India nor America can discharge the responsibility which history has bestowed upon them without a correct perspective of the world in which we live.

WORLD OF TODAY

Let us look at the world of today. As a result of the manifold initiatives already taken towards greater international cooperation, our world is becoming increasingly united. In the second half of the twentieth century, science and technology have definitely tilted the scales in favour of greater hope and promise for all mankind. At the same time, tensions still persist and there is growing inequality between one nation and another. A significant fact is the chance in the outlook and quality of the new generation. There is now opportunity for youth to gain recognition, to pursue excellence, and for their talent to flower. In Europe and America, in Asia and Africa, in the Soviet Union and Latin America, the, young are restless and are seeking identity. They are increasingly free from the passions and prejudices of the past. They repudiate the memories and slogans of an age in which wars, depression, colonialism and racial intolerance gave rise to such fierce passions and ideological disputes. Instead they want to hew their own path of endeavour and self-expression.

WIDER GAP

In India too the gap between the new generation and the older one is much wider than ever before. Talented young people are emerging in large numbers and from all sections of society. The attitudes of these young people are changing the standard image of India that exists in the minds of most people abroad. Even in the Indian village of today, bound as, it is by old custom and tradition, you will find an urge for progress and change. Poverty and want, disease and ignorance are no longer accepted as punishment for past sins. The Indian business community has also come of age. The commercial attitudes of the past are dying and a whole generation of younger businessmen, trained in modern methods of management and attuned to technical and economic efficiency, is emerging to create a new and dynamic industry.

'PROPHETS OF GLOOM'

In the political sphere too, we have repeatedly belied the prophets of gloom. With all our differences and difficulties, India has remained one and united, a secular State where religious tolerance is cherished as much as individual freedom, a federal State where local autonomy is constantly being enlarged without undermining the sense of national unity and purpose.

The question is often asked bow despite all her problem India has been able to strengthen the foundations of democracy and harmony. The answer is not difficult to find. In Mahatma Gandhi we had a great leader whose identification with the poorest of the poor gave a strong base to our political party. In my father we had a leader who was young at heart and who retained to the last a fresh and forward-looking mind. He was able to call the nation to great tasks. His leadership was one that stressed self-reliance. He demanded loyalty not to himself but to larger causes. The Congress Party which Mahatma Gandhi and my father guided has a tradition of harbouring under its canopy a wide range of political opinion. Differences are resolved by debate and discussion.

PROGRESS IN ECONOMIC FIELD

I should not like you to believe--mdeed how could I ? --that all is well with India or that

82

we do not have formidable problems still ahead of us. With all our progress in the economic field. and it has been considerable, life for the average Indian still retains its harshness. Much remains to be done to bring the benefits of science and technology to our homes, our farms and our factories. health and education require far greater attention than we have been able to give. In our commerce with other nations, we run an adverse balance which must be met by borrowing from abroad. What should we do to meet this situation ? We have initiated a bold new programme for raising agricultural production and for encouraging family planning. In regard to external trade also, we are making every effort to increase our export earnings and to produce at home a growing proportion of our rapidly rising needs of fertilizers, pesticides, petroleum products, steel and even machinery. The Indian economy has, over the years, achieved a fairly high degree of sophistication and diversification so that even today we are able to manufacture a wide variety of goods and equipment in our own factories.

Some of the difficulties which we are experiencing today in regard to prices, food production and foreign exchange are in large part a reflection of the very success that we have achieved in modernising and transforming the Indian economy. Progress has brought expectation of even greater advance and the desire to move faster than is immediately feasible. If our economy falters and shows signs of strain, they are difficulties of growth and not of stagnation or incompetence or wrong objectives and policies.

If we had not thought of building the basic industries, we might have moved faster. There is no escape from setting up basic industry and transport and power. As we, grow we have, to build the basis of further growth. In President Johnson's words-we must "build for tomorrow in the immediacy of today".

So we continue our endeavour. Four-fifths of our investment of \$ 40 billion in the last fifteen years has come from our own people, mainly through taxation, and mainly from the poor. Only a million Indians are rich enough to pay income tax in a nation of 500 million people. The other one-fifth of our investment comes to us as foreign aid. It is a crucial one-fifth, a catalytic one-fifth. It represents new machinery, new technology and the materials needed by our growing industry.

FOREIGN AID

A great deal of our foreign aid comes from the American people. As we draw closer to the turning point, our effort increases and we need a correspondingly greater volume of aid. If this is not forthcoming. the bright tomorrow recedes. As a nation, we do not wish to depend on foreign assistance for a day longer than is absolutely necessary. Our enormous population has made it difficult for us to obtain the kind of external assistance on a per capita basis as has been made available to other more fortunatelyplaced countries.

With all these disabilities, we do wholeheartedly endorse the principle that foreign aid can be justified only in terms of performance. No nation, not even the United States of America, is rich enough to waste its substance. And no nation, certainly not India, can receive even friendly assistance without paralysing its will and moral, unless such aid is merely a stepping stone towards eventual self-reliance.

The assistance we have received so generously from America has been not only on a Government-to-Government basis. It has also been on a people-to-people and a business-to-business basis. The work of the devoted young people of the Peace Corps, the activities of institutions such as the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation and the presence of a large number of Indian students in your universities-all these are evidence of people-to-people, cooperation. As for business, American and Indian businessmen have come closer together in trade and in industry in a number of productive ventures.

I assure those who have a business interest in India or are contemplating such an interest, that India welcomes them. We treat foreign investors strictly on par with our own investors without any discrimination whatsoever. We allow repatriation of profits and capital freely. These problems can be discussed frankly with us and need not be raised to the level of international controversy. As a nation, we are hospitable. Investors coming to India will be received as friends. We have no rigid or dogmatic attitudes. Our main concern is the well-being of our people and the viability of our country. Whatever the odds we must succeed in our experiment of progress with the freedom and social justice. Consistent with this, we are prepared to consider any and every proposal for international business cooperation.

INDO-U.S. FRIENDSHIP

The bonds of friendship between India and the United States are strong, but they cannot be meaningful and purposeful without the realisation that our two countries have a special responsibility to share at this present juncture of history. To discharge this high. responsibility, we must view the present in the perspective of history. We cannot afford to be distracted by impatience

83

or diverted by difficulties or irritated by misunderstandings which seem so inseparable a part of human relations. The quality of statesmanship lies in rising above the vexations, and irritations of the day. Nowhere is this quality more essential than in the relationship between India and America.

No country is an island nor can it contract out of world affairs. So I should like to touch briefly on India's foreign relations.

INDO-PAK RELATIONS

Many people in the United States ask me about India's relations with Pakistan and China. Indo-Pakistan relations are all too often equated with Kashmir. Now, Kashmir is not the cause but rather the consequence of Indo-Pakistan differences. There was no Kashmir problem on August 15, 1947 when India and Pakistan became independent. The 'problem' as it is called, arose some months later with an invasion of the State of Jammu and Kashmir from Pakistan. This is a United Nations finding and a basic fact.

India agreed and indeed suggested a plebiscite at the time but on condition that the State was first cleared of the invader and peace restored The United Nations endorsed this condition. Since this basic condition was never fulfilled by Pakistan, there could be no question of a plebiscite which was categorically defined as the very last stage of a clearly stated sequence of events.

It is now too late to talk of plebiscite. The second invasion of Kashmir by Pakistan last autumn has destroyed whatever marginal or academic values the old U.N. resolutions might have had. Kashmir is also vital to the defence of India in Ladakh against China.

Any plebiscite today would by definition amount to questioning the integrity of India. It would raise the issue of secession--an issue on which the United States fought a civil war not so very long ago. We cannot and will not tolerate a second partition of India on religious grounds today. It would destroy the very basis of the Indian state.

All over the world, states, and statesmen are struggling to bring people together and to keep them together in composite, multi-racial, multilingual, and multi-religious societies. India is the largest composite State, in world. To destroy this State would make nonsense of the values which the United States and men of goodwill are so desperately trying to uphold.

We desire the friendship of Pakistan. We are sincerely anxious to abide by the Tashkent Declaration which binds both parties to abjure the use of force. We seek economic and other cooperation with Pakistan. We have many common interests that could link and keep us together. I think all friends of India and Pakistan have a responsibility to assist these. countries to draw nearer in such a fashion and not to encourage. unrealistic political and military assumptions or an artificial balance of power that merely aggravates tension.

THREAT FROM CHINA

China is almost the only country to have denounced the Tashkent agreement. And now we read of Chinese military supplies being given to Pakistan. We are concerned about these developments especially against the background of China's desire to stir up trouble wherever it can. I am again asked another question : 'If China threatens India, then what is India doing to combat Peking's, designs in South East Asia ?'

China is taking great care to avoid direct military involvement in Viet Nam. But China's shadow does fall across South East Asia. The real threat from China, however, is less military than political and economic. But Chinese influence will be contained if its neighbours in Asia and the nations of the developing world can build around popular and, forward-looking nationalist governments dedicated to fulfiling the aspirations of their people. They would also be greatly strengthened in this purpose were they to see a strong and viable alternative model to Peking. It is precisely by its successful effort to develop in democracy that India thwarts China's designs. India is part of that 'rural countryside' that the Chinese leaders would win and use in their revolutionary assault on the industrially advanced 'cities' of the West. It is in this large and populous 'rural countryside that China can and must be contained. India is fighting this battle through its devotion to the democratic ideal. India is fighting this battle through its perseverance in planned development and its struggle against poverty. India is militarily hold ing a 2,000 mile Himalayan frontier against China. India is also fighting this battle in the crucial forum of Afro-Asia which China has sought to usurp as a political launching-pad and as a revolutionary substitute for the United Nations. India's contribution in this regard has earned little notice or thanks. But I venture to suggest that this is a contribution of high significance since it has the unique distinction of meeting China's challenge on the ground, and plane of Peking's own choosing.

Alongside the massive effort for economic regeneration, we are fully conscious of the unportance of keeping in touch with our cultural roots. Textile and pottery and a while variety

84

of handicrafts are now being developed and adapted for modern living. It is through its art and music that a nation finds and reveals its soul. Much has been done to rediscover our old treasures, to give new life and meaning both traditional and folk dance and art forms. At the same time there is a search for new ideas, new

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

WEST GERMANY

Indo-West German Agreement for Technical Cooperation

A general agreement on Technical Cooperation between the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and India was signed in New Delhi on March 28, 1966. The German Ambassador, Baren D. von Mirbach, signed the agreement for his country and Shri S. Bhoothalingam, Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, signed on behalf of India.

Under this agreement the Federal German Government will provide assistance in setting up technical training centres in India, send here German experts and technicians in the field of industry, agriculture and vocational training and supply articles of equipment required for the work of the experts. Opportunities will also be provided for Indian trainees to receive training in Germany. The Government of India, on its part, will provide land and buildings, where necessary, and make available Indian technical and auxiliary personnel. In addition, India will provide the usual "local costs" to the German experts and technicians. The agreement will remain in force for 5 years.

The Federal German Government has already provided considerable technical assistance to India in the field of agriculture and industry. The main beneficiaries of German assistance have been the Indian Institute of Technology, Madras', the Prototype Production-cum-Training Centre, Okhla, the Agricultural Development Project, Mandi (Himachal Pradesh) and the All India Radio in regard to a television studio.

This agreement is a significant development in the field of economic and technical cooperation between the two countries and will facilitate further technical assistance from the Federal German Government.

GERMANY INDIA USA

Date : Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's Speech at a Dinner in honour of Mr. Petar Stambolic

His Excellency Mr. Petar Stambolic, Prime Minister of Yugoslavia, paid an official visit to India from March 10 to 17, 1966. On March 10, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, gave a dinner in honour of the Yugoslav Prime Minister.

Proposing a toast to the Yugoslav Prime Minister, Shrimati Gandhi said :

We meet here not as strangers but as friends, in fact very close friends. In the last fifteen to twenty years, an intimate understanding has

85

grown up between Yugoslavia and India. This friendship is due to the profound respect that my father had for President Tito, a respect which I think was warmly reciprocated. Love of freedom, hatred of fascist domination and a passionate desire to work for a peaceful world bound these two great men to each other,

Besides sharing a common outlook, we of India and Yugoslavia have cooperated actively with each other in the international field. In the United Nations and elsewhere we have been cosponsors of many moves designed to prevent conflict and preserve peace. In particular I recall the resolution moved by Yugoslavia, Sweden and India in the U.N. Assembly, a resolution which the Assembly adopted, commending to all nations the recognition of co-existence as a basic condition for the survival of the world.

The belief that each nation should be allowed to follow its own elected path has sprung from the national experience of our two countries. Our path was marked out for us by Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. It was a path of non-violence, of compassion, of peaceful change. It followed the best in our ancient tradition which has always stressed tolerance and respect for other ways of thought.

NON-ALIGNMENT

We have an abhorrence of dogmatism and fanaticism. President Tito, rebel and revolutionary, showed that great ideologies and principles cannot be dogmatically interpreted. He advanced the idea of friendship without alignment. Like India, Yugoslavia also refused to belong to any military bloc. President Tito has greatly influenced the course of modern history. Yugoslavia's understanding of events in Europe has influenced our own attitudes considerably. My father often remarked that we had exchanged appraisals of the world situation more frequently with Yugoslavia than with any other country and I think, Sir, you must have noticed that our own talk today coming from the airport and later on started off on the basis of friendship and understanding and sharing of values.

The idea of nonalignment owes much to these two great students of history and men of action. It was but right that the great conference of non-aligned powers was held at Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia. The concepts of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence have served the world well. They have reduced tensions and promoted friendship. They are as valid today as they were a decade ago. In our own country, the importance of non-alignment has, if anything, been appreciated more widely after the armed attacks on our nation. Our faith in co-existence has been vindicated anew by the recent Tashkent Agreement.

FRIENDLY TIES

It is no small satisfaction to us that our two countries have together been able to render some service to the world. This common endeavour must continue. We must further strengthen our friendship. The support you have given us, notably after the attack from China in 1962, and in regard to Kashmir, has been a great comfort to us. True friendship rests on such concrete sympathy.

It has been our good fortune, Sir, to play host to President Tito and to other distinguished leaders of Yugoslavia. My father visited Yugoslavia three times and had the happiest memories of each of these visits. Our late Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had high regard for Indo-Yugoslav friendship and was happy to be able to visit your country. And our President Dr. Radhakrishnan was amidst you only six months ago. I have been to Yugoslavia with my father and by myself and have been overwhelmed by the kindness and courtesy shown to me by your Government, by your people and especially by President Tito and Madame Broz.

ECONOMIC EXPERIMENTS

We have keenly followed the solutions you have found for many political and social problems. We have studied your economic experiments. In less than twenty years, your country has come to be recognised as a, modern industrial power. Your systems of agricultural and industrial management hold great lessons for us. We appreciate your economic assistance to us. Trade between our two countries has been growing. There is no reason why it should not grow even more. You have materials and machinery which we need. We have commodities and products which may be of use to you. And again today as we were talking we discovered that perhaps the greatest help we can give each other is not through these material things but through something which is very much important and that is in the realm of ideas, in joining together to work and to spread those ideals for which we have fought and for which we stand today.

Your Excellency, the great progress of your

country owes much to your leadership. You have been a great revolutionary and fighter, eminent both in resistance and in reconstruction. it is a matter of special happiness to me to welcome today such a distinguished statesman. I am sure that your visit will be productive of great good, not only for our two countries but for the world.

May I ask you, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen to drink a toast to the good health of His Excellency Mr. Petar Stambolic and to the welfare of the people of Yugoslavia.

86

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA SWEDEN USA UZBEKISTAN CHINA **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Reply by Yugoslav Prime Minister

Replying to the toast, H. E. Mr. Petar Stambolic, said :

Dear Madam Prime Minister,

Dear friends,

Allow me to thank you, on behalf of my associates and in my own name, for the very cordial welcome and kind expressions of friendship addressed to my country, to President Tito, to my associates and to me personally. I am happy to be able, on this occasion, to convey to you, Madam Prime Minister, and to the people of India greetings and best wishes from President Tito.

At the same time, I wish to express my gratitude for the renewed invitation and to say how happy we are for having been offered the opportunity to get better acquainted with your great country and your people.

It is with feelings of profound sorrow that I recall at this moment your late Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri. I also wish to say on this occasion that I and all of us in Yugoslavia were deeply grieved by his death. Lal Bahadur Shastri enjoyed the undivided sympathies of the peoples of Yugoslavia. Symbolic are the circumstances of his death, the death of a man who sacrificed himself to the last moments of his life, to the cause of peace and the interests of his country.

I wish to point out, Madam Gandhi, that your election as the Prime Minister of India was warmly welcomed in Yugoslavia.

We have been following with satisfaction all that the independent India has achieved in the economic, social and cultural fields. We admire and appreciate the splendid efforts of your people, who are determined to further develop their country and the socioeconomic order which best suits their wishes and aspirations.

INDO-YUGOSLAV RELATIONS

Dear Madam Prime Minister, our two peoples have behind them a relatively short but rich history of amicable relations and mutual cooperation. We shall never forget the important role played in regard to the strengthening of this friendship by your distinguished father, the late Jawaharlal Nehru, the builder of modern India and great champion of peace and cooperation among nations based on equal rights. It gives me great pleasure to be able to share fully your opinion that relations between India and Yugoslavia are developing very successfully. We are gratified by the fact that our friendship has been still further strengthened in recent times. During the past year new agreements were concluded for the further development of economic and cultural cooperation and we have no doubt that there still exist many unused possibilities in this respect.

It is a happy coincidence that this year our two countries are launching new plans of development of their national economics. Last year's visits and talks in Belgrade provided an opportunity for us to engage in a timely and thorough exploration of possibilities for intensifying cooperation in all the fields of the economy. Therefore, I am confident that the concrete conclusions of the Inter-Governmental Committee, which is now holding its session in New Delhi, will reaffirm the readiness of our two countries and Governments to constantly improve and promote mutual friendship and cooperation.

As you have observed yourself, relations between India and Yugoslavia have been forged and strengthened not only through bilateral cooperation but also through efforts for the safeguarding of peace, for equitable relations among peoples and States, for active and peaceful coexistence and for the peaceful settlement of problems burdening the contemporary world. These efforts have been manifesting themselves through common positive actions in the United Nations, at the Belgrade and Cairo Conferences, as well as on all other occasions.

Our two Governments view with concern the current international situation, which is characterised by the danger of war and by stubborn attempts to settle the fate of peoples through the use of force.

VIETNAM

There is no doubt that, today, the war in Vietnam constitute the most dangerous hotbed of conflict in the world and is taking a heavy toll of human lives and causing material destruction. This war is, at the same time, the most acute and most dangerous expression of the basic contradictions of the contemporary world. For a longer period of time, a large number of countries have been striving to find a solution to the problem of Vietnam by way of negotiations, with due respect for the fundamental rights and interests of the Vietnamese people. From the very outset the Yugoslav Government has been firmly convinced that this aim can be best achieved through a lasting discontinuation of the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the

87

recognition of the National Front for Liberation of South Vietnam as an equal partner in negotiations. This could-together with other possible positive measures-create essential conditions for the taking of steps leading to a peaceful solution of the problem on the basis of the Geneva Agreements, with a view to ensuring the right of the Vietnamese people to decide their own fate themselves, without any interference from outside.

COLONIALISM

We consider that the efforts of the colonial powers to preserve their domination, or of others tending to gain new positions, are the basic cause of tension in the world. In some parts of the world and, in particular, in Africa, the process of decolonialisation of the still dependent territories has been slowed down owing to the open resistance and pressure of the colonial powers. The rights of the people of Rhodesia have been usurped by the racist minority and attempts are being made at establishing a racist neocolonialist stronghold in Central Africa. At the same time, the newly liberated countries of Africa have been exposed, for some time already, to pressure and various forms of interference and intervention by some great powers which are interested in slowing down the process of emancipation of the African continent. We feel that it is more than ever necessary to give support to these countries. We deem it very important, today, to oppose all forms of interference in the internal affairs of other peoples and to promote actively the full assertion of the principles of equality in relations among States.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Madam Prime Minister, the Goals for the realisation of which our two as well as other nonaligned and peaceful countries are exerting efforts stem from the most profound interests of peoples of the whole world. We believe that the struggle for peace in the world is the most important task of all countries, since this is the only alternative to war, which would, at present, amount to a suicide of mankind. In our time, active and peaceful co-existence has become a historical necessity and-I would say-the only form of lasting security in the world.

TASHKENT DECLARATION

Therefore, in these days of grave international tension, the peace-loving world has welcomed with joy the Agreement concluded between your country and Pakistan at Tashkent, since it provides a constructive example of the victory of commonsense and peace. Great is the significance of the Tashkent Declaration, primarily for the two countries concerned; however, its significance transcends the framework of Indo-Pakistani relations. The Tashkent Declaration gives encouragement to all those who are struggling for peace. It has shown that, by joint efforts and on the basis of realism, it is possible to undertake the solution of the most complex problems existing between the two neighbouring countries. We welcome the Tashkent Declaration as an agreement which makes it possible to settle outstanding problems between India and Pakistan peacefully, in the interest of the two peoples and in the interest of world peace.

NON-ALIGNMENT

Your Excellency, the overwhelming majority of mankind appreciates and supports the principles of co-existence today. There is no doubt that the policy of non-alignment plays a significant role with regard to the assertion and realisation of these principles in the world, principles which are, at the same time, the most suitable road conducive to the progress of all countries. and of the developing countries in particular. The non-aligned countries have not only assured continuity in their cooperation, despite objective difficulties and crises that some of them have to lace, but have also increased their influence in international affairs. This has been clearly manifested at the last session of the General Assembly of the United Nations where a number of proposals submitted by non-aligned countries were adopted. There is no doubt that the activity and cooperation of non-aligned countries will continue to be strengthened as a policy meets the vital needs and corresponds to the interests of a large number of countries which are endeavouring to consolidate their independence and friend cooperation with all countries. I should like to note with satisfaction, on this occasion, that India has been from the very outset one of the main pillars of the policy of nonalignment. Today India is great and respected throughout the world not only because of its vast territory and the number of its inhabitants, its ancient civilization and cultural traditions, but also because of its independent peaceful policy.

We are convinced that our two countries will

continue, in the future as well, together with all non-aligned and peace-loving countries, to exert efforts aimed at strengthening equitable relations among all peoples, on the basis of the principles of the Belgrade and Cairo Declarations. A fortunate circumstance is the normalisation of the work of the United Nations, which remains undoubtedly, the most appropriate place for the concerted efforts of all countries and peoples aimed at safeguarding peace and establishing international relations based on equality. 88

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

The full support lent by the twentieth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to the initiative of the non-aligned countries to convene a world disarmament conference constitutes an obligation for all peace-loving courttries to see that this conference is convened and that it should conclude its work successfully. The responsibility for the successful materialisation of the conference rests with all countries, although there is no doubt that the nuclear powers bears a special responsibility. Therefore, it is incumbent upon them to exert utmost efforts for setting in motion the process of disarmament and freeing the world from the constant danger of a nuclear war.

In the struggle that has been waged, over a number of years, for the mitigation and elimination of economic inequality, a progressive contribution is being made by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which is endeavouring to evolve a new trade and financial policy with a view to accelerating the progress of the developing countries as one of the primary tasks of the present time. The underdeveloped countries are not only the promoter but are also an active partner in the elaboration of this policy. The significance of the latter transcends by far the interests of the developing countries. The consistent implementation of the principles of this policy will greatly promote not only general progress in these countries, which represent the large majority of mankind, but will ensure the normal and even development of all countries including the most highly developed ones. Furthermore. it is obvious today that the general situation in the world cannot be stabilised in a lasting manner as long as the gap existing between the developed and

under-developed countries does not begin to narrow. I am certain that our two countries will actively promote the implementation of these principles in the future as well.

Dear Madam Gandhi, I Should like to say once again how gratified we are to be in friendly India. We are convinced that there are no obstacles whatsoever which could prevent us from continuing to march along the road of friendship and cooperation that we had marked out long ago. I propose this toast to the health of the President of the Republic, His Excellency, Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, to the health of Madam Gandhi, to that of your associates, to the further progress of your country, and to friendship and cooperation between India and Yugoslavia.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA EGYPT VIETNAM SWITZERLAND UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN MALI **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-Yugoslav Joint Communique

The following is the text of a joint communique issued in New Delhi on March 17, 1966 at the end of the Yugoslav Prime Minister's eight-day visit to India.

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the President of the Federal Executive Council of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, His Excellency Mr. Petar Stambolic, accompanied by some of his Cabinet colleagues and Senior Advisers paid an official visit to India, from the 10th to 17th March, 1966.

The Yugoslav Prime Minister's programme included visits to places of cultural and historical interest and to economic development projects and scientific establishments.

The Yugoslav Prime Minister was received by the President of India with whom he exchanged views on matters of common interest.

Prime Minister Stambolic and members of the Yugoslav delegation had talks with the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Government of India in the atmosphere of friendship and mutual confidence which has always characterised Indo-Yugoslav relations.

From the Yugoslav side, the discussions were attended by the Federal Secretary for Foreign Trade, H.E. Mr. Nikola Dzuverovic; the Federal Secretary for Information, H.E. Mr. Gustav Vlabov; the Deputy Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, H.E. Mr. Misa Pavicevic; the Yugoslav Ambassador in India, H.E. Dr. Radivoj Uvalic; the Head of the Asian Department of the State Secretariat for Foreign Affairs, H.E. Mr. Nikola Milicevic and Counsellor in the Federal Executive Council. Mr. Istok Zagar.

From the Indian side, the discussions were attended by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh; the Minister of State, Shri Dinesh Singh; the Foreign Secretary, Shri C. S. Jha: the Indian Ambassador in Yugoslavia, Shri R.S. Mani; and Director in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shrimati Rukmini Menon.

89

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed the faith of their governments in the principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence as the main pillars of their foreign policies which, they were confident. would continue to make a vital contribution to the maintenance of world peace.

Both Prime Ministers expressed their conviction that adherence to a policy of peaceful coexistence and faithful application of such a policy in relations between States is imperative for the maintenance of world peace, and for the preven-tion of it disastrous conflict in this nuclear age. Both Prime Ministers condemned policies and tendencies opposed to peaceful co-existence and intervention or interference in internal affairs of other countries. They denounced resort to force and stressed the need to settle all differences and disputes between States, including border disputes. entirely and solely through peaceful negotiations.

The two Prime Ministers emphasized the importance of the early codification of the principles of peaceful co-existence between nations in accordance with the U.N. General Assembly Resolution.

The Prime Minister of Yugoslavia expressed his country's appreciation of the Tashkent Declaration and the statesmanship shown by the leaders of India and Pakistan in its adoption. He stressed the positive role played by the late Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri at Tashkent. He expressed the hope that the two countries would be able to solve all outstanding problems on the basis of the Declaration.

The two sides considered that the United Nations is the most suitable forum for all countries, large and small, for the concentration of their efforts for the safeguarding of peace and promotion of international cooperation on the basis of sovereign equality.

The two Prime Ministers considered that the widening gap between developed and developing countries is among the main causes of instability in the world.

The two Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the close cooperation between the two countries in the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. They affirmed their readiness to undertake together with other developing countries all necessary steps for the implementation of the conclusions of the aforesaid Conference.

The Prime Ministers discussed the question of disarmament. They welcomed the U.N. resolution oil the convening of a world disarmament. conference with the participation of all States, They agreed on the urgency of an international agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Prime Minister expressed serious concern over the grave situation in Vietnam and the danger of its developing into a major war. They confirmed their stands and reaffirmed their conviction that the solution of the Vietnam problem should he sought within the framework of the Geneva Agreement of 1954.

The two Prime Minister expressed the strong opposition to all forms of colonialism and ncocolonialism. They extended their whole-hearted support to the peoples of Africa still struggling for the achievement or consolidation of their independence. They denounced the illegal declaration of independence by the White minority regime in Southern Rhodesia as a threat to peace and a violation of fundamental human rights.

The Prime Ministers condemned the racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa which is a crime against humanity and a threat to peace. Both sides called for the full and expeditious implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations on this subject.

The Prime Ministers noted with great satisfaction the development of friendly cooperation between India and Yugoslavia in the economic, cultural, scientific and technical fields, which is of lasting benefit to the peoples of the two countries. They expressed the hope that their recent Agreement on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the two countries will make a further valuable contribution towards this end. They welcomed the expanding trade between the two countries and the prospects of further expansion envisaged in the Protocol signed last year.

The two Prime Ministers were confident that the visit to India of the Yugoslav Prime Minister would contribute to the further strengthening of the friendly relations so happily existing between the two countries.

The President of the Federal Executive Council of the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia highly appreciated the friendly and cordial reception given to him and his associates in India. He invited the Prime Minister of India to visit the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia at a convenient time. The Prime Minister of India accepted the invitation with pleasure.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-Yugoslav Agreement for Scientific Collaboration

A five-year agreement for scientific collaboration between the Indian Council of Scientific and industrial Research and the Federal Council for file Coordination of Scientific Activities of Yogoslavia was signed in New Delhi on March 1, 1996. Dr. S. Husain Zaheer, Director-General of Scientific and Industrial Research, signed for C.S.I.R. and H.E. Dr. Radivoj Uvalic, the Yugoslav Ambassador in India, signed from the Yugoslav side.

The agreement stipulates cooperation in solving specific scientific problems of mutual interest for which necessary assistance will be provided.

The C.S.I.R. and the Federal Council for the Coordination of Scientific Activities of Yugoslavia will establish direct links and exchange experiencc among corresponding scientific institutions and individual scientists. The actual contents, forms and ways of realisation of scientific cooperation will be settled by means of biennial programmes.

According to the agreement, scientists will be exchanged for research, consultations, exchange of experience, scientific improvement, participa tion in scientific meetings, delivery of lectures, and assistance in organisational and scientific matters. It also provides for training of junior scientists in scientific investigations and similar activities. The trainees will be provided with opportunities for participating in scientific investigations and similar activities.

Both C.S.I.R. and the Yugoslav Federal Coun-

cil will exchange information on the organisation of scientific research work, data about scien tists and scientific institutions as well as information on materials of interest. Both the parties will assist in the publication of scientific papers and the results and development of scientific research as well as support the acquisition of scientific equipment, literature, microfilms photo copies and other material necessary for scientific research and also organise exhibitions Direct cooperation will be encouraged among those institutions in both the countries whose activities include publishing of scientific literature.

The programme of scientific cooperation between the two parties will be drawn biennially and signed alternately in New Delhi and Belgrade.

91

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1966

April

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1966 Vol. XII APRIL No. 4

CONTENTS

PAGE

AFRO-ASIAN SCIENCE SYMPOSIUM

Prime Minister's Address 93

BHUTAN

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of H.M. the King of Bhutan 95

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czech Agreement for Scientific Collaboration 95 Indo-Czech Committee for Economic and Technical Co-operation 96

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament 96

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Excerpts from Prime Minister's Press Conference 98 Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on her Visit Abroad 101 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the Lok Sabha 103

NEPAL

```
Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of the Prime Minister
of Nepal
111
Reply by the Prime Minister of Nepal
112
Nepalese Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Prime Minister
Indira Gandhi
113
Reply by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi
```

114

Indo-Nepal Joint Communique

115

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

BHUTAN NORWAY SLOVAKIA NEPAL INDIA

Date : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

AFRO-ASIAN SCIENCE SYMPOSIUM

Prime Minister's Address

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following speech at the forty-nation symposium on collaboration among Afro-Asian countries in science and technology in New Delhi on April 30, 1966 :

I am very pleased to be here with you and I must apologise for not being with you more. I would have liked to have attended some of your discussions and to have got educated. This is a world today in which no politician can afford to ignore science. So it is not from a purely altruistic motive perhaps that we take interest in science and scientific development. I am very happy that this symposium is being held here in Delhi and I have no doubt that your fruitful discussions will have a very good effect not only on our scientists, not only help them in their work but also on the general public. Even though the Indian Government is very conscious of the importance of science and has tried to help in every way, we still find that we are a long way from having a scientific or a rational outlook in the country. And this to my mind is the most important thing which we have to achieve if we plan to go ahead and to really raise the standards of our people and to give them what they need for their betterment.

CRADLES OF CIVILISATION

Asia and Africa were cradles of civilisation and thought and led the world for centuries but they fell prey to foreign domination and to imperialism not only because of internal trouble but because they fell behind in science and technology. After generations of foreign rule, freedom has returned to these two ancient continents, except in some parts where freedom struggles still continue. We have found in India that political freedom by itself has little meaning. It has to be defended against economic pressure and exploitation. It has to be made meaningful by the possibility of a better life for the people. And. therefore, development is vital to the maintenance of freedom. Today, the nations of Asia and Africa are engaged in the hard task of development. In most areas this involves a transition from traditional to modern practices.

TECHNOIOGY KEY TO PROGRESS

Technology is the key to change and progress. The world has seen wonderful advances in science and technology but even the simple tools and assistance of modern science have to be adapted to the circumstances of each country. And this in itself is an immense task. Developing nations also have certain problems of their own because of geographical and other factors. Therefore, original scientific effort is very necessary and the nations of Africa and Asia have much to offer to one another and can usefully pool their experiences. And that is why this conference can be so useful to us all. It brings together scientists of different countries and by pooling knowledge, by discussion, I think, it can hasten the process of development in their respective countries. Scientists have a great responsibility because they are increasingly shaping the destiny of mankind. They have in that sense a great part but also greater responsibilities.

You have hinted in your remarks, Mr. Chairman, that scientists cannot be divorced from the life of the people. While you are discussing scientific problems, I hope you will always keep in mind the role of the scientist in society and the effect of the work of the scientist on the lives of ordinary people. Science knows no frontiers and here again by a gathering of this kind you help in bringing together people and inculcating in them a rational approach to current problems. I feel it will be presumptuous on my part to talk to you really about the role of scientists or of science since you are far more knowledgeable and experienced than I am in this field. But if you will permit me I should like to say a few words on what is my own field, that is, politics.

AFRICA AND ASIA IN TURMOIL

But today, as you know, politics embraces practically everything else. Many of the countries of Africa and Asia seem to be in turmoil and the question is asked why should this be. Sometimes a very simple answer is given in the West which is that these countries are not able to rule and are not able to handle their affairs. This is a simple answer. It is also not a correct one.

93

Let us look back and see what happened in Europe half a century ago. We had two of the bloodiest wars which engulfed the entire world. Before that for centuries there were conflicts, internal wars, civil wars, revolutions, not to speak of many other lesser tensions and conflicts.

Now much of the conflicts which we see in Asia and Africa stem from the same sort of social, economic and political soil which obtained in Europe in past centuries. Why did that happen in Europe? Because they were trying to transform their agrarian economy to an industrial economy, feudal order to free human relations from concepts of hereditary status, from being divided by regional and linguistic and religious particularism to being organised as nation states such as in Britain, France, Germany, Italy etc. Some parts of Europe escaped this, and there we find there were, later on, greater sources of tension, of conflict and of instability. Now this scene has shifted from Europe to Asia and to Africa.

The countries situated in these two continents are going through the same processes in this later half of the 20th century and all our difficulties, instabilities and tensions have their origin in our attempts to lay the foundations of an industrial society, to democratise our political and social institutions and to set up nation States so chat the minds of our men and women become freed from local, religious, tribal or caste feelings; so that their concept of citizenship may become a more effective force. Because the framework within which these historical processes are working are not always the same, they vary from place to place. Now although Asia and Africa are experiencing the sensations and tensions of change which affected Europe for several centuries, there are certain vital differences which add to the tensions and these are that democratic rights and liberties, adult franchise, trade union rights reached their ultimate fusion in Europe at the very end of the process of economic growth. Consequently, when rights were asserted for bread, for education, health, housing, etc., the economy was capable of satisfying these vital needs of man. In contrast, in India, for instance, we have already the widest democracy, the widest franchise, we have equal rights for all people, trade union rights and these are exercised and asserted at a time when our economy is at its lowest. Hence, there are so many tensions. Population increases are taking place and we have the contrast of a high population and a low economy. The human awareness of assertion of human dignity and human rights exists at present in a greater degree and in heightened forms in Asia and Africa than what it existed in Europe when its economy was at a comparable level of development. These factors are bound to create tension and a certain amount of conflict within the nation. To this is added the ever-widening disparity between the rich and the poor nations. This is really the nature of the economy, the social, the political climate in which we have to fashion our relations and in which you have to consider how science can help to remove these disparities and how it can help to ease some of these tensions. I am sure that you will look at the problems of science from these many points of view and try to find Solutions which will prove satisfactory in the varying circumstances of the nations which you represent.

ROLE OF SCIENCE

We are, in India, trying to give a place to the scientist and, as I said earlier, this is something which may be true of sections of the Government but this is unfortunately not yet true of the people. This is what is most important for the country. People should realise the role of science and for scientists it is equally important that they should see that this vast knowledge which they are now gaining should be used for the good of the people. It is sometimes felt that in the interest of true research, knowledge should be advanced but how that knowledge should be used has until lately been largely ignored. There has been a feeling that man exists somehow for science and technology rather than science and technology being merely tools for what we want to do for mankind.

If you keep this in view, I am sure that you will be able to go ahead much faster. We have full confidence in our own people, in our own scientists and while realising the importance of the interdependence of knowledge, of the sharing of knowledge and experience between different countries, we know that in each country there are bands of devoted, dedicated scientists who can put their knowledge to work and help their country to advance.

I am sure that this conference will be one more step forward in this direction. You have already had some meetings. May I give you good wishes for the rest of the conference. I welcome the foreign delegates and I hove they will find their stay here interesting as well as enjoyable. I hope they will go back to their countries as good friends of India.

94

USA INDIA FRANCE GERMANY ITALY PERU

Date : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

BHUTAN

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of H.M. the King of Bhutan

His Majesty the King of Bhutan arrived in New Delhi on the 27th April, 1966 at the invitation of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. On April 27, the Prime Minister gave a dinner in honour of His Majesty the King of Bhutan at Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Speaking on the occasion, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said :

Your Majesty, may I welcome you formally.

We are very glad you have come here. We have, as you know, the greatest friendship for Bhutan; the ties between our two countries have been very old ones, which have, since independence, been renewed and given a new meaning.

Your visit here is a very welcome one for it will give us the opportunity of exchanging views on matters which are of concern to both India and to Bhutan. It will also give me the opportunity to repay, in a very small measure, your lavish hospitality to me and to my father when we visited your very beautiful country about eight years ago.

We are full of admiration for your able leadership and the manner in which you are trying to transform your country. It is very difficult for some of our old countries to bring progress and modernisation and yet, keep what is beautiful and of value in the old. I found Bhutan very beautiful and, while I wish it progress naturally, because, for the well-being and prosperity of the Bhutanese people, it is necessary, but I hope that, at the same time, you will be able to retain its very special qualities and its great loveliness.

This is the time of change and transition for countries in Africa and Asia and changes bring their own problems. We have to face these problems and Bhutan has also to face them. But with courage and determination it is possible to meet them and to go ahead and bring a better life to our people.

India looks upon your plans and your attempts to bring a better life to your people with the greatest sympathy and we shall give you all the help that we can and all the co-operation which we can.

In the world of today it is necessary that we should all develop a sort of understanding which helps different cultures to enrich each other, instead of destroying each other.

Once again I welcome you, Sir, your sister and the rest of your party to India. We hope you will have an interesting and enjoyable stay.

BHUTAN INDIA USA **Date** : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czech Agreement for Scientific Collaboration

An agreement for scientific collaboration between the Indian Council of Scientific & Industrial Research and the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences was signed in New Delhi an April 26, 1966. Dr. S. Husain Zaheer, Director-General of Scientific and Industrial Research, signed for CSIR and H.E. Ing. Jaraslav Kohout, the Czechoslovak Ambassador in India, signed on behalf of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

The agreement stipulates collaboration in those fields of science and technology which will be of mutual interest.

The agreement provides for exchange of scientists for a period of about two weeks to six months for consultation, exchange of scientific experience, participation in scientific conferences and meetings, delivery of lectures and assistance in organization and scientific matters. The number of experts and scientific matters. The number of experts and scientific matters way vary but the total man-days to be spent in either country would be limited to 350 per year.

The agreement also provides for exchange of information on the organisation of scientific research, data about scientific institutions and scientists as well as information on materials of interest.

Cooperation among scientific libraries, information centres and scientific institutions in the

95

exchange of books, periodicals and bibliographies is also envisaged.

According to the exchange programme, which will remain in force for a period of two years,

both parties will place at each other's disposal four fellowships annually for a period varying from six months to two years.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA

Date : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czech Committee for Economic and Technical Cooperation

The Deputy Foreign Minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Dr. Ladislav Simovic, visited India at the invitation of the Government of India as from the 7th April 1966 for about a week.

His goodwill visit proved to be useful in further promoting overall friendly relations between Czechoslovakia and India.

Dr. Simovic accompanied by the Ambassador of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in India Ing. Jaroslav Kohout, called on the President Prime Minister, Foreign Minister, Planning Minister, Minister of Commerce, Minister of Education, Finance Minister, Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Cabinet Secretary and Foreign Secretary.

The talks he had with the leading representatives of the Indian Government, covering political, economic and cultural aspects of the relations between the two countries as well as views on most important problems of the international situation, contributed to strengthen mutual understanding and co-operation.

During the visit, an agreement was reached on the establishment of a high-powered Inter-Governmental Committee for Economic, Trade and Technical Co-operation, the suggestion whereof had emanated during the visit to India in March 1965 of the Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Jozef Lenart.

The Committee for Economic, Trade and Technical Co-operation between India and Czechoslovakia will have as representatives the Deputy Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Josef Krejoi, as Chairman of the Czechoslovak Section, and Shri Asoka Mehta, Minister of Planning and Social Welfare of the Government of India, as Chairman of the Indian Section.

The, Committee will, infer alia, make joint studies of the developmental needs of the two national economies and explore the possibilities of co-operation, particularly in the field of production and in devising measures for effective implementation of the various economic agreements between the two countries. The Committee will also study and utilise the planning activities of the two countries for furthering its objectives.

In the discussions, further progress was achieved with respect to the Treaty of Friendship, Trade and Navigation, the Agreement on Cooperation in the field of the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, Consular Agreement, Cultural Plan for 1966-1967, and other agreements to be concluded in the near future.

Dr. Simovic handed over a letter of the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Jozef Lenart, to the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, inviting her to visit Czechoslovakia. The invitation was accepted. Dr. Simovic also called on Mr. Kamaraj, President of the Indian National Congress, and handed over to him an invitation to visit Czechoslovakia. This invitation was also accepted.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA

Date : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement In the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament

Shri Chandra Shekhar Jha, Foreign Secretary of India, made the following statement in the plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva on April 5, 1966:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for your kind words of welcome.

I am not here to participate in the deliberations of this Committee. That is being done in ample 96

measure by our representative here, Mr. Trivedi. I am here to get the feel, so to speak, of this Committee, to learn, to make personal contact with some of you and, above all, to present myself as a token of proof of the great importance that my Government attaches to the deliberations of this Committee.

I have just visited some of the great capitals of the world, accompanying my Prime Minister, who has been in the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. Everywhere the question of disarmament was among the matters uppermost in the minds of those with whom we had discussions. In particular, the danger posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the consequent urgency of reaching an agreement on the non-proliferation of such weapons were discussed.

I found much hope and faith in the deliberations of this Committee, and certainly a universal acceptance of the Committee's importance. Progress on disarmament has been slow, but this has been inevitable because of the complexity of the problems. Nevertheless, we have the feeling that some progress has been made and that the Committee's deliberations have not been unfruitful.

The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament can take the credit for stimulating in abundant measure the conclusion Of the Moscow partial test ban Treaty (ENDC/100, Rev. 1). It is true that that treaty was not negotiated in this Committee, but it may be said that it was a direct result of the very profound deliberations that took place, the contacts that were established and the mutual understandings that were reached in this Committee.

We think that some progress has also been registered on non-proliferation, the topic that absorbs us all at the present moment because of the obvious dangers presented by the possibility that many countries in the world have or will have the technical capability to produce nuclear weapons. The fact that the Committee is giving earnest and serious consideration to various proposals is in itself a sign of progress.

The concrete proposals which have been submitted to the Committee by the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, with the supplements and revisions that have been made from time to time (ENDC/152 and Add. 1, ENDC/164); the memorandum of the non-aligned nations of 15 September 1965 (ENDC/158); General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX); and various other ideas and suggestions that have come out of the discussions and contacts in this Committee seem to us to be signs of progress towards the goal of a non-proliferation treaty. In this connexion I was struck by the remarkable statement made by the Foreign Minister of Sweden on 23 March 1966 in the Swedish Parliament.

The currents and cross-currents of thought represented in the proposals and statements provide the possibility of finding an acceptable basis for a non-proliferation treaty. In saying that, I do not minimize the differences and the gaps that still divide the various points of view. but, although we admit that there are still a large number of differences and difficulties and very large gaps, we think that it is by the process of discussion and further discussion that we can reacn an acceptable basis for a non-proliferation treaty. Such it basis must be found because the hopes of the world are pinned on the deliberations of this Committee. It the world is to be safe for the future. for our children and their children, agreements have to be reached. We feel that with patience, with perseverance, and with the earnestness and dedication that the members of the Committee have demonstrated time and again in these deliberations, a generally acceptable basis for a nonproliferation treaty will be

found.

I do not wish to go into substantive details. Our representative, Mr. Trivedi, is deeply involved in these and has from time to tame presented our point of view to the Committee and to the United Nations General Assembly. I do not wish to encroach upon his domain. Whatever I say is said in ignorance, because I know that this problem is extremely complicated. We at "headquarters" are overwhelmed by the expertise of our representatives on this Committee.

My Government has high hopes that discussions in this Committee, supplemented and aided by intensive discussions in the capitals of the countries represented in the Committee--and I think that the stage has arrived when discussions in the capitals have become very necessary to supplement what is being done here-will result in the success of the present endeavours to find a basis for a non-proliferation treaty. We do not think that the gaps are unbridgeable, and every effort must be made to see that we reach our desired goal.

I have ventured to say a few words about the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the subject which is uppermost in the minds of the Committee at present. But we must never forget that the tasks of this Committee are very wide, fairly distant and very profound. There can be no other goal but that of general and complete disarmament, to which the United Nations and the whole of humanity is committed; and, if I may say so, all nations-at least, all nations in this Committee--are engaged in finding a solution to that

97

problem. That goal should never be lost sight of. Even a non-proliferation treaty will be only a milestone in the progress towards general and complete disarmament.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to pay a warm tribute to you and to the members of the Committee on behalf of my Government, and to wish you all God-speed.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA FRANCE RUSSIA SWEDEN **Date :** Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Excerpts from Prime Minister's Press Conference

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, gave a Press Conference in New Delhi on April 19, 1966, at which she dealt with a number of national and international subjects. This was her first formal Press Conference after she took over as Prime Minister on January 24, 1966.

The following is the text of the answers the Prime Minister gave to the questions relating to foreign affairs :

Prime Minister: I should like to say a word of greetings to you all, and also to make the point that you will not ask about policy matters that is, new policies, because since Parliament is in session, I can be hauled up for not making that announcement in Parliament first. Otherwise, of course, you can ask whatever questions you like and I shall do my best to answer them, if I know the answers.

WORLD BANK

Question : I ask you one question by way of clarification. The World Bank hitherto has been acting as a coordinating agency for economic aid or for various other schemes. Now we are told that they are going to be some kind of an arbiter on our economic policies. Are we going to accept that decision ? Hitherto, they have made some suggestions which we have accepted or not accepted according to our conception. Is there going to be any change ?

Prime Minister : The position is exactly what it was before, that is the World Bank will still help us. It is India who initiated the whole idea, this Aid India Consortium. We went to them and asked that some such body should be formed to channelise the aid. I do not think the situation has changed in any way. The World Bank naturally gives advice and if that advice is, we feel, to our good, and if it will help us, we will take the advice. Obviously if it goes against what we consider our national interest, we cannot take it.

FOREIGN AID

Question : Do you think your discussions in Washington, London and Paris encourage you to believe that we will get Rs. 4,000 crores odd foreign aid for implementing the Plan ?

Prime Minister : It is difficult to say exactly what we will get because this matter will be discussed. Shri Asoka Mehta is there. The World Bank will have its meeting; the Consortium will have its meeting. My visit, I think, created a certain amount of goodwill and understanding both about what India is attempting and also about the difficulties which stand in her way.

Question : Was it your impression during the talks in Washington that the US was prepared to release the frozen aid totalling four hundred million dollars ?

Prime Minister : I did not discuss the frozen aid. I did not discuss it at all.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Question : How do you look at the criticism against your fertiliser decisions, some of the recent decisions, and also the apprehensions about your aid commitments expressed by a small sect of Party Members, some of the backbenchers in Parliament?

Prime Minister : Perhaps, it is because they have not gone into the question very fully. Firstly, of course, the argument is that we are going against past policies. Now, it is not against the Industrial Policy Resolution. According to that this is, I think, called Category B or something, which is not a State conserve and that you cannot have private enterprise. Also about whether the foreign investment-should have majority participation and an Indian private concern, private enterprise, have a minority participation. This is also something that has been accepted for some times, it is not a new thing. Even the present deal

98

which we have made with regard to fertiliser does not prevent us from having our own plants. We have got two and we may put up more. It is only a way of helping us. When we cannot produce more here at the moment and we have a very urgent need, we should take what help is available from outside. And it is true that the world Bank felt that we should be more energetic in this matter because the food problem is such an urgent one for India and also in terms of what we will get out of it. I mean, it is very much to India's benefit.

Question : About the raw material. do they insist that we should have material from Iran or some other countries ?

Prime Minister : No. While we have sufficient naphtha, we shall naturally use it. If there is a shortage or we need something else, then we can consider what to do in that case.

Question : Last time when you addressed us at the Vithalbhai House you told us that this fertiliser was an old commitment and that we could not go back on it possibly. Now since then, the World Bank President has asked us for certain new conditions, namely, the question of majority participation of foreign capital At that time, they had taken only two concessions regarding prices and distribution. Now, how do you say that this is not a new factor which has entered into the fertiliser negotiations, namely, that they insist on majority capital participation ? Secondly, they have not gone it in the case of an industry as a whole in the past or a sizeable section of the industry. It has been only done in the case of few units. If you will refer to the old records, the question of majority participation was only in the case of a few units even during your father's time. It has never been done in the case of a sizeable section of the industry.

Prime Minister : Well, the question, as I said, is that we want to encourage private investment for fertilizers and what we can do about it. I do not think, it really goes against our interest, if we allow majority participation since the principle has been accepted. It may not have been done in this particular case. Question: After you took over Prime Ministership, the estimate of the foreign assistance for the 4th Plan has been revised upward from Rs. 4,000 to Rs. 4,700 crores. One does not know whether this is the last limit or not. Do you consider this as the movement forward or backward towards the goal of self-reliance.

Prime Minister: Forward, I think. Because you really need, sometimes a person needs much bigger help in order to stand up on his feet and from then on he can be on his own. Whereas if you get very little help over a longer period, then it does not help you to stand on your feet.

Question : Reports from Washington suggest that the United States Government has decided not to release the balance of the pledged aid. What is the position ?

Prime Minister : I do not think that is a correct report.

INDO-U.S. FOUNDATION

Question : Apart from, this fertiliser deal, the Congress Party in Parliament does not seem to be reconciled to the Education Foundation also. Could you kindly tell us to what extent the Party is reconciled to it or it is justifiable to demand further explanation about it ?

Prime Minister : I do not know how far the Party is reconciled. There are people in the Party and outside who are not fully in favour. But here again I think it is largely due to a misunderstanding. This money was in the hands of Americans to use it as they like. Now with the coming of this Foundation, Indian participation comes into it. And it is up to us to see bow it is used. I do not see why we take a very defeatist or pessimistic view of everything and always think that we are so weak, and somebody is going to put something on us. This is the first attitude which we must get rid of if we want to be self-sufficient or if we want to stand on our own feet.

Question: Just now you stated that the money was in the bands of Americans and they can use it as they like. Is there no Indian control that they can use the money against our interest ? Prime Minister : Actually, they have to use it within our own Plans and the Government of India's policies. But in the Indo-American Foundation, this will be even more. If I may say-it may be pinpointed-because what projects will be benefited will be decided by a joint group of Indians and Americans. It is up to us as to how effective our own group will be in this Foundation. I am personally quite sure that even the Americans, who will be there, will not be trying to force anything down us and that they will do whatever will take place after discussions and what is in the interest of the area or the country or the institution.

Question : Will the Foundation be responsible to the Government of India or Parliament ?

Prime Minister: Autonomous Foundation.

Question : Is it the experience of the Government of India that recently the terms for the United States aid are getting more onerous and also about this Foundation whether the release of Rs. 150 crores, that is, unfreezing of part of it will have any impact on our economy ?

Prime Minister: Firstly, it is only the interest which will be used. I do not think it

99

will have, any effect on the economy. Many institutions are getting grants from Foundations such as the Ford Foundation and so on. And this will be in the same nature except that there will be Indians on the Committee.

I would not use the word "onerous". It is true that no country wishes to go on giving aid. Therefore, in the United States also there is the same feeling as we have in India which is that India should make the utmost effort to become self-reliant so that this aid becomes unnecessary or at least marginal as soon as possible.

Question : You said in Parliament that the Education Foundation thing was agreed to some time back, in Shastriji's time. When was it ?

Prime Minister : In November or December.

Question : Why is it that such an important decision was not made known to the people and

the press and it had to wait for so many months to come out ?

Prime Minister : Because the details were not decided. It was only accepted in principle and the situation is exactly the same now. Why it was released now was, because I was going to the U.S.A. President Johnson thought that he would like to make a mention of it during my visit.

Question : Was it suggested that the funds may be given out through the Ministry of Education ?

Prime Minister : No.

Question : Is there any plan ready on the basis that no foreign assistance will be forth-coming ?

Prime Minister : Not yet.

Question : Did you discuss with President Johnson about the release of military aid ?

Prime Minister: We have done economic aid and we are doing Tashkent

TASHKENT AGREEMENT

Question : Are you still optimistic about the functioning of the Tashkent Agreement and bow?

Prime Minister: I do not know what the 'how' means here. It is true that the Tashkent spirit is perhaps not as bright as it was some time ago but at the same time practically all the countries of the world have realised the importance of Tashkent and have supported the Declaration. We have implemented it to the extent possible and we fully realise how necessary it is to have friendship with Pakistan. both for us and for Pakistan. So I am deeply concerned about the present trends and am very seriously thinking whether it will be possible to take some positive steps to reverse these trends which can be dangerous.

Question : What practical and effective steps the Government has in view to liberate our places forcibly occupied in Jammu, NEFA, etc. by Pakistan and China? Prime Minister: Well, I do not think even if I had a plan this was hardly the place to release it, would it be ?

Question : You said you have in mind sonic steps ?

Prime Minister : Yes, I am thinking of sonic.

Question : Does it mean another Ministerial meeting ?

Prime Minister : I do not know what shape it will take. The Ministerial meeting is by the way on the cards. It was mentioned at the last meeting but no date was fixed.

Question : Is there any possibility of your meeting President Ayub Khan in the near future ?

Prime Minister : Nothing has been fixed or decided nor has it even been talked about but if there are. good reasons for meeting I shall certainly not hesitate to do so.

Question : Could it be said that this change in Pakistan's attitude towards Tashkent Declaration has come about after February 25, that is, after the withdrawal of the troops ?

Prime Minister : I think, it is difficult to pinpoint a date.

Question : Do you think it is after the withdrawal of the troops?

Prime Minister : It is very difficult for us to say on what particular date; whether it was immediately after or whether it was during the withdrawal. To the world it is obvious only in the speeches which the Pakistani leaders have been making.

CHANGE IN PAK ATTITUDE

Question : Has any assessment been made of the change in the attitude of Pakistan ?

Prime Minister: What do you mean by assessment ?

Question : Why is it that they have suddenly turned round ?

Prime Minister : Well, there may be many reasons for it. They may feel that it is easier to keep Pakistan united if they have a sort of slogan like this or they may have other reasons. It may be also because of the visit of the Chinese leaders at that particular time.

Question : Madam, in your statement in Parliament yesterday you said that Pakistan had

100

also complained to the Soviet leaden about India not observing the Tashkent Agreement. Did you get any indication of the specific complaints that Pakistan made as to where India was deviating from the Agreement; and may I know whether the U.S.S.R. is taking up these things with India ?

Prime Minister : No things were taken up with me, but this was mentioned; the question, for instance, of 30 acres in Sialkot; but before I left for America, when my attention was drawn to this, we had already decided that it was a local matter which would be decided by the two Commanders or local Commanders.

Question : How was it a local matter for the local Commanders ? The Army Commanders were not in change of civil administration in the area. It was only the Civil Government under whose civil authority this area was, which could know.

Prime Minister : You see the Defence Minister went into this in detail in Parliament yesterday. According to our revenue records as he said there, this area belongs to India. But we agreed that we would withdraw from the places where we were not in full occupation on the 5th August. That is why this matter came up.

VIETNAM

Question : Vietnam and the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs which created some furore in the American Press and in the U.S Administration. Could you clarify that point?

Prime Minister: There is no difference really between the Report and our declared stand. Even

while I was in America I did state that we held to the Geneva Agreement and I believe America also has approved of the Geneva Agreement.

NON-ALIGNED SUMMIT

Question : It has been reported from Cairo that you will attend a non-aligned summit this summer in U.A.R. is that correct ?

Prime Minister : I have not heard anything about it except what I saw in the newspapers.

CHINA

Question : Is there any move from any quarter to bring India and China round the conference table ? Or if you yourself are thinking of any such move ?

Prime Minister : No such move has been made. When asked the question in a different form, I have said that India has not closed any doors, but at the same time you will yourself realise that with China's present menacing and threatening attitude-the speeches, for instance, which were made by the Chinese leaders during their recent visit to Pakistan-it is really very difficult to see a common ground which could lead to such a meeting or which could make such a meeting profitable.

INDIA USA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM IRAN UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC VIETNAM SWITZERLAND EGYPT

Date : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Ministers Statement in Lok Sabha on her Visit Abroad

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha

on April 7, 1966 on hex ten-day visit to the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., France and the U.K.

As the House is aware, I paid an official visit to the United States from March 28 to April 1, in response to an invitation from President Johnson. On the way, I broke journey at Paris, where I met President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Pompidou. On the return journey, I met Prime Minister Wilson in the course of a brief stop-over in London. I also made a halt at Moscow, where I had discussions with Chairman Kosygin.

FRANCE

In Paris, I was received with much warmth and cordiality. President de Gaulle showed deep interest in our economic problems and assured me of the earnest desire of the French Government and people to help us in dealing with them. In particular, the French Government is ready to help develop further cultural, scientific and technical cooperation between our two countries. A team of French technical experts is visiting India soon in pursuance of this objective. My talks with the French President revealed a full understanding of our position on various international issues and a substantial area of agreement between France and India on many issues. I feel sure that my meeting with President de Gaulle will further strengthen the close and friendly relations between our two countries. Our President has already invited President de Gaulle. The House will recall that sometime back (towards the end of last year) Shrimati Pandit personally conveyed the invitation from the President when she visited France as our special envoy. I hope President de Gaulle will find it convenient to visit our country. He will be a very welcome and honoured guest.

UNITED STATES

Before coming to the main points of discussion with President Johnson and the impressions

101

of my visit to the United States, I should like to take this opportunity to tell the House of the great warmth and graciousness of the hospitality and courtesy shown to me by President Johnson and the American people, and to express my sincere thanks to them for it. I had full and frank discussions with President Johnson and his colleagues and the broad substance of our discussions is set out in the joint communique issued at the end of the visit. I should perhaps mention briefly the general spirit in which our talks took place. In the fast changing world of today such meetings are necessary even between friends who share many values in common. Our object was primarily to establish a close rapport and understanding and not to exchange advice or favours. I believe that in this we succeeded in full measure-an outconic which owes much to the complete candour and mutual confidence with which we approached our task. The conversations ranged over a wide field. President Johnson expressed understanding and appreciation of our own massive efforts to raise the living standards of our people. He assured me of the deep interest of his Government in continuing to assist us in our efforts to promote such development, by playing its full part in the Consortium which has existed for some years to mobilise external support for our plans under the auspices of the World Bank.

On our emergency needs for food, President Johnson sent an urgent message to the U.S. Congress immediately after our discussions, seeking Congressional approval for generous additional supplies of foodgrains. cotton and other agricultural commodities. The message set our economic progress and current problems in perspective. I am sure the House would like to join me in expressing our appreciation at its speedy passage through the U.S. Congress. During our talks on India's food problem, President Johnson likewise displayed a sympathetic understanding and appreciation of our efforts to help ourselves, of the promise of our plans for increasing agricultural production and of our programmes for population control.

The President also announced the establishment of an Indo-U.S. Foundation to help develop new techniques in farm and factory, to advance science and to extend research facilities. Such a proposal had in fact been under consideration for quite some time and was approved by Government about a year ago. The Foundation will be administered in a manner consistent with the Government of India's educational plans and programmes and with a view to further the national interest and the health of the economy.

As the House is aware, we view external assistance only as a means of supplementing our own efforts and as an aid towards-achieving selfreliance in the shortest possible time. In the course of our talks, President Johnson repeatedly stated that the United States views its assistance to us in the same spirit of promoting self-help and early self-reliance on our part without interfering with our policies or our plans.

There was reference to India's relations with Pakistan during the talks. I reiterated India's desire to promote the, friendliest of relations with Pakistan in keeping with the Tashkent spirit, despite the difficulties created. We agreed that the peaceful processes set in motion by the Tashkent Declaration should be continued. President Johnson expressed his strong support for the Tashkent Declaration and his desire that there should be friendship between India and Pakistan. Reference was also made to the threat posed to India's security by China's aggressive designs and postures. Apart from re-affirming our determination to defend our freedom and territorial integrity against any threat, from whatever quarter it may come, I emphasised the fact that the long-range challenge of China is as much political and economic as military. I also explained that India's gigantic effort to attain the goal of democratic socialism and of achievements in the field of development, in conditions of stability, was itself a notable contribution to peace.

The situation in Viet Nam was briefly discussed. I reiterated India's continuing desire to see a just and peaceful solution of this problem.

I have extended an invitation to President and Mrs. Johnson to visit India and the President has expressed the hope that it would be possible for him to visit India again.

In New York, I had a useful meeting with Secretary General U Thant at the United Nations and I took opportunity to address the Afro-Asian group.

Besides the discussions which I had with President Johnson and his colleagues, I had occasion during my stay in the United States to meet and share my thoughts with a large number of distinguished American citizens in the course of various public engagements. I reiterated our stand on Kashmir and its wider implications. These contacts have, I think, helped promote a better understanding of our views by the American people.

UNITED KINGDOM

On my way back from the United States, I had a meeting with Prime Minister Wilson in London. Our talks covered many subjects and were held in a friendly atmosphere. They have resulted in a better understanding of India's position. Mr. Wilson expressed the British Government's readiness to join other countries in giving

102

urgent consideration to immediate steps for providing further economic assistance to India as soon as possible. I have invited Mr. Wilson to visit India and he has accepted the invitation.

SOVIET UNION

In Moscow, I had a valuable exchange of views with Chairman Kosygin in the course of which we reviewed the international scene and in particular the developments following the signing of the Tashkent Declaration. As the House is aware, Indo-Soviet cooperation in the economic and other fields has grown steadily during the past many years. A number of projects are currently under execution with Soviet assistance, and the Bokaro Steel Plant has been added to the list very recently. The Soviet Union continues to take a friendly and sympathetic interest in our Fourth Plan and during our talks in Moscow, we agreed that the preliminary discussions which we have already had in this regard will be expeditiously pursued.

Chairman and Mrs. Kosygin have agreed to visit India later this year. This will give us yet another opportunity to strengthen the bonds of friendship and goodwill between our two countries.

I was reluctant to be away from India even for a brief period when Parliament is in session and at a time when we have many Pressing problems to tackle at home. But as the House-will appreciate, despite the urgency of our tasks and the underlying friendship of other nations towards us, it is necessary to develop contacts at the personal level from time to time with the leaders of countries with which we have established strong ties of cooperation and understanding. I have every hope that my discussions during this visit abroad will advance the cause of friendship and cooperation not only between our respective countries but also in the wider comity of nations.

ABUNDANCE OF FRIENDSHIP

Mr. Speaker Sir, throughout my ten-day visit, I found an abundance of friendship and goodwill for India and a growing understanding of the significance of India's foreign policy and of its developmental efforts. We can derive satisfaction and strength from these manifestations of friendship. But we must never forget that there is no substitute for hard and determined effort and sacrifice on the part of the Indian people. The nations of the world are watching the Indian experiment and they will respect us and be willing to assist us only in the measure of our own effort and sense of dedication. This is the task to which we must now, as before, address ourselves, with faith and confidence in the capacity of our people to shape the destiny of India.

FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM USA RUSSIA INDIA PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN CHINA

Date : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the Lok Sabha

The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following speech in the Lok Sabha on April 26, 1966 in reply to the debate on budget grants for the Ministry of External Affairs : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate on our Demands was spread over three days and speeches have been made on these three days covering several points. I am grateful to the Honourable Members who have participated in the debate and have touched upon several useful and important aspects of international affairs. In the course of my reply, it will not be possible for me to reply to all the points that have been raised, and I will confine myself to certain important matters which are important from. the point of view of discussion that has been raised and are also important from our national point of view.

TASHKENT DECLARATION

Sir, the one subject which has, naturally, exercised the minds of hon. Members from both sides of the House is our relationship with Pakistan. On this matter, it is not my intention to go over the whole area, but I would like to briefly recapitulate the events after the Tashkent Declaration. In the course of this Session itself there was a full-dress debate on the Tashkent Declaration, and it is not necessary for me to repeat the many things that had been said on that occasion and to give answers to several points of criticism or clarification about the Declaration. We have to see our relationship with Pakistan after the Tashkent Declaration. How has Pakistan conducted herself after signing the Tashkent Declaration ? It is, no doubt, correct that for some weeks after the Tashkent Declaration the Pakistan leaders made speeches in their own country which were in support of the Tashkent Declaration, in support of the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration, in support of common desire of both the countries to reverse the trends that unfortunately had bedevilled the relations between the two countries and to improve those relations. But I am sorry to inform the House that after about three or four weeks the Pakistan leaders started making public statements which 103

were a complete reversal of the policy to which they had subscribed when they signed the Tashkent Declaration, I do not want to go into details, but it is a fact that Pakistan leaders had agreed when they signed the Tashkent Declaration that the Press, the radio and the public platform would be used in both the countries for improving the relations and not to heighten tension and animosity between the two countries. Anyone has to pick up the newspapers which are published in Pakistan and I would like to add that there is a great deal of control, almost complete control over the Press by the Pakistan Government--to find out the exact position. The Pakistan Press could not adopt a hostile, anti-Indian attitude if it did not have the support of the Government of Pakistan.

Then, again, it had been agreed that the complications that had been caused by the conflict, the unfortunate conflict, between India and Pakistan, they would be undone as a result of discussions and agreement between the two countries. in earnest of our desire to implement the Tashkent Declaration, we, from the Indian side, proposed that there should be a meeting at ministerial level between India and Pakistan, and we took out to Rawalpindi some weeks ago one of the most high-powered delegations that had ever left this country to any other foreign country --we had three Cabinet Ministers, 5 Secretaries to Government and several other experts. We had gone there with the desire to settle all those points of difference which we had agreed to discuss according to the Tashkent Declaration and to initiate action to implement such agreements that might be arrived at. We noticed, however, when we went to Rawalpindi, that Pakistan leaders and ministers were not at all interested in implementing the Tashkent Declaration, they were not prepared to honour the obligations that they had taken upon themselves under the Tashkent Declaration. All the time they were raising this point that Jammu and Kashmir is the only matter that requires discussion between the two countries, and unless this is discussed and some progress made there is no use discussing any of the other matters. This, to say the least, was a complete disregard of Pakistan's obligations under the Tashkent Declaration. I would like to remind this hon. House of the very admirable speech by my hon. friend opposite, Shri Frank Anthony, when he pointed out that an analysis of the Tashkent Declaration shows that the two countries had never said that they will discuss Kashmir as the only issue or as the important issue or as the first issue for improving relations between the two countries. In fact, all that was mentioned about Kashmir was that this matter was raised and both countries reiterated

their well-known positions on Kashmir. And, our position on this question of Kashmir is well it known, and I have reiterated more than once on the floor of the House that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India. In view of this, there was nothing new that could be discussed, after a lapse of four or five weeks, on Kashmir.

At Tashkent, the two countries had agreed to discuss, had agreed to settle several other matters including economic matters, cofiscation of properties, resumption of normal communications, resumption of air flights between the two countries, and several other matters. It was a complete surprise to us to find the Pakistan leaders adamant, and we came back under this impression that they are not interested in honouring their obligations under the Tashkent Declaration.

Notwithstanding that, we did not want to close the door, and we said that we will be prepared to discuss these matters further and we had agreed to meet again. There has, after that, been no move trout Pakistan side to indicate that they are prepared to come to Delhi for any further talks. Not only that. The Pakistani leaders have been searching for some excuse to blame India for not honouring the Indian obligations under the Tashkent Declaration, and in this they have signally tailed. The only thing that they have been able to point out is that India at one time did not vacate those 30 or 36 acres of land by the 25th of February as had been agreed upon between the two countries.

Now, this position has been explained by the Defence Minister on the floor of this House. I am mentioning this only to point out that there could not be any more flimsy excuse for Pakistan to accuse India, that India was not honouring her obligations under the Tashkent Declaration. It is interesting that Pakistan has again reverted to its familiar theme of describing India as aggressor, knowing full well that it was Pakistan that had started the trouble by first sending armed infiltrators into Kashmir and then marching its armed forces with heavy armour in the area of Chhamb.

SINO-PAK COLLUSION

In this they are receiving encouragement from their now-found friend and ally, China. It is interesting that Tashkent Declaration was hailed as a positive contribution to peace by almost all countries of the world. This is one of those rare occasions when countries which are generally opposed to each other in their postures in international life have supported the Tashkent Declaration and described it as an act of statesmanship between two countries where a conflict had been resolved, and where they had expressed their determination in future to resolve all their differences and disputes by peaceful means. There however, one solitary exception to this, and the Government of the Peoples' Republic

104

of China, which described this agreement between India and Pakistan as having been brought about by compelling Pakistan. It is quite interesting to see the comments of China on that occasion. They used the phraseology with which we are all familiar namely, that the United States' imperialists, combined with the revisionists of USSR, twisted the arm of Pakistan to make her bow before India. It is a strange description. This shows how adept they are in distortion while presenting their picture. But it was obviously done with a purpose. It was to create a feeling amongst Pakistanis that though they have signed the declaration, it is not something to which they need stick to. Therefore, in the course of the last visit of the Chinese leaders, they projected the Chinese picture as the sole saviours of Pakistan.

It is for Pakistan to decide as to what type of relationship, they want to have with the Peoples Republic of China, but it is amazing that Pakistan, which is a member of many defence pacts like SEATO AND CENTO, should extend such inspired so-called peoples response, with all the fanfare of publicity and a large number of people turning out in the streets, and trying to create the impression amongst the people of Pakistan that the Chinese are their fast and steadfast friends and, perhaps, their only saviours.

The Chinese leaders have also used this occasion to make anti-Indian. speeches. In the joint communiques and also in their statements in receptions they have again reverted to describing India as the aggressor. They have said that there are common links between Pakistan and China and that when one of those countries is faced with what they describe as aggression, both countries will help each other. Pakistan has unfortunately become a pathetic psychological case. If any suggestion is given to them with the best of intentions and with extreme good faith by India, somehow or other, they react rather in a very amateurish manner. This posture which borders almost to a sort of alliance-you may call it defence alliance; they have actually used such expressions which are generally found in certain pacts between countries which are described as defence pacts--does not leave any doubt in anybody's mind about Sino-Pakistan collusion.

These are important events which we cannot ignore, especially the hostility of China towards India, which they have shown in all parts of the world. The supply of military equipment by China to Pakistan and the public display of Chinese-built tanks and Chinese-built aircraft at the time of their parade in Pakistan, out and out support by China to Pakistan on their position on Jammu and Kashmir, all these are circumstances which some countries even now choose to soft-pedal or not take full note of, but we in India an fully convinced that these are unmistakable proofs of a deep conspiracy between China and Pakistan to the detriment of India. In this background, we have to view our relationship with both our neighbours in formulating our policies and postures towards both Pakistan and China.

We, on out side, are continuing to hope that Pakistan, even at this stage, would hunour the obligations and commitments they have made. unuer the Tashkent Declaration. We, on our side, have made the position clear, Our Prime Minister have made clear statements on many occasions that we adhere to the Taslikent Declaration in letter and in spirit. However, unilaterally we will not be able to make much advance unless there is response front Pakistan. We do continue to hope that, notwithstanding their internal difficulties, which Pakistan may be facing, or at any rate which some commentators have described as important considerations wily Pakistan is adopting the present hate-India attitude.

There may be some external instigation, and undoubtedly there is; I have referred to some of them in, the remarks that I have already made. but it is our earnest hope that the people of Pakistan will realise the importance of having good-neighbourly relations with a country like India; because India has made the position quite clear that India wants to develop friendly, goodneighbourly relations with Pakistan. We will persevere in our efforts to implement the Tash-Kent Declaration and to impress upon Pakistan the necessity and the desirability of doing the same. At the same time, we have to continue to make our own arrangements and preparations for strengthening ourselves in everything. We cannot ignore that in view of our experience in the past. Militarily, economically and psychologically, in every way, we have to strengthen ourselves in order to meet any contingency that might arise.

An hon. Member : Sir I hate to interrupt the Minister of External Affairs, but he has said that he relies on the people of Pakistan for the maintenance of good neighbourly relations as well as the maintenance of the Tashkent spirit and letter. The people of Pakistan are already friendly to us; it is the Government of Pakistan which is creating all this trouble. Why do we not make a proper distinction between the people and the Government and then address ourselves to the proper party ?

External Affairs Minister: I am thankful to the hon. Member for reminding me that the people of Pakistan are not unfriendly to India. It is, necessary for us to stress that from time to time because even the people are sometimes fed on slogans which were raised by both the Pakistanis and the Chinese during the last visit of the

105

Chinese leaders. This is the strategy which is adopted by the Pakistani leaders to project to the people of Pakistan that China perhaps is their main or only supporter. Therefore, the common hostility of the Pakistani and Chinese leaders as the cementing factor between China and Pakistan is always exploited by the leaders of Pakistan and China.

It is necessary, therefore, that we have to explain this correct position and our correct attitude so that the people of Pakistan should continue to hold the view that we believe they have held so far, that they have nothing to gain and everything to lose by an armed conflict between India and Pakistan. It is amazing that the Chinese statements of support to Pakistan against the so-called Indian aggression and on Jammu and Kashmir should be more vociferous, more loud, than even the Pakistan stand. These are the instruments that are generally employed by the Pakistani leaders to instigate the people of Pakistan and also for several other purposes.

I do not want to recount the experience of other countries in relation to China. It is for the leaders and people of Pakistan, if they so desire, to benefit by the experience of the deepening relations between the present leadership of China and those countries, their governments and their people.

The internal contradictions that are there in the Pakistani posture of sticking to the defence pacts and of hoping to get massive economic aid from the western democracies on the one side and, at the same time, of getting military aid and having closer tie-ups with China, on the other, is a matter which will be for the leaders of Pakistan to explain and it is for the other countries to decide whether they should accept the explanations of Pakistan in this respect. We, on our side, cannot take an academic or a theoretical view of this. This is a matter which is very much a live matter for us and it casts the responsibility upon us of strengthening ourselves in every way, going ahead with our preparations in as best a manner as possible, getting help from all quarters wherever we can get help and, at the same time, continue to be ready to settle all our disputes and differences with Pakistan by peaceful means. This is the essential ingredient of the Tashkent Declaration--our determination to resolve all differences and disputes with Pakistan by peaceful means.

There is nothing that exists today between the two countries or that can arise between the two countries which cannot be resolved by peaceful means and we will always continue to take this line of showing our determination to resolve all the disputes and differences by peaceful means.

We hope that Pakistan also will have to change its present attitudes and postures of blackmailing others and will revert to the path of reason; it will see wisdom in improving relations between India and Pakistan.

This is all that I wanted to say on these two issues which are of a grave concern to us and of which several hon. Members had made a pointed mention. There are other issues and I would like to mention those briefly.

PRIME MINISTER'S TOUR ABROAD

Here, I would like to say that our Prime Minister's last visit to Paris, Washington, London and Moscow was a very successful visit. Several hon. Members have paid their tribute to the manner in which our Prime Minister upheld the honpur and dignity of our country and explained our viewpoint in very clear and dignified tones. I am sure that the House would join me in paying our tribute to the excellent work and results that have flowed from this visit.

But whereas there was almost complete unanimity in expressing this approbation, I am so that Professor Hiren Mukerjee and, may be, one or two other lone voices, raised certain doubts. I do not want to go into details but I would like briefly to mention the points that have been raised not so much in relation to the Prime Minister's visit but as important matters of policy upon which we have to clarify our position and reiterate our attitude.

PEACE AND NON-ALIGNMENT

I was amazed to find that there was some indication in Professor Hiren Mukerjee's speech that we are not as enthusiastic about the policies of peace and nonalignment and of anti-colonialism that we have always pursued. I am sorry that this should have been said because I can say with a great deal of happiness and, if I may add humbly, pride that we have steadfastly adhered to the pursuit of policies of nonalignment and peace which we have followed all these years and of which our late Prime Minister and leader of our country, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, was the architect. It is unimaginable and unthinkable that the Prime Minister or anyone of us should ever think of deviating from the pursuit of those policies.

RHODESIA

What was the content of that? On anticolonialism, on the question of Rhodesia which is the most important question, I claim that the Indian attitude in this respect has been in line with the most progressive countries in any part of the world including Africa. From the very

106

beginning we took decisive steps in relation to Rhodesia. As soon as the white racist government declared independence illegally in a unilateral fashion, we broke off diplomatic relations and we cut off all economic relations although we had a sizable trade and a favourable trade balance with Rhodesia. We did not count our rupees and we cut off our trade relations because we wanted to demonstrate our solidarity with the African people; we wanted to demonstrate to the white racist regime our strong feelings in this respect. Even thereafter, in the United Nations, I myself and my colleagues at the time of the General Assembly made very forthright statements which were greatly appreciated by all the African leaders. Even a few days back, there has again been a resolution in the United Nations and India was one of the co-sponsors of that. We have always urged that it is imperative that the white racist regime, which has assumed power illegally, should be ended and if the economic pressures and other pressures that the world is mounting against them do not fructify, there should be no hesitation even with regard to the use of force to end this regime. I cannot imagine a clearer stand and notwithstanding that, I am sorry to note that Prof. Hiren Mukherjee thought it necessary to mention Rhodesia in thecourse of his speech as a point of criticism against us.

APARTHEID

Again on anti-colonial issues, in relation to South Africa for ending that government's policies of apartheid, for working to end colonialism in Mozambique and Angola and for lending all possible support to the freedom fighters there, and also in regard to Arab countries where the last vestiges of colonialism are still there and also in several other parts of the world, we have, in a very persistent and consistent manner, always worked for ending these last vestiges of colonialism and we think that, having ourselves attained independence from colonial rule, it is also our duty, and we will not consider any sacrifice too great, to discharge our responsibilities and our obligations to those brethren of ours who are still groaning under foreign domination.

VIETNAM

Then again a mention was made that there was a back-sliding---this was the expression that Prof. Hiren Mukherjee used--on Vietnam. I made the position quite clear when Shri Hem, Barua was speaking yesterday that the Press report of our having conveyed to anyone that the report does not express our position correctly war, incorrect and this news is also incorrect that anybody in the Ministry was reprimanded or taken to task for incorporating this in the report. I said that yesterday when Shri Hem Barua was trying to build an argument on that basis. I want to reiterate the position that the report should be read as a whole and we should not pick up paragraphs here and there and read them.

On Vietnam we have explained the position quite clearly and in this connection I was a little sorry and I was also surprised when Shri Krishna Menon said that, although the Minister has said that there is no change in the policy, we do not know what that policy is. Our policy is clearly stated in the report and I would like again, for the purpose of clarification, to reiterate the stand which we have always taken in this respect. We have always taken the view that a military solution of the unfortunate situation in Vietnam is not possible. We have always taken the view that the only way to resolve the dispute is to co back to the Geneva Agreement and in this, I would like to inform the House that there is a ray of hope because all parties to the Geneva Agreement, fortunately for the world community and for them, continue to take the attitude that they adhere to the Geneva Agreement. It is no doubt correct that each side is blaming that the other-party is breaking the Geneva Agreement, but each signatory to the Geneva Agreement takes the view that they adhere to the Geneva Agreement. So, the Geneva Agreement and its implementation, is the only hope and we will very strenuously work for starting any talks which might see the end of these difficulties. I would like to assure Shri Krishna Menon that we have never hesitated to do the necessary work nor prepare the ground or sound the parties for starting talks in any fruitful manner. We do not

claim that we succeed every time; sometimes the situation is such. and he himself is fully conscious of the complexity of the situation. But in a matter like this we do not take the attitude that nothing ran be done; we do continue to hope that something can be done and it should be done and we are exploring all possibilities from time to time by contacts with various Governments to find out if there could he some method of starting talks and starting a dialogue....

An hon. Member : The stand of the U.S. is that they were not a party to the Geneva Agreement and, therefore, the Geneva Agreement does not bind the U.S. What has the hon. Minister got to say on that?

External Affairs Minister : Our stand on that issue is quite clear that the Geneva Agreement is the Agreement which can be the basis. and perhaps the only basis, for a settlement of the dispute. On that issue I do not know what is the exact attitude of the United States Government. but I do know that although the United States wag not a signatory to this they have made statements where they have accepted the Geneva Agreement in substance and they have never

107

made any statement that they are not bound by the Geneva Agreement.

An hon, Member: The Geneva Agreement prohibits entry of any foreigners except a team of French people.

External Affairs Minister : It is correct. That is what I said when I made the statement that, fortunately for every one, each party says that they are bound by the Geneva Agreement and they will honour it, but each party is accusing the other that the other party is breaking the Geneva Agreement. One party says that the American troops are there and there is the allegation by the others that outside help is inducted, which changes the complex of the military balance. I do not want to go into the details thereof ...

An hon. Member : He is equating the Americans' presence in South Vietnam with whatever suspicions he is inviting--God knows for what reasons-about other foreign interests operating there. For a long time India has not said a word about the withdrawal of American troops who are there to the extent of 200 to 300 thousands for a long time India has not said a syllable about the use of napalm bombs and poison gases about which allegations are being made; for a long time nothing has been said by India and he says that it is not soft-pedalling, it is not back-sliding.

Another hon. Member : All the time in his speech the Minister is presuming that South Vietnam is in full accord with the Geneva Agreement. I want to ask whether it is not a fact that at the time of signing of the Geneva Agreement, South Vietnam refused to append its signature to the clause which divides South Vietnam from North Vietnam.

External Affairs Minister : It is not for me to adjudicate about the attitude of the various countries and to express my own opinion. Our attitude on this issue is guite clear. I would also like to say categorically in reply to what Prof. Hiren Mukerjee has said, that I am not trying to equate anybody; I am only stating the position which is taken up by those countries for the information of the House and for the information of the country; it is necessary for all of us to know what each side says; you may not agree; you may not accept that, but there is no use saving that I would like to make the position quite clear that our position on this question of Vietnam has been very clearly stated from time to time. I have again enunciated with utmost clarity that we feel strongly and we continue to hold the view that (i) a military solution is not possible. (ii) the only possible solution is that the Geneva Agreement should be implemented and (iii) there Amid be peaceful talks, dialogue in order to end this.

About the presence of foreign troops in any part of the world, we have always taken the position, which continues to be our position, that the presence of foreign troops in any part of the world in any other country is something to which we are totally opposed We have always taken the view that, if heightened form of armed activities continue, there cannot be any talks. Obviously, for any talks to start this should be stopped. (Interruption).

INDO-ARAB RELATIONS

I would like to say a few points about our Arab policy. Something has been said by Shri Krishna Menon. I agree with his analysis that in relation to the Arab world we have pursued a policy of strengthening our friendship with the Arab world. We are very happy that the Arab countries who expressed themselves at the time of the Casablanca conference have taken an objective view even on such controversial issues as Indio-Pakistan conflict. May be, certain countries in the Arab world do not fully agree and we have always expressed our view-point with regard to them. Let us not forget that there is in the Arab world a strong resurgent, progressive force, a force which is pitted against the type of this new development, about which Shri Krishna Menon made a pointed reference, new ideas of Islamic pacts and the like. These are directed really against this progressive Arab force. Let us try to understand the situation. We should therefore condemn it not only on the ground that these are theocratic ideas, but also because they are opposed to the progressive ideas, and we should continue to work for ensuring that these efforts do not succeed. Our attitude has been to strengthen our friendship with the Arab countries. The Arab countries have always brought about a great deal of understanding in appreciating our attitudes; and in this respect we have good relations, both economic and political. We work together in the United Nations and in several other fields in a very friendly manner. This has to be strengthened.

I am sorry that in this connection an hon. Member made a statement without verifying the facts, when he said that we send only Muslim Ambassadors to the Muslim countries I must confess that I have never considered this matter from that aspect. it had never occurred to me that in making and appointment to a particular country the person's community should be the consideration. When I checked up the list, it was surprising to find that out of 13 countries who are members of the Arab League. there are only in three countries Muslim Ambassadors, and in the other countries we have got non-Muslims. out of 23 non-Arab Muslim countries there are only 6 countries to which we have got Muslim Ambassadors accredited and in the 17

108

other countries we have got non-Muslims as our

Ambassadors. In making these appointments, it is mainly the suitability of a particular Ambassador that is considered and it also depends upon the exigencies of the service. The communal consideration does not enter into our consideration while making these appointments.

To be fair to these countries, I would also like to say that they themselves have mentioned to us that they would not like us to feel that a Muslim Ambassador of India will in any way have a better chance of being acceptable or being effective as compared to a non-Muslim Ambassador. So it is neither in our thinking nor in the thinking of the countries to which these Ambassador are accredited. I am sorry that, belonging as he does to a communal Party, Jan Sangh, he should impose such communal considerations and should make a remark just off the cuff, without even trying to verify the facts. I would not have mentioned this, but I must be frank with the House. I must say that while making the selections it has never occurred to me that I am sending a particular Ambassador to a particular country because he happens to be a Muslim, a Christian, a Hindu or a Sikh. It was his capacity to function which was the sole consideration. When Mr. Trivedi mentioned this, I checked up the list and this is the result. This shows how unwittingly, by making remarks, we unnecessarily excite communal feelings in the country and also try to project them to other countries, the countries who themselves are pursuing policies which are nationalist, which are secular, which are non-communal. We should try to encourage the pursuit of such policies rather than to try to influence them in the wrong direction by making speeches here which may have adverse effect upon their thinking and upon our relations with them.

FOREIGN SERVICE

I have tried to cover most of the points and now I would Eke to touch upon one or two small points. I have already informed the House that we have constituted a Committee to review the working of the Foreign Service. We are hoping that they would produce a report which will help Government to improve the working of the Foreign Service and our Missions abroad. I would like to inform the House that the response generally to the questionnaire has been very good. I think several Hon. Members of this House have already replied to the questionnaire and I shall be very happy to get further comments, further views or further advice from any other Hon, Member.

I would say that some of the criticism that ha been directed either against the Foreign Offic here or against our Missions is, to say the leas not at all justified. Let us not forget that sometimes when we visit foreign countries and we try to explain our viewpoint, generally they are very courteous, and it is quite a common phrasemany of us who haw visited other countries have experienced this, and generally they say-'Oh, now, I have learnt for the first time that this is the Indian position.' Let us not always be just misted by this courteous acknowledgement of learning for the first time the Indian viewpoint. Sometimes, the countries have got their own national viewpoints and they have got their own postures, and when you try to explain and suggest and press, that may have its effect, but let us not always come back with this impression that 'I happened to tic the first person who has explained that viewpoint to them'. This is a normal courteous way of response and this should be taken in proper perspective and it should be viewed in a proper spirit and we should not come to this conclusion from that that the Missions abroad have not functioned or have never explained our viewpoint.

An hon. Member : May I humbly suggest to the Hon. Minister that all this is not as simple as he is just trying to make it? There may be some justification in our drawing attention to certain aspects of functioning of the Indian Embassies abroad, which need attention. That was all that we wanted to say.

External Affairs Minister : I readily concede that, and that is the reason why we have constituted this committee, and I have said already and I would like to repeat, that I have not got a closed mind on that. I have already benefited by the reports, for instance, of the delegations of the Members of Parliament who visit abroad. They have suggested several points of policy, own points of administration and points of functioning. I have myself taken action in several matters, based upon the reports which were given to me. Even orally, several points were mentioned to me in confidence, and I have greatly

benefited by them. (Interruption).

These are matters about which we must take broadly an overall view and not be influenced too much by incidents. There could be indifferent representatives, there could be good representatives and there could be very effective represntatives. But I have no hesitation in saying that under the guidance and leadership of our leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the inspiration that he always provided to the members of the Foreign Service at the headquarters and in our Foreign Missions, they have on the whole done well, because this was a new field of activity for us. and we entered the international life and we Played an important role, and we shall continue to play an important role in the international sphere, at the same time always taking every

109

possible step to strengthen and improve our functioning procedurally and the like. As for selection and training etc. this is a subject on which the IFS Review Committee will make their report, and in the meantime if there are any suggestions, I shall be glad to consider them.

Naturally, as usual, publicity also has come in. Some Hon. Members on this occasion, for a refreshing change, have also said that in certain countries our publicity was good. This is a matter to which we are constantly giving attention, through the press, the radio and the like, for both external broadcasts and other purposes, and some more steps would also be taken. The Chanda Committee's report has also been received, and this deals with our external publicity, so far as AIR is concerned. I am sure that follow-up action will be taken so that we can use our resources, limited as they are, to optimum advantace so that we can project the viewpoint of our country and we may be able to counteract the misstatements of which there are plenty in view of the special position in which we find ourselves on account of the hostility of China and the hostility of Pakistan against us; we have to be vigilant all the time and do everything possible to counteract these things.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

On the question of the GDR, what we are proposing to do is that we are developing our

economic relations, and we hope to establish an office of the STC there before long, and this will enable us to increase our trade, beyond that I think that at present the stage has not yet arrived when we can make any further move

INDO-US FOUNDATION

I would like to clarify one or two things which it is very necessary for me to do. One is about the Indo-US Foundation. There has been a lot of misgivings and a good deal of lack of appreciation of the true facts. With your permission, I would like briefly to give the information I have got about this Indo-American Foundation. As you know, PL 480 supplies of foodgrains and other agricultural commodities are paid for in rupees and not in foreign exchange. The manner in which these rupees can be used is determined by the various agreements relating to PL-480 supplies which are entered into from time to time. On an average, 80 per cent are made available to the Government of India in the shape of loans for financing Plan projects and programmes. Roughly 7 per cent has been kept aside for making loans to industrial units in the private sector which have American collaboration and about 13 per cent of the total amount remains at the disposal of the Us Government

This 13 per cent can be used for various purposes provided for in the PL-480 Act and in accordance with the agreement entered into with the Government of India when the supplies are made. Expenses of the US Embassy, development of agriculture and promotion of education are among the various items provided for in the PL-480 Act. The amount of rupees at the disposal of the US Government has been growing as PL-480 supplies have been coming in from year to year. As these amounts are invested in government securities, interest also is earned upon them. Then again, as loans made for Plan projects are repaid, the funds increase further The total amount at their disposal at present is estimated to be above Rs. 300 crores.

The idea of setting up a Foundation for education out of these funds was mooted over a year ago. In order not to have an inflationary impact on the economy, the intention is that the entire amount transferred to the Foundation would be invested in government securities.

As a rule, only the amount of interest earned would be used by the Foundation for its purposes. We welcomed this approach as a constructive one (Interruption). I am giving the facts. You can have different views. But I think the House should know the facts.

As the amount to be so invested is to be the equivalent of 300 million dollars, the sum normally available for expenditure would be Rs. 5 to Rs. 6 crores. It is necessary to mention this fact because an impression was sought to be created that this would be a major portion of the total effort of the country on education. I do not want to tire the House by giving facts. But our total education programme runs in terms of cost into several hundred crores-it is something of the order of Rs. 400 crores. When we are spending Rs. 400 crores. a sum of Rs. 4-5 crores annually which will be utilised for certain purposes Re research or special types of educational activities cannot be regarded as something which will topple our entire educational setup. I think it is very unfair to put forward that argument.

Concern has been expressed about possible risks involved if these funds were to be used in a manner contrary to our values and our policies or for purposes of which we do not approve. We have no reason to feel that in making this generous amount available, the President of the United States has any intention whatever of influencing our internal policies. At the same time, it is necessary as many Members of Parliament and educationists have pointed out, that the actual agreement under which the Foundation is set up should provide adequate safeguards so that this danger is altogether eliminated for all

110

time. The actual agreement has yet to be negotiated. We would certainly pay the fullest regard to the considerations which have been urged when the draft comes to be discussed..

An hon. Member: ... I know the Government of USA was also at one time agreeable to have 9 American directors on this, our share being 10 Indian directors. Now the Government has shown its agreeableness or inclination to accept a proposition where they would be on an equal basis. Why is this so?

External Affairs Minister : These are matters A detail. I would request hon. Members not to formulate their arguments merely on the basis of press reports. All these matters have still to be finalised, and nothing has yet been settled about the number or about the other things. These are the matters which have been discussed.

An hon. Member raised a basic point, why could the Education Ministry not do it. I think this matter had been under discussion between the Education Ministry and the US authorities for quite sometime, and it was considered that a joint trust or a joint foundation of this type where the actual function has to fit in with our own policies, programmes and plans, should not in any way be objectionable. This was the view taken by the Education Ministry. (Interruption).

We have taken help in various spheres like economic development, establishment of plants and the like. I am referring to another point raised by Shri Krishna Menon. But in accepting aid from any country, we have always endeavoured, and we will continue steadfastly, to adhere to the policy that it is our policy that prevails. The other party can make suggestions, they can give us the benefit of their experience, but the decision ultimately is ours. Let there be no doubt or fear in any quarter that in accepting aid from any country, whether it is from the US, France, UK or USSR or anyother country, we will ever be influenced or will ever change our own policy, either in the economic field or in the international field. It is for this reason that we should view it with a certain measure of confidence in ourselves rather than always have a feeling that the other party is bound to influence us in some way or other, either directly or indirectly.

On the basic question, I agree that the real strength of the country lies in developing our economy and making it strong. That is the object before the country. We have to develop ourselves economically so that we are not dependent on aid from any country. But so long as our development effort can be accelerated by aid from outside, we should not hesitate to avail of that aid, at the same time, always ensuring that we do not give up our independence, our sovereignty, our line of action and our policies in this respect. This is the policy we are pursuing....

ISRAEL AND TAIWAN

On Israel there is some confusion in the minds of the hon. Members. We do recognise Israel. Many of the hon. Members have been saying that we do not recognise Israel. there is an Israeli Consul also in Bombay. We feel that it is not necessary to have Ambassadors between the two countries, and we have to look at the whole impact of that upon our relationship with a large number of countries, and we have to take a view which is in our best national interests. We have carefully considered it from time to time and we continue to hold the view that we cannot make any change in our present policy in relation to Israel.

So far as Taiwan is concerned, we recognise the People's Republic of China.

USA UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN INDIA CHINA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM RUSSIA SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE VIETNAM SWITZERLAND TAIWAN ISRAEL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date**: Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of the Prime Minister of Nepal

His Excellency Shri Surya Bahadur Thapa, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, His Majesty's Government of Nepal, arrived in New Delhi on April 11. 1966 on an official visit to India. On April 11, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, gave a dinner in honour of the Prime Minister of Nepal at Rashtrapati Bhavan. Speaking on the occasion, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said :

111

Your Excellencies and Distinguished Guests :

I should Eke to extend, once again, to His Excellency the Chairman of Nepal's Council of Ministers and Shrimati Thapa, a most cordial and warm welcome on behalf of the Government and people of India and on behalf of myself.

Your Excellency represents the government and people of a country with which we share a common history and heritage of culture and custom and a long frontier of friendship and freedom.

Nepal and India are two independent and sovereign countries but both children of the Himalaya. They follow independent policies of peace and nonalignment, co-existence and friendship. These policies are characterised by a deep sense of shared history and common aspirations and a basic sense of kinship between our peoples which is, perhaps, unparalleled elsewhere in the world.

It is the task of our generation both in Nepal and India, to further this existing understanding, to deepen these bonds and to expand this community of interests and aspirations so that all the peoples of this sub-continent together will hold up to the world an example of trust, friendship and peaceful co-operation for mutual benefit in international dealings, and an ideal of good neighbourliness to other peoples.

We have the highest admiration for the people of Nepal. We are both engaged in the task of rebuilding our societies and of improving the lot of our people. Economic prosperity, like freedom, is indivisible. What you do or achieve in Nepal concerns and influences our endeavours to achieve economic reconstruction and vice versa In this stupendous task we are co-operating with each other and our co-operation is bound to grow and develop further. We wish the people of Nepal well in their nation-building efforts under the wise and energetic leadership of His Majesty and His Majesty's Council of Ministers over which Your Excellency presides. Give and take is an essential part of international life. We are all part of the human family. We are glad to be able to help our neighbours.

As in the cultural field, so in the economic field we give to Nepal what we can and we receive from Nepal what Nepal can give.

Nepal and India share a number of rivers. We have collaborated in harnessing two of these, the Kosi and the Gandak and these joint projects will be of great and lasting benefit to both our peoples. More than this, they symbolise the close kinship between Nepal and India which forms the basis of our indissoluble friendship.

The two countries have a community of interests in the cultural as well as the economic field. They are determined to co-operate together, to their mutual benefit, in bringing social emancipation, religious freedom and economic prosperity to their peoples in full measure.

Once again I extend to Your Excellency and to the members of Your party a hearty welcome and hope that this visit will lead to yet greater co-operation between our two governments and peoples.

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date :** Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Reply by the Prime Minister of Nepal

Replying to the toast proposed by the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi at the dinner, His Excellency Shri Surya Bahadur Thapa said:

I am very grateful for the kind sentiments which you have just expressed towards the Government and people of Nepal. I heartily reciprocate the same feelings towards you and the people of India. At the same time I would also like to take this opportunity to extend my warmest greetings and good wishes to all of you present here at this pleasant function.

I am indeed very happy to come to this friendly and hospitable land of our great neighbour with which our relations have been both traditional and perennial, based as they are on geographic and cultural contiguity.

Nepal's relations with India have special characteristics of their own. We not only share the heritage of common ancient culture, but also, because of our contiguous frontier for hundreds of miles, we are tied to each other by ethnic affiliations, unrestricted flow of human traffic and trade and commerce from one side to another.

The peoples of India and Nepal, since ages past, have remained in an atmosphere of cordiality, mutual friendship, understanding and cooperation.

I would like to mention here the state visits of Their Majesties the King and Queen to India and the Indian leaders to Nepal which have proved very fruitful in cementing the bonds of

112

friendship and laying solid foundation of goodwill and co-operation in our mutual relations. I believe that in future too such exchange of visits would be useful in bringing the peoples of our two countries even closer.

It is gratifying to note that in international relations our two countries have followed similar approach, inspired by the ideals of peace, friendship, non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. The Belgrade and Cairo Declarations of the non-aligned countries are the common denominator of our similar views on most of the basic questions of the world. In today's slightly changed pattern of bloc politics, I feel that the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence continue to have its utility in promoting goodwill and understanding in the interests of world peace, effective international co-operation and the realisation of the aspirations of the millions of people for their happier and better future.

As a friendly country, Nepal has always shown her admiration for the development of India and would further like to see India's glory, progress and prosperity at all times under Your Excellency's energetic leadership.

We in Nepal deeply appreciate the active support and interest of the Government of India in our programmes of economic development.

With these few words, I would now like to request all ladies and gentlemen to join me in proposing a toast for friendship between our two countries, to the health and long life of the Prime Minister of India, Her Excellency Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

NEPAL USA INDIA EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA **Date** : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Nepalese Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi

His Excellency the Prime Minister of Nepal, Shri Surya Bahadur Thapa, gave a dinner in honour of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in New Delhi on April 12, 1966.

Proposing the toast, the Prime Minister of Nepal said:

Though we are on the first lap of our visit to India, we have been deeply touched by the warm hospitality and reception accorded to me and members of my party by the Government and the people of India. On behalf of my wife and myself, I would like to take this opportunity to express once again our sincere thanks to Her Excellency Mrs. Indira Gandhi and the Government and people of India.

We have found that the people of India, like the Nepalese people, highly treasure the traditional friendship and today we see that more favourable conditions exist in our relations to flourish even further to the mutual benefit of our two countries.

We are glad to see that since independence of India, specially in recent years, the Indian people, on the basis laid down by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, have achieved marked success in the all round development of the country. We rejoice in each and every success achieved by you along the road of national development and wish still greater successes in the days to come.

Nepal is peace-loving country. She desired to maintain friendly relations with all the countries of the world on the basis of the principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence and in particular with our neighbours. Nepal and her people are firmly on the side of justice and world peace. Friendship with all and malice towards none is the core of our foreign policy. It is in consonance with this spirit that Nepal has maintained her relations with all the countries of the world and would like to do so in future too.

Peaceful friendship among states being the best possible way for international peace and harmoney, Nepal believes that in the present-day world there can be no such problem that cannot be solved through peaceful means, mutual understanding, co-operation and goodwill.

Nepal and India have been living in amity and peace through ages on the basis of equality and respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Both of our countries fully believe that. adherence to the principles of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence is a sine qua non for the international co-operation and harmony of interests. This common approach of our two countries has definitely led us to hold almost similar views on the basic world issues.

In the recent times, we are busy in the task of our national reconstruction and raising the level of the living conditions of our people through industrialisation, social, legal and economic reforms under the democratic framework of Panchayat system. The Panchayat democracy has taken a deep root in our country under the leadership of His Majesty the King. It ensures sharing of responsibilities by all without distinction of class, creed and sex. Under this system every body can directly participate in the state affairs of the country.

113

In the effort of our economic development, we have at present many friendly countries who have been helping us in various ways. In this connection, the keen interest shown by the Government of India through their economic and technical assistance and co-operation in the task of our national reconstruct-ion is highly commendable. We appreciate this friendly gesture of the Government of India. I hope that in times to come, further co-operation and collaboration would continue to grow to the mutual benefit of our two countries.

An important aspect in our friendly co-operation has been the continuous development of economic and trade relations. I am sure that with the joint efforts, the friendship between our two countries would continuously be strengthened and developed.

Satisfactory as the present relations are, we should not relax our efforts to revitalise these relations in the context of the new circumstances.

I would now like to propose a toast to the friendship between Nepal and India and to the good health of His Excellency the President of India and Mrs. Indira Gandhi as well as to the health of all friends present here.

NEPAL INDIA USA MALI **Date** : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Reply by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi

In her reply the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi said:

Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen, faith and friendship, awareness of a common destiny and a deep understanding and appreciation of each other's motives and purposes characterise Indo-Nepal relations. And yet as Your Excellency has observed their quality is not, as indeed it ought not to be, a static balance but a dynamic growth. As years go by and generations pass, they grow from strength to greater strength, from deep comprehension to wider consciousness of that kinship of the spirit which the mighty Himalaya has bred and nurtured in our very beings. Proper understanding amongst nations is the real and only basis for the genuine peace which we all desire.

You said, Mr. Chairman, that we in India have achieved much progress in the economic development of our country since independence. There is progress, indeed; but our work is not done. An era has ended, a generation has gone by; yet the task is an ever broadening one and we of the younger generation are determined to accomplish it and to rid our people of the want and privation which still haunt their lives.

Your country has made great strides in recent years: but there also much remains to be done. This commonwealth of want is also the area of our common effort, the endeavour to eliminate poverty and ignorance and to bring the fruits of progress within the reach of all our people. The forces of science and technology are welding us together into one world; yet the same forces are bringing nearer the threat of war and are making the face of that war more frightening than ever before. What is most important now is not only bringing of material comfort but along with it the transformation of the mind of man to enable him to use the knowledge he has gained, to enable him to be educated to a common conception of human purpose and destiny, to endeavour that different nations

should live together as friendly partners.

There is much that we have been doing together for mutual benefit and there is much that we could do together for mutual benefit. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that there is room for more active and greater co-operation and collaboration between our two countries. I hope, for instance, soon enough it should be possible for our two countries to jointly address themselves to the task of harnessing, on a planned basis, the mighty rivers which in their wide courses continue to flow into the sea without rendering to our two peoples the benefits which should be theirs.

You have been only a couple of days with us and in that short time you have seen how many friends you have made. You have seen what great affection and regard there is for and for your country and your people. I that in the rest of your journey you will find it interesting and I am sure wherever you go, in every part of India, you will be welcomed with warmth, with respect and with regard. I am sure that this visit will strengthen the bonds which bind our two countries together and will bring a freshness to a friendship that is as old as the ages, and I hope will be, as new as tomorrow.

May I now request you to drink a toast to the King of Nepal, to His Excellency the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Mrs. Thapa, and to friendship between all of us who are gathered here.

114

NEPAL USA INDIA **Date** : Apr 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Indo-Nepal Joint Communique

The following is the text of a joint communique issued in New Delhi on April 15, 1966 at the end of talks between the Prime Minister of India and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, His Majesty's Government of Nepal :

At the invitation of Her Excellency, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, His Excellency Shri Soorya Bahadur Thapa, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, His Majesty's Government of Nepal, accompanied by Shrimati Thapa, arrived in New Delhi on the 11th April on an official visit to. India. Shri Jharendra Narayan Singha, Foreign Secretary, Shri Bhekh Bahadur Thapa, Economic Planning Secretary, and other officers of His Majesty's Government of Nepal are also accompanying Chairman Thapa.

Chairman Thapa and his party received a warm and affectionate welcome in Delhi. The Chairman was accorded a Civic Reception at the historic Red Fort on April 12. He also attended receptions given in his honour by the Bharat Nepal Yuvak Maitri Sangh and the Indo-Nepal Friendship Association. On April 14, the Chairman received the degree of Doctor of Letters at a special convocation of the University of Kurukshetra. The Chairman and his party have proceeded on a tour of several places of economic, cultural and religious interest in different parts of India: they will return to Kathmandu from Patna on April 28.

During their stay in Delhi, Chairman Thapa and Shrimati Thapa were received by the President of India. The Prime Minister and the Chairman reviewed the international situation with special reference to the developments in Asia and Africa. Among the questions discussed were Vietnam and General and Complete Disarmament. The discussions, which were held in an atmosphere of the greatest friendship, goodwill and mutual confidence showed that there were no serious problems between the two countries and that there was complete understanding and identity of views between them on important issues. Me Prime Minister and the Chairman re-affirmed their dedication to the principles of peaceful co-existence, non-alignment and international co-operation. They endorsed the United Nations Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty. The Prime Minister and the Chairman further reiterated the conviction of the Governments of India and Nepal in the settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means without resort to the threat or use of force.

The Prime Minister and the Chairman viewed with concern the widening gap in the standards of living of the peoples of developed and developing countries. They hoped that their delegations would work closely together, along with other developing countries, in order to secure effective implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

The Prime Minister explained to the Chairman the position regarding the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration and reaffirmed India's adherence to the Declaration and resolve to build up its relations with Pakistan on the basis of that Declaration. The Chairman appreciated this and expressed his conviction that the Tashkent Declaration opened the way for peaceful and good-neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan.

The two sides reviewed with satisfaction the fruitful development of relations between India and Nepal. The Chairman and the Prime Minister expressed satisfaction with the growing economic and technical co-operation between the two countries. The Chairman conveyed to the Prime Minister and her colleagues His Majesty's Government's appreciation of the assistance and co-operation extended by India in the task of Nepal's economic and social development in the last decade. He expressed satisfaction at the progress achieved in the implementation of India-aided projects in Nepal. He explained the scope of Nepal,s Third Development Plan and expressed the hope that co-operation between the two countries will continue.

The Prime Minister welcomed the progress achieved in Nepal in recent years and renewed assurances of India's deep interest in Nepal's continuing progress and prosperity. She indicated that in the period of India's Fourth Plan, the Government of India would be willing to extend suitable assistance and co-operation in Nepal's economic development.

The Chairman also had discussions with the Home Minister, the Ministers of External Affairs, Finance, Commerce and the Minister of Planning on many matters in which the two countries share a community of interests and aspirations.

On behalf of His Majesty the King of Nepal and on his own behalf Chairman Thapa extended an invitation to the Prime Minister to pay a visit to Nepal. The Prime Minister accepted the invitation with great pleasure.

115

NEPAL INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA VIETNAM UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN **Date** : Apr 01, 1966

May

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1966 Vol. XII MAY No. 5

CONTENTS

PAGE

COMMONWEALTH LAW MINISTERS' MEETING

Final Communique 117

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement on General and Complete Disarmament 118

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons 121

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speech in the Security Council on Rhodesia 126

Shri Prem Bhatia's Statement at the Opening Session of Committee of Twenty four 129

Shri Prem Bhatia's Statement in the Committee of Twentyfour on Rhodesia 130

Shri C. R. Gharekhan's Speech in the Committee of Twentyfour on Fiji 132

INDO YUGOSLAV UAR SUMMIT

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on the Proposed Tripartite Su mmit 136

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Extracts from Prime Minister's Press Conference 137

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Thermo-Nuclear Explosion

by China

139

SWITZERLAND

Swiss Assistance for Agricultural Development Project 140

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Cultural Exchange Programme 140 Soviet Technical Assistance for Bokaro Steel Plant 141

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreements

142

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Food Agreement 142 Indo-U.S. Mineral Exploration, Agreement 143 Indo-U.S. Loan Agreement 144

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA FIJI CHINA SWITZERLAND USA

Date : May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH LAW MINISTERS' MEETING

Final Communique

A Conference of Law Ministers of the Commonwealth countries was held at Marlborough House, London, from April 26 to May 3, 1966. India's Law Minister Shri G. S. Pathak, attended the Conference as the Leader of the Indian Delegation.

The Conference was attended by twenty-one independent countries and presided over by Lord Gardiner, Britain's Lord Chancellor. At the conclusion of the conference, the following communique was issued:

The meeting reviewed the arrangement for extradition of fugitive offenders within the Commonwealth in the light of constitutional changes which have taken place since the passing of the Imeprial Fugitive Offenders Act, 1881.

When the Law Ministers met in Canberra in August, 1965, they agreed that there was need

to revise existing arrangements between independent Commonwealth countries for the return of fugitive offenders. Consideration of the common principles of legislation on this subject was, therefore, the main item on the agenda of the present meeting and much of the first week was devoted to a thorough and frank examination of the present arrangements and discussion of problems of achieving a uniformity of procedure against the background of differing legal systems and constitutions.

The meeting considered that commonwealth extradition arrangements should be based upon reciprocity and substantially uniform legislation incorporating certain features commonly found in extradition treaties e.g. a list of returnable offences, establishment of a prima fade case before return and restrictions on the return of political offenders. The meeting accordingly formulated a scheme setting out principles which could form the basis of legislation within the Commonwealth and recommended that effect should be given to the scheme in each commonwealth country. The scheme does not apply to Southern Rhodesia.

The Ministers discussed reciprocal arrangements concerning enforcement of maintenance orders within the Commonwealth and took note of and commented on British proposals for revision of present arrangements to remove defects in them, bring procedure up-to-date, and overcome obscurities that have come to light in practice.

The meeting also agreed to recommend to the Prime Ministers that a small legal section be added to the Commonwealth Secretariat to perform functions of a legal liaison office among Commonwealth Governments. It was envisaged that such section could facilitate exchange of information among governments on legislation in their respective countries, and on other legal matters, act as a central point to bring to the attention of Governments information which might be useful to them on particular problems and where this might be obtained, and keep governments apprised of significant changes in the law of other Commonwealth countries. It was also agreed that the section could assist in legal matters at Commonwealth Conferences and in the work of the Commonwealth Secretariat as

a whole.

After discussion as to whether the question of the Commonwealth Court of Appeal should be included on the agenda, it was felt-that ministers of those governments interested in, the idea of establishing some form of a Commonwealth Court of Appeal could take the opportunity afforded by the meeting to have an informal discussion outside the meeting about this subject. Ministers of some countries did meet and agreed to pursue the matter further among themselves in cooperation with the British Government, in the hope that a suitably constituted court, drawing on judicial resources from the wide range of Commonwealth countries, could be available to go on circuit to those countries who wished to make use of it.

The Ministers were unanimous in agreeing that this had been a most successful meeting. On business before them they had adopted a number of recommendations for action by Commonwealth Governments. At the same time they had a useful opportunity to renew personal contacts and to exchange views on common problems. They noted that the extent to which they had been able to reach agreement had been

117

largely due to the fact that the countries of the Commonwealth have so much in common in their traditions of law and standards of justice. They reaffirmed the value of this meeting as being of great practical benefit to Commonwealth countries, and as helping to strengthen the concept of an international society based on rule of law.

UNITED KINGDOM USA INDIA AUSTRALIA **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V, C. Trivedi, Indian Ambassador in Switzerland and leader of the Indian Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, made the following statement in the Committee in Geneva on May 3, 1966, on the question of general and complete disarmament :

Mr. Chairman, with your permission and with the indulgence of the members of the Committee, I should like to speak this morning on the question of general and complete disarmament.

As we are all aware, our Committee has been constituted, to quote General Assembly resolution 1722(XVI), to undertake negotiations :

"....with a view to reaching ... agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control" [A/RES/ 1722 (XVI), part 11, para 2]

as a matter of utmost urgency. It is perhaps a little too harsh, and admittedly somewhat exaggerated, to say that we have been straying away from our terms of reference; but the fact remains that we have not been devoting adequate time to the main task before us. When the reports of our Committee came up for discussion during the last session of the General Assembly, that august body asked us to continue our

"efforts towards making substantial progress in reaching agreement on the question of general and complete disarmament" [A/RES/2031(XX), para 1, ENDC/161].

The Indian delegation believes that the only way to make progress on this question is to devote adequate time and effort to discussions and debates on it.

It is necessary to remind ourselves that ours is not an Eighteen-Nation Committee on arms control and arms limitation but a Committee on Disarmament, that we have been specifically constituted to negotiate a treaty on general and complete. disarmament and that the General Assembly of the United Nations has been asking us every year to resume our negotiations on general and complete disarmament with energy and determination.

When the Committee met last year, it hardly touched upon the problem of general and complete disarmament. This year we are now about to go into recess and so far we have only skirted around the subject at a few meetings. It is essential for us to examine, therefore, whether it is not appropriate that we revert to our traditional programme of work and devote one day a week to the question of general and complete disarmament when we resume our meeting in the middle of June.

The Indian delegation is aware that there are also some collateral issues before us and that these issues require urgent attention. The problems of the continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons with its attendant and consequent risks, the incompleteness of the partial nuclear Test Ban Treaty (ENDC/100/Rev. 1), both in its adherence and in the extent of its prohibitory provisions, and the various proposals for reduction of international tension and building of mutual confidence-these are unquestionably important issues deserving continued negotiations. At the same time, as we said on 15 February, we should be careful that we do not "miss the wood for the trees" (ENDC/PV. 240, p. 6). It is necessary to remind ourselves continually not to lose sight of our real objective, the objective of general and complete disarmament, and to ensure that we do not convert ourselves into a mere sub-committee discussing one or two specific and limited mea. sures of anus control. We should by all means deal with the urgent problems of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and cessation of all nuclear weapon tests and conduct our negotiations on them with energy, determination, urgency and continuity. As the Indian delegation sees it, there is no doubt in the mind of any one of us, on the need to continue our discussions on these issues. It is equally essential, however,

118

to ensure that we also negotiate on the main task which forms the raison d'etre of the Committee and the, precise terms of reference of the Committee as laid down by the international community-namely, agreement on general and complete disarmament. As our foreign Secretary said on 5 April 1966: ".. we must never forget that the tasks of this Committee are very wide. . . There can be no other goal but that of general and complete disarmament, to which the United Nations and the whole of humanity is committed That goal should never be lost sight of". (ENDC/PV.255, p. 11, provisional).

I should like to emphasize the thought in this statement that this is a goal to which the whole of humanity is now committed. The evolution in man's thinking on the questions of peace and security, which led finally to the formulation of the goal of general and complete disarmament, is one of the most hopeful features of modern civilization. It has been a slow evolution, but it has been sure and unmistakable. In the centuries of the past, the emphasis was on arms control and limitation, on reduction of armaments and, on some occasions, on controlling the, activities of other nations. To be sure, there were philosophers and statesmen even in dim past who talked of complete abolition of all arms and of total repudiation of the use of force. In our own country there was an emperor, Ashoka, who ruled a vast empire in the third century B.C. He waged a short and sanguinary war against the Kalingas in Eastern India and was afflicted by repentence as the war involved death, destruction and unhappiness. He revealed himself a philosopher in the consequences he drew from his remorse and expressed his philosophy in proclamations and laws inscribed on rock edicts throughout his empire. Although Asboka died centuries ago, his edicts have Survived. One of these, which scholars describe as Rock Edict XIII, sets forth Ashoka's philosophy of peace and morality as follows :

"The Kalinga country was conquered by King Priyadarshi, beloved of the Gods, in the eighth year of his reign. One hundred and fifty thousand persons were carried away captive, one hundred thousand were slain and many times that number died... The beloved of the Gods, conqueror of the Kalingas, is moved to remorse now. For he has felt profound sorrow and regret because the conquest of a people involves slaughter, death and deportation, But there is a more important reason for the King's remorse ... Even those who escaped calamity themselves are deeply afflicted by the misfortunes suffered by their friends, acquaintances, companions and relatives... Thus all men share in the misfortune and this weighs on King Privadarshi's mind... Even if the number of people who were killed or who died or who were carried away in the Kalinga war had been only onehundredth or one-thousandth of what it actually was, this would still have weighed on the King's mind.... King Privadarshi considers moral conquest, that is conquest by Dharma, the most important conquest. ... This edict on Dharma has been inscribed so that my, sons and grandsons, who may come after me, should not think new conquests worth achieving. Let them consider moral conquest the only true conquest. . . ".

There were other philosophers and statesmen in other lands who also put forward over the centuries this basic philosophy of international and inter-human relations. Despite these precepts and practices, however, the society of nations as a whole did not until very recently accept fully that the only hope of survival of our civilisation and of progress lay in general and complete disarmament.

In the past there have been treaties of arms. control and limitation, of qualitative and quantitative disarmament and of special prohibitions placed on defeated nations by the victors. It is pertinent to observe, however, that even in these fields the approach was to stipulate that the obligations and responsibilities, limited or partial, would apply equally to all countries concerned. As early as the 18th and 19th centuries there was growing realization among the nations of Europe that the balance of power could be maintained not only by frustrating the growth of the opponent's strength but also by restraining as a matter of policy the growth of one's own strength. Even the imposition of a discriminatory treaty like the Treaty of Versailles had a dual purpose: firstly, "to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of all the armaments of all nations" and secondly, to render it impossible for Germany "to resume her policy of military aggression." Lord Cecil, who made qualitative disarmament the dominant issue in the' League

Conference of 1932, specifically urged that the chief task of the Conference was the prohibition to all nations of those kinds of armaments which are forbidden to the vanquished Powers. That Conference demonstrated, however, that it was not easy to impose discriminatory restrictions on some countries in the first instance and then hope to negotiate corresponding obligations and responsibilities on the rest.

At this stage I do not wish to go into the question of these past pitfalls or of the inadequacies of past procedures. What I wish to emphasize is that until very recently the efforts of the international community were directed towards

119

measures of arms control and limitation and not towards total and universal disarmament. Even the Charter of the United Nations which was drafted before the world was made aware of the transcedent terror of the nuclear weapon. talks of the use of armed force in the common interest of the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments and of "Possible disarmament" (Article 47). The early resolutions of the United Nations referred to general regulation and reduction of armaments to be observed by all participants and not only by sonic of the participants; nevertheless the General Assembly was then concerned with the regulation and reduction of armaments and not with total disarmament. It was not until 20 November 1959, at the fourteenth session and the 840th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, that United Nations resolution 1378(XIV) adopted the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control as the goal of the international community.

Resolution 1378(XIV) considered that the question of general and complete disarmament was the most important one facing the world. Since then the United Nations has reiterated this fundamental truth repeatedly. The international community has firmly and unequivocally set this goal before itself and has entrusted to our Committee the task of negotiating a treaty on general and complete disarmament. It is imperative, therefore, that we do not lose sight either of the immutable essentiality of this objective or of the views of the international community on the subject or of the raison d'etre of our Committee.

Let us by all means discuss various limited or collateral problems, but we must continue to negotiate a treaty on general and complete disarmament and, above all, we must ensure that in all our discussions on any problem, general or specific, we bear in mind the requirements of the ultimate goal. Non-dissemination of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the banning of all nuclear weapon tests in all environments and other measures have thus to be conceived as forming an integral part of our basic objective. They have all to be conceived in the general and harmonious framework of disarmament. Unless we do this we are apt to develop a basic disequilibrium of approach which at best tends to treat a particular measure as an end itself and at worst militates against the basic principle of balance and universal security. The Indian delegation therefore notes with gratification that the draft outline of a treaty on general and complete disarmament submitted by the United States of America (ENDC/30 and Corr. 1 and Adds. 1, 2 and 3) and the draft treaty submitted by the USSR (ENDC/2/Rev. 1 and Add. 1) include measures like non-proliferation within the framework of comprehensive disarmament. This is not to say, of course, that the partial measures of disarmament should not be discussed separately and collaterally or that they should not be accorded priority, but it does mean that those measures must be clearly conceived of as measures of disarmament and not as isolated or preliminary limitations to be imposed on some small countries.

It has been argued that in the past the Committee did devote some time to the question of general and complete disarmament but an impasse was reached on the problem of the elimination of nuclear delivery vehicles. The Indian delegation recognizes this but is convinced that the Committee's response to it should not be to stop or postpone its discussions on the subject. Disarmament is not a process or a situation which can be achieved overnight or even within a short time. It is a matter which vitally affects the security interests of all nations, and obviously it will not be easy to reach agreements. Moreover, general and complete disarmament and the prospect of a completely disarmed world is a relatively new concept. The human society has never been disarmed in the past; our endeavour

is therefore unprecedented. All this makes it abundantly necessary that we continue to negotiate and attempt to solve the difficulties which we encounter. It is true that we have been meeting here for over four years, but that is not too long in relation either to human history or to the importance of the supremely vital objective that we have before us.

It appears to the Indian delegation that there are four principal reasons why we should resume our regular discussions on the question of general and complete disarmament. First, of course, that is our main task. Our Committee was formed precisely to undertake these discussions. Secondly, it is only the discussion on general and complete disarmament which will give us the correct perspective for all our discussions, whether we are talking of the bomber bonfire or nuclear-free zones, of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons or controlling the use of nuclear energy. Without this perspective we are apt to lose our way and stray into perilous paths which even the balance-of-power-oriented potentates of the past rejected as early as the 18th century. Thirdly, it is only through debate and discussion, through negotiation and exchange of views, however fruitless and frustrating they may appear momentarily, that we can hope to resolve the outstanding differences. Finally our negotiating body of eighteen has one unquestionable advantage, and that is the presence of the eight nonaligned delegations. Scholars and statesmen who have thought about disarmament and felt deeply about it have pointed out that there are three elements which provide the justification for

120

disarmament and for the goal of a disarmed society. These are moral, economic and security factors. On all those grounds, the non-aligned nations, which are at the same time developing nations and in general militarily weak nations have a greater stake in disarmament. The non-aligned nations have accordingly attempted to make their contributions to the task of the Committee in as constructive a manner as possible. Their views may not have always found favour with the super-Powers and their allies. That is understandable; for, after all, disarmament affects the vital security interests of all nations and the super-Powers have to exercise particular care in that behalf as they have to dismantle a vast, complex and far-reaching military apparatus. At the same time, a fresh approach, one which is not based on alliance interests, can sometimes help the super-Powers themselves as well as the international community as a whole. Our Committee thus provides an ideal forum for proceeding with our efforts towards making substantial progress in reaching agreement on the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The Indian delegation was happy to note that in their last interventions the Soviet and the United States delegations gave comprehensive expositions of their points of view, bringing the Committee up-to-date, as it were, on the question of general and complete disarmament and on the specific issue on which disagreement had developed when we postponed our substantive negotiations on the subject over eighteen months ago.

It has been generally recognized that the most complex and at the same time the most vital problem concerning general and complete disarmament is that of nuclear disarmament and that the crux of this problem is the elimination of nuclear delivery vehicles. India drew the attention of the world community to the urgency of dealing with this issue as early as 1957, when in its proposals to the United Nations Disarmament Commission it suggested that there should be an early elimination of the carriers of nuclear weapons. India emphasized that it was simpler to deal with carriers than nuclear weapons, and that if the delivery vehicles were eliminated the nuclear weapons' capacity for harm would be greatly reduced, Subsequently, in 1959, the French Government made the suggestion through Mr. Jules Moch that carriers be eliminated in sea and air, including submarines and intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Soviet Union adopted this basic approach in its draft treaty on general and complete disarmament (ENDC/ 2/Rev. 1). In March 1964, therefore, the Indian delegation (ENDC/PV. 177, pp. 27 et seq.) commended for acceptance the thesis underlying the Gromyko proposal (ENDC/2/ Rev. 1/Add. 1) in relation to elimination of nuclear delivery vehicles. That was the thesis that India had long propounded, for India has always believed that disarmament has to be on a large and comprehensive scale and that the first

stage of disarmament has to be substantial and impressive. As we said in March 1964, however, this need not mean the abandonment for ever of any other thesis, which may be revived at a later stage if this particular thesis is found wanting.

I do not propose to go into further details during this intervention, - regarding, for example, the need for unbroken continuity in the process of disarmament and its conclusion within a reasonably short and definite period, or the organic relationship between nuclear and conventional disarmament. I hope that when we reconvene after the recess we shall resume the thread of our discussion where we left it eighteen months ago and deal with these and other issues. What I wish to put before the Committee principally is the conviction of the Indian delegation that we must devote increasing and regular attention to the question of general and complete disarmament. Let us not be daunted by differences, for despite these differences there is so much in common among us. The real danger lies not in discussing differences and difficulties but in avoiding such discussions and in resorting to inadequate remedies.

Before I conclude, I should like to quote what the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Myrdal, said in another context

"When we recall our United Nations assignment, it is evident that we have no right to work solely on one possibility, the prospect of concluding a non-proliferation agreement." (ENDC/PV. 256, p. 14/20, provisional).

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GERMANY SWEDEN **Date** : May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi, Indian Ambassador In Switzerland and leader of the Indian Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, made the following statement in the Committee in Geneva on May 10, 1966 on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons :

121

Today is the last meeting of our Committee before we recess for about a month and it is appropriate that we address ourselves to the subject which has been the principal item debated during the twenty-nine meetings we have held so far-the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Our Committee functions in the framework of the international climate and our strength and utility as well as our weakness and shortcomings depend on the extent to which we reflect that climate. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to consider the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as other problems of disarmament, in the context of international thinking and the guidelines laid down by the international community.

The widespread public interest in the problem of proliferation has been a somewhat recent development. In the past, either in the context of the danger posed by the nuclear menace or separately, countries such as Ireland, Sweden and India had brought up this issue in the United Nations, but it was mainly after the explosion of a nuclear weapon device by the People's Republic of China in October 1964 that the queslion aroused general and public interest. The Chinese action was widely condemned by all the peace-loving peoples of the world. In its antisocial arrogance the People's Republic of China exploded a second nuclear weapon device in May 1965, while the Disarmament Commission was actually in session. And now, only yesterday, China has given new radioactive evidence of its hostility to peace and disarmament and its expansionist and militarist ambitions, once again placing the entire human society as well as the

generations yet unborn under far-reaching hazards to health and hazards of thermonuclear holocaust.

It is essential that our Committee and the international community consider the implications of these repeated acts of defiance of the will of humanity and damage to its well-being. It is necessary that we devote ourselves with energy and determination to the task of preventing this real and blatant proliferation and deal with the fundamental problem of the menace of current proliferation. This cannot be done, however by an attitude of moral indignation, sorrowful frustration or cynical acquiescence, or by putting forward ineffectual and superficial remedies for some future contingencies. The problem of present as well as future proliferation is undoubtedly urgent, and it is becoming more urgent with these periodic and annual explosions. At the same time, a sense of urgency should not lead to panic. for measures devised hastily in an atmosphere of panic are often unwise and unjust.

One of the most gratifying features of the situation has been the steady and rational evolution in the thinking of the international community on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Ever since the birth of these dreadful weapons statesmen of many nations have emphasized time and again that the highest priority should be given to the question of halting an reversing the nuclear arms race. As far as India is concerned, it has always urged that the central problem of peace and security and of disarmament is the nuclear arms and that it is not fruitful to deal with the consequences of the arms race unless that central problem is dealt with. Nine years ago Jawaharlal Nehru said in the Indian Parliament :

"We have declared quite clearly that we are not interested in making atom bombs even if we have the capacity to do so and that in no event will we use atomic energy for destructive purposes. I am quite sure that when I say this I represent every member of this House. I hope that will be the policy of all future Governments. The fact remains that if one has these fissionable materials and if one has the resources, then one can make a bomb, unless the world will be wise enough to come to some decision to stop the production of such bombs."

Whether in the context of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons or in the wider framework of disarmament India has thus urged upon the international community that it is essential to deal urgently with the main problem of the nuclear arms menace, and particularly with the vital problem of halting and reversing the nuclear arms race, for the only efficacious solution is to deal with the cause along with the consequences of the malaise. India voted for what is called the Irish resolution [A/RES/1665 (XVI)], but in explaining its vote and in putting forward its reservations it said that the resolution did not go far enough. India supported what is called the Under Plan and voted for the Swedish resolution [A/RES/1664 (XVI)], which called for an enquiry to be made into the conditions under which non-nuclear weapon countries and nuclear weapon countries might agree to non-proliferation and non-dissemination of nuclear weapons.

India has remained constant in its national determination to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. At the same time it is aware that in order to arrive at an international agreement and to obtain an international treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons it is necessary to stop proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects-that is. actual and present proliferation of nuclear weapon Powers themselves anti possible or future proliferation by-the nonnuclear weapon countries.

122

In this context the Indian delegation was greatly impressed with the profound statement on disarmament problems contained in the Swedish Government's declaration on foreign policy made in Parliament by the Foreign Minister of Sweden on 23 March. This statement merits close study and a constructive response from all concerned, and I should like to quote some relevant extracts from it:

"The question of non-proliferation is thus a problem extending outside the exclusive sphere of interest of the great Powers. It is those countries which do not possess nuclear weapons but which can produce them that are requested to relinquish their option in the interest of general security; and in principle, we call agree so far. But, fur sound reasons, it can in addition be maintained that the present expansion and improvements of existing nuclear stockpiles also involve a continuously increasing danger to peace. if the general security of the world shall be the guide-line of the efforts to gain control over the possession of nuclear weapons, then the great Powers must also obviously put a limit to their nuclear armaments. A non-proliferation agreement not paying reasonable regard to this demand can be difficult to accept for several of the countries which are of considerable importance in this connexionnamely, those which now are more or less close to the point where they are able to start their own production of nuclear weapons. Without the co-operation of these countries, a non-proliferation agreement cannot be efficient. There is cause to regret that so far the great Powers have shown themselves disinclined to consider sufficiently the viewpoints of the non-aligned. nations in this important respect.

"As to the Swedish point of view, we are positive to the efforts to bring about an effective agreement against further proliferation of nuclear weapons. Such an agreement presupposes universal accession attainable only through 'an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of nuclear and non-nuclear Powers' [A/RES/ 2028(XX) to use the wording of the United Nations resolution. Therefore, Sweden supports in Geneva the demands of the non-aligned nations that the great Powers shall give their contribution in the form of a complete test ban and the discontinuaance of the production of fissionable material for weapon purposes.

When we set these demands, we do not mean, of course, that we shall start production of nuclear weapons if our demands are not fulfilled. Such a decision has no political actuality in this country. When we insist on commitments in return, this is due to the fact that we want an agreement which constitutes an efficient contribution to the limitation of the nuclear threat in the sense of the United Nations resolution".

In considering these issues the Committee should constantly bear in mind that the international community has been defining with progressive precision what should constitute the basic elements of an adequate treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. It gives an incomplete picture, therefore, when some people talk of the United Nations and refer to only one of the two general resolutions of 1961 and not to a specific and detailed resolution of 1965, or when they talk of the position of the non-aligned countries and refer to the memorandum of September 1965 (ENDC/158) often misquoting it--but not to historic General Assembly resolution 2028(XX) sponsored by those non-aligned delegations. We should not forget that the world community as a whole has demonstrated in international documents the sure and unmistakable evolution in its thinking on the subject of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and that the final and firm view of the United Nations have found their rational expression in the specific principles laid down in General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX).

References have been made in our Committee to an article-by-article examination of the two draft treaties (ENDC/152 and 164) which were presented before the drafting and adoption of this resolution. This is undoubtedly a useful and constructive procedure, but it is even more essential to conduct initially a principle-by-principle examination of United Nations Genera Assembly resolution 2028(XX). As I said earlier, our Committee necessarily has to function in the framework of the international climate and international directives and this historic resolution of the twentieth session of the United Nations represents the inescapable demand of the international community as a whole. The principles laid down in this resolution are not those of only the nonaligned nations or the aligned nations, not those of only the nations of a particular region or continent but of the entire world society, and it is inappropriate for this Committee to ignore them. When the General Assembly of the United Nations is reconvened in September this year, that august body will be concerned primarily with how we have implemented its resolution on the subject and how faithful we have remained in our discussions to the guidelines given to us in that

resolution.

As the non-aligned delegations in the Committee have pointed out, the most important principle laid down by the United Nations is that

123

the treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear weapon Powers. It needs to be emphasized that out of the five principles laid down by the international community in this resolution it is only this particular principle which stipulates specifically what should be embodied in an acceptable treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, that is, what should be in the body of the treaty. The treaty must, therefore, have specific provisions and articles in its text which would provide an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear weapon Powers and the non-nuclear weapon Powers. The United Nations has not accepted the thesis that this treaty should by its nature be discriminatory, that it is not a measure of disarmament, that it should embody principally the obligations and responsibilities of the non-nuclear weapon countries, and that as far as the nuclear weapon countries are concerned they need only attempt to negotiate measures balancing the obligations of the non-nuclear weapon countries separately, in the hope that they may reach some agreement on them some time in future.

As I said earlier, the United States and the Soviet Union presented their draft treaties before the adoption of the General Assembly resolution, with its firm and clear principles. Since then, both delegations have advanced some amendments or proposals of amendment. The Indian delegation has already welcomed the proposal made in Chairman Kosygin's message of 1 February (ENDC/167) and would like to take this opportunity of welcoming the message from His Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia, circulated to the Committee on I March in the context.

"... of the fact that the present nuclear possession and proliferation could be a serious danger to the security of mankind...." (ENDC/171). The Indian delegation also welcomes the amendment put forward by the United States delegation in defining rationally the status of the countries concerned and using the expressions "nuclear weapon countries" and "non-nuclear weapon countries" (ENDC/152/Add. 1). I am personally grateful to the United States delegation for its handsome and generous acknowledgement of my modest contribution in that behalf.

Those are some wholesome developments and deserve to be praised. In particular, the Indian delegation believes that they indicate a welcome receptiveness on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union delegations, and it hopes that in the same approach of understanding they will soon introduce other amendments so as to reflect the directives given to all of us by the United Nations in resolution 2028(XX).

Principle 2 (b) of that resolution talks of the responsibilities and obligations of non-nuclear weapon countries and of nuclear weapon countries. As far as the, non-nuclear weapon countries are concerned, the two draft treaties before us set out their obligations and their responsibilities. Firstly, there is the question of dissemination, pure and simple. The drafts provide, in principle, that the non-nuclear weapon countries shall not receive weapons or weapon technology. Secondly, there is the question of the production of nuclear weapons, and the drafts stipulate that the non-nuclear weapon countries shall not manufacture these weapons. Thirdly, a suggestion has been made for some kind of control on the peaceful activities of nations. It is true that article III in the United States draft (ENDC/152, p. 2) is only a statement of an objective to be attained, although a preambular statement of that type could properly find its place only in the preamble of the treaty, rather than in a substantive article. Nevertheless, some statements have been made which seem to indicate that the imposition of such control is believed to be an important feature of an international instrument on non-proliferation.

The United Nations resolution says that all obligations should apply mutually to the nuclear weapon Powers as well and that they should be balanced as between the non-nuclear weapon countries and the nuclear weapon countries. It goes further and says that the balanced and mutual obligations of the nuclear weapon Powers should be embodied in the treaty. This requirement is clearly spelt out in the resolution and cannot be ignored.

If we look at the two drafts (ENDC/152 and Add. 1 and ENDC/164), however, we findpresumably because they were presented before the adoption of the United Nations resolutionthat the principle of balance and mutuality is reflected only in the first set of obligations, namely, those relating to dissemination proper. Just as the non-nuclear weapon Powers are required not to receive weapons and weapon technology, the nuclear weapon Powers are required not to give them. This certainly provides balance and mutuality in the body of the treaty. Incidentally, apart from the controversy between the two alliances on the exact definition of what constitutes the giving or receiving of weapons and weapon technology, there is another aspect of this problem which needs to be attended to. The transfer of weapons and weapon technology should be considered not only in relation to transactions between the nuclear weapon Powers on the one hand and non-nuclear weapon Powers on the other, but also among the nuclear weapon Powers themselves. This is a point which India made as early as 1961. That means that transfer of nuclear weapons and technology

124

should be prohibited even if it involves transfer from one nuclear weapon Power to another nuclear weapon Power.

Despite this lacuna and despite the controversy on the definition of the contours of dissemination, the two drafts embody in principle the mutuality and balance enjoined upon us by the international community. When we come to the other two sets of obligations, however, we find that there is as yet no provision to reflect the requirements of the United Nations resolution. As far as production is concerned, it is only the non-nuclear weapon countries which are directed not to manufacture nuclear weapons. The nuclear weapon Powers retain the right to continue to manufacture these dread weapons of destruction. That provides no balance and no mutuality. This lacuna is particularly Calamitous when one considers the case of the People's Republic of China, an incipient nuclear weapon Power, a Power which

does not as yet have either a stockpile of nuclear weapons or a developed system of delivery. The drafts as they stand would give it a licence to develop its stockpile and its delivery systems. They would permit such a country to proliferate at will under the umbrella of an inadequate treaty.

Leaving aside individual cases, however, the fact remains that the United Nations resolution demands balance and mutuality as between nonnuclear weapon countries and nuclear weapon countries. The Indian delegation has noted with satisfaction that the Swedish delegation made a concrete proposal in that respect on 10 March (ENDC/PV. 247, p. 14) and it endorses the suggestion that the very first article of an acceptable treaty on nonproliferation should prohibit the production of fissile material for weapon purposes to all countries alike, nuclear weapon Powers and non-nuclear weapon Powers, in accordance with the principle of mutuality and balance. The other articles can then follow in a rational and coherent sequence.

The Indian delegation is aware that the United States delegation has referred at several meetings to the question of cessation of such production, In implementation of United Nations resolution 2028(XX), however, this requirement has to be embodied in the treaty itself. The Indian delegation hopes that this will be done in the near future so that the Committee can express itself in detail on the actual terms of the article in question.

There is yet another aspect of the balance which needs to be embodied in the treaty, and this arises from the existence of the awesome arsenals of the existing nuclear weapon Powers. There is no balance nor security if these overkill stockpiles continue even at their present hazardous levels. Several delegations have devoted their attention to this problem and, in particular, the Indian delegation is impressed with the suggestion in that respect made to the Committee by the delegation of the United Arab Republic on 3 March (ENDC/PV. 245, p. 15). The treaty should, thus embody an article providing for a legal obligation on the part of the nuclear weapon Powers to reduce their stocks in an acceptable manner. As Ambassador Khallaf said, this should be a formal and firm

indication, The Indian delegation believes that if the first article of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons covers the problem of production and the second article the problem of dissemination, the third article should provide for an obligation for reduction of stockpiles. This is not a preambular matter but a substantive one and needs to be embodied in the substantive articles of the treaty. Other subsidiary articles, like the withdrawal clause and the one on the coming into force of the treaty, could then follow these basic articles.

Finally, there is the question of control on the peaceful nuclear activities of nations. India has always maintained that control and disarmament should be simultaneous and that it is not possible to isolate the two concepts. What is even more important in the context of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is that any measure we envisage should be mutual and balanced. It should leave no loopholes, as enjoined in principle 2 (a) of resolution 2028(XX) (ENDC/161), and in accordance with principles 2(b), (c) and (d) of that resolution it should apply in particular to the armed activities of nations. If, therefore, any control is to be envisaged in a treaty of this nature,-and that is another issue-it should, firstly, apply equally and without any discrimination to all nuclear facilities of all nations and not only to the facilities of non-nuclear nations or developing nations; and, secondly, it should apply to the peaceful activities of nations as well as their warlike activities. As India has stated several times in the past, nuclear weapons are fabricated by the nuclear weapon Powers with the fissile material produced by them in their gaseous diffusion plants. They are not manufacturing these weapons in their atomic reactors or in their atomic power plants, and it is no use controlling the semi-finished product while leaving the finished product completely uncontrolled. The most essential facility to be controlled, therefore, is the gaseous diffusion plants. In this Committee, unlike other organizations and agencies, we are discussing only the issues of disarmament, and as far as we are concerned it is our obligation to deal specifically with these issues. At any rate, the directives given to us by the United Nations resolution are that a

treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should leave no loopholes which might permit either the nuclear weapon Powers or the nonnuclear weapon Powers to proliferate nuclear weapons in any form, that the body of the treaty should provide for an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of nuclear weapon Powers and non-nuclear weapon Powers and that the treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and particularly of nuclear disarmament.

The Indian delegation believes it is necessary to emphasise that it lays special stress on the resolution of the United Nations not so much because that resolution represents the combined and overwhelming opinion of the international community on the subject as because principles laid down in it have a universal validity and represent the fundamental truths of the situation. Again, the sovereign, equal and independent nations of the world desire that an international treaty should be non-discriminatory. But that is not the main emphasis of the resolution. Its main emphasis is that an international instrument must ensure security for all and that it should safeguard not only the interests of countries which are militarily aligned with the nuclear weapon Powers, but also the interests of the non-aligned nations-in fact, the interests of the entire world society. It was with this supreme consideration in mind that the United Nations adopted resolution 2028(XX) by a massive vote.

INDIA SWITZERLAND PERU USA IRELAND SWEDEN CHINA ETHIOPIA RUSSIA **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speech in the Security Council on Rhodesia

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, made the following statement in the Security Council on May 17, 1966 on Rhodesia:

I should like to express to you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council, the appreciation of my delegation for allowing us to state our views on the serious and inflammatory situation in Rhodesia. The world is well aware of the inherent dangers involved in not dealing with the problem of Rhodesia immediately and effectively.

The people and Government of India have been watching with great anxiety and concern the worsening conditions of the four million Africans of Zimbabwe. We believe that the United Nations has a twofold responsibility in regard to Rhodesia. The first, and the primary function of the Security Council, is to prevent the situation from being a threat to international peace and security. The second, and equally important responsibility of the United Nations, is to help the people of Zimbabwe to attain their freedom and independence. These have been denied to them by the colonial administration for long and now are being denied by the white racist oppressors who have usurped authority in the colony in defiance of everything that the United Nations stands for.

The delegation of India had an opportunity to express its deep concern on the situation in Rhodesia last November at the 1258th meeting of the Security Council. If you will permit me, Mr. President, I would like to recall what I stated at that time in regard to the crucial question involved in this problem. I said :

"The question of Southern 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 Africa, South West Africa, Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea." (1258th meeting, p. 41).

In the same statement I also pointed out:

". . that the serious situation demands sterner measures ... It is imperative for the

United Nations 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 sanction do not meet the requiremerits 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 birthright

126

of freedom, of equality and of human dignity." (ibid., pp. 46-47).

It would have given my delegation and other Members of the United Nations great satisfaction had the economic sanctions been effective and resulted in the avowed objective, namely, the overthrow of the illegal regime. But subsequent events have proved that our worst fears were well-founded. The Smith regime has not only not been dislodged; but in actual fact, judging by the continued defiance of world opinion and the bravado in Mr. Smith's statements, it remains unshaken. The resolution adopted by the Security Council in November last was half-hearted in method and objective, and consequently has not been adequate to meet the situation. We had hoped, however, that the Administering Power would at least have energetically carried out those limited measures. In this context, my delegation would like to refer to the reported statement of the Prime Minister of Great Britain at Lagos, Nigeria, on 11 January this year that within a matter of weeks, the economic sanctions would dislodge the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia. Not weeks, but months have passed. There is as yet no sign that the Smith regime is about to be toppled over. In fact, a true analysis of the recent events points in the opposite direction.

At this stage I would like to examine why the economic sanctions have failed. As I stated earlier, the resolution of 20 November 1965 was not effective enough to achieve the main object of ending the racist regime in Rhodesia. But even if those limits of recommendations outlined in the resolution had been implemented by all States--and I emphasize "all States"--they would have made some impact on the economic situation in Rhodesia. As we know, not all States had co-operated with the United Nations. Some have openly defied the terms of that resolution; others have contented themselves with token compliance; still others have issued vigorous statements but have not translated them into equal vigorous action. As was to be expected, South Africa and Portugal take pride of place in the first category. Details about the assistance and support given by the Governments of these two countries to the illegal Smith regime are to be found in the working paper on Southern Rhodesia prepared by the Secretariat of the United Nations and circulated as General Assembly document A/AC.109/L.264/Add.2 of 10 May 1966. From paragraphs 61, 62 and 102 to 110 it is clearly seen that Rhodesia has been able to overcome the consequences of the limited economic boycott by relying on its increasing trade with Portugal and South Africa. The same document also gives details of the extensive trade which Rhodesia is still able to carry on with some other countries.

The failure of economic sanctions is also due to the fact that many countries have considerable investments in Southern Rhodesia and their primary concern appears to be to protect those investments through the smokescreen of limited economic sanctions. It cannot be forgotten that many white people have large-scale landholdings in Rhodesia, directly producing profits for many British shareholders and shareholders of other nationalities in the tobacco, sugar and textile industries of Rhodesia. There are even larger foreign investments in Rhodesia's mining industry. My delegation does not want to take up the time of this Council by unraveling the intricacies of the working of many international enterprises operating in Rhodesia and in the neighbouring colonial territories under the administration of Portugal and South Africa. Reference need only be invited to the very useful and revealing studies prepared by the Special Committee of Twenty-four in regard to South West Africa and the colonies under Portuguese administration, and also to the records of Sub-Committee I of the Special Committee of Twenty-four, which is at present engaged in a detailed study of the implications of the activities of foreign economic and other interests in Southern Rhodesia

As vie a know, the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 20 November 1965 did not make any effective provision for an oil embargo. To some extent this lacuna was filled by the resolution adopted by this Council on 9 April 1966. However, the second resolution and the action that the United Kingdom Government took as a result of it were confined only to the limited quantities of oil destined for Beira. As will be seen from paragraph 146 of the Secretariat's working paper to which I have already referred, Rhodesia continues to receive large and regular supplies of oil. I quote this paragraph :

"On 18 April 1966, the Rand Daily Mail estimated the extent of the oil flow from South Africa to Southern Rhodesia as being between 140,000 and 160,000 gallons daily. This would be about double Southern Rhodesia's consumption under rationing. According to the Rand Daily Mail, the figure was based on a careful survey in the previous week at Beit Bridge and in Mozambique. The daily total was made up of about 45,000 gallons by road tankers via the Beit Bridge and about 100,000 gallons by rail."

It is obvious, therefore, that Rhodesia has built up sizable stocks of oil supplies within its territory, so as to be able to face an effective oil embargo. But the most disturbing aspect regarding the oil embargo, according to the same Secretariat document, is that all the major oil

127

suppliers are said to be participating in the supply of considerable quantities of oil to Rhodesia. This sad result is due to the fact that few Governments the nationals of which own and operate the major oil companies are taking effective action to persuade them, much less to put pressure on them, to discontinue supplies to Rhodesia. Experience of the working of the oil embargo thus proves beyond doubt that unless it is applied to all the areas surrounding Rhodesia it will not succeed.

While my delegation does not wish to minimize the possible impact of a truly effective oil embargo, it is evident that such action alone will not enable the United Kingdom and the United Nations to bring about the overthrow of the white racist government in Rhodesia. From the study prepared by W. J. Levy, Inc., New York, for the United Nations, we see that oil is not a dominant factor in Rhodesia's overall energy balance. Moreover, as Mr. James Fairbairn wrote in the 15 April issue of the New Statesman:

"Mr. Wilson would be wrong to congratulate himself on the clever British drafting which wrung from a reluctant and suspicious Security Council a resolution authorizing British force for the strictly limited purpose of preventing oil from reaching Beira, for this will not bring Smith down."

Now that it has been proved that economic sanctions and even the oil embargo have failed to bring to an end the illegal regime in Rhodesia, the Council must consider other measures to achieve this objective.

The delegation of India welcomes the initiative taken by the African States in calling for this meeting of the Security Council and believes that the measures contemplated in the draft resolution which appears as an annex to document S/7285, if implemented quickly and fully, would help the people of Zimbabwe to attain freedom and independence. As stated in the memorandum Of the African States and the draft resolution annexed to it, the present negotiations between the United Kingdom and the representatives of the racist regime, excluding as they do the genuine representative of the people of Zimbabwe, will result only in the perpetuation of the racist oppression in Rhodesia. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom has sought to minimize the possibility that there is any such danger in the negotiations. Yet we cannot forget the history of white rule in South Africa in this context. the delegation of India cannot but be apprehensive regarding the risks inherent in the negotiations being carried on in London just now. In this connexion I would like to quote what the Minister for External Affairs of India said on 9 March 1966:

"Any attempt by Britain to negotiate with the existing illegal regime in Rhodesia to bring about the imposition of another period of white-minority rule in that country would be wholly unacceptable to India. India would also not favour any delay in the convening of a constitutional conference representative of all sections of the people of Rhodesia or the reimposition by Britain of the 1961 Constitution after the termination of the rebellion".

My delegation feels that what is urgently required is the immediate implementation by the United Kingdom, under the authority and with the co-operation of this Council, of the following steps :

First, the Government of the United Kingdom should make it clear to Mr. Ian Smith and his colleagues in Rhodesia that they cannot reap any benefits from the treasonable act of the unilateral declaration of independence,

Second, since Mr. Smith appears to be confident that force will not be used against his act of treason, the United Kingdom should declare that the use of force to end the illegal minority regime is by no means ruled out. In fact, it should be made clear that further continuation of the rebellion will make the use of force imperative.

Third, at the same time, the Government of the United Kingdom should declare unequivocally that the dictatorial and reactionary constitution of 1961 will be abolished;

Fourth, a definite date for the attainment of full freedom and independence by the people of Zimbabwe under a freely chosen constitution should be set immediately.

Fifth, the United Kingdom Government should declare that elections will be held on the basis of a constituent assembly charged with the task of framing a constitution which will contain adequate safeguards for minorities.

Sixth, that in the intervening period the territory of Southern Rhodesia will be administered by an interim government with the participation of representatives from all sections of the community in proportion to the strength of their population.

These six steps are the minimum required to restore and maintain peace and security in the

area; it is only by these measures that the United Kingdom and the United Nations can discharge their responsibility to the people of Zimbabwe. Unless the United Nations can persuade the administering Power to implement these six steps, violence and racial conflict in Rhodesia will be inevitable.

As the Government of India has repeatedly stated, India will extend all possible assistance

128

to the people of Zimbabwe through the United Nations add the organization of African Unity. The Minister for External Affairs of India stated in the Indian Parliament on 26 April 1966, as follows :

"We have always urged that it is imperative that the white racist regime, which has assumed power illegally, should be ended, and if the economic pressures and other pressures that the world is mounting against them do not fructify, there should be no hesitations even with regard to the use of force to end this regime. . . We have, in a very persistent and consistent manner, always worked for ending these last vestiges of colonialism, and we think that, having ourselves attained independence from colonial rule, it is also our duty, and we not consider any sacrifice too great, to discharge our responsibilities and our obligations to those brethren of ours who are still groaning under foreign domination."

For India's part, it has already adopted measures to implement fully the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. To quote the Minister of External Affairs again:

"As soon as the white racist Government declared independence illegally in a unilateral fashion, we broke off diplomatic relations and we cut off all economic relations although we had a sizable trade and a favourable trade balance with Rhodesia. We did not count our rupees and we cut off our trade relations because we wanted to demonstrate our solidarity with the African peoples we wanted to demonstrate to the white regime our strong feelings in this respect." It is the earnest hope of my delegation that from the current deliberations of this Council will emerge positive and concrete measures which will help the people of Zimbabwe to attain their freedom and independence.

INDIA USA ZIMBABWE ANGOLA GUINEA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NIGER NIGERIA PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA MOZAMBIQUE UNITED KINGDOM

Date : May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Prem Bhatia's Statement at the Opening Session of the Committee of Twentyfour

Shri Prem Bhatia, High Commissioner of India in Nairobi and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the U.N. Committee of Twentyfour, made the following statement at the opening session of the Committee in Dar-es-Salaam on May 23, 1966:

Mr. Chairman,

Permit me, first of all, to express the most sincere gratitude and appreciation of my Government, my delegation and my own to the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania for their generous invitation to the Committee of 24 to hold some of its meetings in Dar-es-Salaam. During the few hours that we have been here we have already felt the warmth and affection of the friendly people of the United Republic of Tanzania. On behalf of my delegation I extend to them our best wishes for their continued well-being and prosperity.

The United Republic of Tanzania occupies a unique position in the brave struggle against colonialism with which this Committee is occupied. Situated as it is, contiguous to several nonself-governing territories, Tanzania has a major role to play in helping the freedom fighters in these territories. My delegation is more than satisfied with the contribution which the United Republic of Tanzania has made and is making to this worthy cause. The locating of the headquarters of the Liberation Committee of 11 of the Organisation of African Unity in Dar-es Salaam is by itself a recognition of this special position of the United Republic of Tanzania. My delegation would like to pay a sincere tribute to one of the most outstanding personalities of Africa, President of the Republic, His Excellency Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, his Government and his people.

Mr. Chairman, my country enjoys the most friendly relations with the United Republic of Tanzania. His Excellency Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere is held in high respect in India for his qualities of leadership, for his devoted efforts to raise the living standards of his people and for his success in-building up a truly multi-racial society. The signing of the Friendship and Scientific, Economic and Technical Cooperation Agreement between Tanzania and India is, to quote the words of His Excellency Mr. A. M. Babu, Minister for Commerce and Co-operatives, Government of Tanzania, "not the beginning but the continuation of the age-old friendly relations between India and Tanzania". My country is proud of the tribute paid to it by His Excellency Mr. A. M. Babu who said that, by its co-operation, India was helping not only in Tanzania's economic development but also in the emancipation of colonial Africa.

We have just listened to the inspiring address given to our Committee by His Excellency Mr. Rashidi Kawawa, Second Vice-President of the United Republic of Tanzania. Mr. Kawawa has

129

adequately surveyed the present colonial situation. He has reminded us of the continued urgency with which the problem has to be tackled. His address will guide us in our future deliberations and discussions of the various items before us. We are grateful to His Excellency for his enlightening words.

My delegation will have much to say on the general and specific problems of colonialism during the detailed discussions which follow today's opening meeting. But I would like to say briefly on the present occasion that our stand on this subject has been consistent and forthright. My country has always stood for the emancipation from subjection by alien powers of peoples who, for varying periods of history, have not known freedom. Whether it was Asia, or Africa, or any other part of the world, our attitude has been unmixed with floral compromises. This uncompromising forthrightness we shall always continue to project, without fear and without the desire to please those whom our stand may seem to hurt. I am happy to say, Mr. Chairman, our conscience and our principles are not for sale.

It is in this context that my delegation deeply and sincerely regrets the absence from the deliberations of this Committee of the representative of the United Kingdom. In view of the clear acceptance which the United Nations hag already given to the principles on which the functions of this Committee are based, it would have been better for the United Kingdom's representative to remain associated with our deliberations.

As Vice-President Kawawa rightly emphasized, it is important that this Committee should once again meet on African soil. When this question was raised, my delegation supported without hesitation, the proposal to come to Africa. We believe that it is useful for the Committee to go geographically as close to the colonial territories as possible and to facilitate the presentation of petitions. This also keeps the attention of the world community focussed on the burning issues with which our Committee is seized. The pressure on the administering powers must be kept up, until the remaining ugly blots of colonialism, in whatever form, have been removed from the face of the earth.

In the end, once again, I wish on behalf of my delegation every success to the people of the United Republic of Tanzania.

INDIA KENYA TANZANIA USA **Date :** May 01, 1966

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Prom Bhatia's Statement in the Committee of Twentyfour on Rhodesia

Shri Prem Bhatia, High Commissioner of India in Nairobi and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the U.N. Committee of Twentyfour, made the, following statement in the Committee in Dar-es-Salaam on Rhodesia on May 30, 1966:

Mr. Chairman,

We are often advised not to get "emotional" over situations such as the Rhodesian question. Perhaps it, is easier for countries which are already free to abjure emotion and to try to appear wise and calm. But even such countries, however wise and calm their look, cannot help feeling outraged over tactics which are transparently deceptive in intention and projection.

As this Committee knows very well, the United Kingdom Government's initial stand was that Rhodesia was internally self-governing and, therefore, immune from interference by the United Kingdom. The United Nations General Assembly refuted this stand and held Rhodesia to be a non-self-governing territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. The Smith rebellion forced the United Kingdom Government into a position which it was earlier unwilling to take. The United Kingdom thus assumed the sole responsibility for dealing with the rebellious regime of Ian Smith and demanded that others should keep out. We then waited to see how this responsibility was going to be exercised.

World opinion was thereafter sought to be kept in good humour by the assurance that effective economic sanctions would be imposed on Rhodesia by the United Kingdom Government. We were promised that the collapse of the Smith regime was a matter of "weeks" rather than of "months". Some of us, against our better judgment, even persuaded ourselves to agree with the United Kingdom assessment of the future of Ian Smith and his accomplices; also to think that, at worst, the end of the Smith regime was a matter of "months" if not of "weeks".

Those "weeks" have already rolled into months, and the months keep rolling. Meanwhile the so-called sanctions have been exposed as a hopeless and tragic misnomer. For five minutes, one fine morning many months ago, Mr. Ian Smith rode a bicycle, with the obvious objective of proving to the world that the White usurper in Rhodesia was determined to resist the symbolic punishment which the United Kingdom Government proposed to inflict on him. Photographs of this ostentatious austerity received

130

more publicity in the British Press than anywhere else. Mr. Smith riding a bicycle was news indeed; but the reasons for the publicity given to the event in the United Kingdom went deeper. The world was asked to believe that the oil sanctions were already working and. that Brittania, still ruling the waves, had asserted itself Needless to say that Mr. Ian Smith has never again been seen riding a bicycle--or even within neighbourly distance of this pretentious instrument of physical torture through economic sanctions.

An identical act of public relations on the part of the United Kingdom Government was the effort to attract world attention to the incident of the oil tankers. The farce of sanctions continues. Meanwhile Mr. Ian Smith has no further use for his bicycle. Doctors Voerword and Salazar have seen to that--not unknown, I presume, to Mr. Harold Wilson. To add insult to injury, the United Kingdom Government has now started talks with the Smith regime--having repeatedly ruled out such a possibility only a few months ago.

Mr. Chairman, a very distinguished African leader once told me in another context and I quote : "The world should not underestimate the intelligence of the African". Un-fortunately, Mr. Chairman, this is precisely what the United Kingdom Government has tried to do; only, with regard to Rhodesia, African intelligence alone has not been under-estimated. The insult is intended to cover the whole world, including the people of the United Kingdom.

Where do we go from here ? The following points are clear :

- I. That the United Kingdom version of sanctions was neither purposeful nor effective. These sanctions, because they were calculated to protect rather than to punish, have failed.
- II. That the United Kingdom and its supporters do not intend, at least for the time being, to adopt stronger and effective measures against Rhodesia.
- III. That the Smith regime is defying world opinion and consolidating itself.

It is the last fact (which even the United Kingdom Government would find it hard to deny) that worries Africa and the friends of Africa. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Smith regime is consolidating itself, in utter contempt for the opinion of its critics. And who are the partners of Mr. Smith in this process of consolidation ? Do I have to answer this question ?

There is, of course, the United Kingdom. I would not be so unfair as to suggest that the Government of the United Kingdom is deliberately prolonging a regime which has defied and arrogantly ridiculed the authority of Mr. Wagon's administration. The United Kingdom's attitude is best described as concern for kith and kin. Such concern is understandable, but far from morally defensible. Then there is the argument that the United Kingdom Government would prefer economic, sanctions to the use of force, for reasons of principle and practical wisdom. But surely economic sanctions do not at the same time justify continued trade, even if such trade is routed through a third party ! I am afraid the United Kingdom attitude to Rhodesia has clear and comprehensive reservations-for the benefit of kith and kin.

White Rhodesia's two other partners in this process of consolidation are now familiar names. What more significant, they collaborate in crime not through sophisticated hypocrisy, not with apologetic deviation from truth and morality, but with blatant, unconcealed and aggressive alliance with a backward, cowardly and conceited leader of the international underworld. It is no accident, Mr. Chairman, that the Governments of South Africa and Portugal are in the vanguard of all movements which want to put back the clock of history. Whenever the voice of reaction, racism and crude self-congratulation for inhumanity is heard, these two Governments are the cheer leaders. They do not share the finesse of some others in the exercise of duplicity. They are the unashamed, unrepenting, proud Al Capones of our time. They are our international lepers whose touch pollutes, whose neighbourhood brings disgrace to the neighbour, and social, commercial and political intercourse with whom is a crime against man.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, there are Governmerits, there are people, who, through devices which have been unmasked time and again, continue to engage in this polluted intercourse. There is one such major Power even in Asia: whose proclaimed concern for the underdog and for the exploited races of the world has not prevented it from selling and buying from South Africa. In fact its trade with South Africa has increased in recent years while the African and Asian in South Africa groan under the heels of Dr. Voerword.

This slight diversion on my part is intended only to show that hypocrisy and aggressive crime are today's unmistakable bedfellows. We cannot be satisfied any more with sweet words of smug comfort from the United Kingdom. The, pretence of sanctions will not work. Commercial and racial interests will have to yield place to a genuine effort to undo a palpable wrong. The United Kingdom will have to act (and not hide itself behind the generous apron of support in the Security Council) if Africa and the rest of the world are to be saved from

131

a conflict which will be bloody, and which may assume an unlovely racial shape.

My delegation does not have to repeat before this Committee the stand India has taken

against racialism and injustice. We took the lead against apartheid many years ago. We took the bit between our teeth and forced the Portuguese colonialists to retreat from our soil when persuasion failed. We have given tangible proof of our support for the subject people of Rhodesia by being the first to break off all relations with the Smith regime, including diplomatic and commercial. Elsewhere, too, Mr. Chairman, our voice has been raised whenever the monsters of reaction, colonialism and racialism have shown their ugly faces. And we shall continue to raise our voice, come what may.

My delegation would like to suggest that in expressing our considered stand on Rhodesia, we make it clear beyond doubt:

- I. That the United Kingdom, consistent with its own claim of sovereignty, is responsible for what is happening in Rhodesia and for what may happen in future.
- II. That, in accordance with the scope of that responsibility and obligation (which transcend relations between herself and her rebellious colony), the United Kingdom must now be prepared to act and not merely pretend to act.
- III. That our dislike of the use of force cannot be extended to shield a regime which, by declaration and action, has fully qualified itself to be treated as a criminal delinquent and deserves to be suppressed.
- IV. That members of the United Nations, irrespective of their race or colour, must now make up their minds which side they belong to-the gong of the aforesaid Portuguese and South African Al Capones or the vest and trusted group of nations who have, rasped for man and the rule of law.

This Committee is aware of the detailed stand my delegation has taken on Rhodesia. In the Security Council on May 17 we suggested a programme of six points to meet the situation. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I repeat those points here .

First, the Government of the United Kingdom should make it clear to Mr. Ian Smith Ind his colleagues in Rhodesia that they cannot reap any benefits from the treasonable act of the unilateral declaration of independence;

Second, since Mr. Smith appears to be confident that force will not be used against his act of treason, the United Kingdom should declare that the use of force to end the illegal minority regime is by no means ruled out. In fact, it should be made clear that further continuation of the rebellion will make the use of force imperative.

Third, at the same time, the Government of the United Kingdom should declare unequivocally that the dictatorial and reactionary constitution of 1961 will be abolished.

Fourth, a definite date for the attainment of full freedom and independence by the people of Zimbabwe under a freely chosen constitution should be set immediately.

Fifth, the United Kingdom Government should declare that elections will be held on the basis of universal adult franchise for the formation of a constituent assembly charged with the task of framing a constitution which will contain adequate safeguard for minorities.

Sixth, that in the intervening period the territory of Southern Rhodesia will be administered by an interim government with the participation of representatives from all sections of the community in proportion to the strength of their population.

INDIA KENYA USA PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA ZIMBABWE **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

Shri C. R. Gharekhan's Speech in the Committee of Twentyfour on Fiji

Shri C. R. Gharekhan, Indian Representative at the U.N. Committee of Twentyfour (on Colonialism), made the following speech in the Committee in New York on May 11, 1966 on Fiji.

At the 409th meeting of this Committee on 26th April 1966, the representative of the United Kingdom stated :

"I am bound to say, however, that having had a long discussion on Fiji not so very long ago in the Fourth Committee, I doubt whether I shall be able to add materially to the description of the situation I gave then." (409th meeting, p. 51)

The statement made by the representative of the administering Power at the subsequent meet-

132

ing last Friday not only did not add materially to the description of the situation in Fiji, but in a few well chosen sentences it attempted to avoid altogether the, responsibility of the administering Power to this Special Committee on the implementation of various resolutions of the General Assembly.

The distinguished Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, addressing the United Nations Association of the United Kingdom in London on 28th April 1966, paid the following well-deserved tribute to the efforts of the successive Governments of the United Kingdom in the field of decolonization :

"This is an achievement which, although not yet complete and somewhat dimmed by exceptions among which Southern Rhodesia now disturbingly stands out, warrants being regarded with pride."

My delegation is in general agreement with this assessment of the situation by the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General mentioned only Southern Rhodesia by way of an example of the exceptions which dim the United Kingdom achievements. This was only natural since Southern Rhodesia is a most explosive colonial issue facing the United Nations today.

Yet, the events in Fiji and the lack of any constitutional progress in that territory persuade us to point out that the case of Fiji also is one of those exceptions which tarnish the image of the United Kingdom in the inevitable process of decolonization. My delegation was among the first to give credit to the United Kingdom for many of its efforts in implementing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. But this cannot make us indifferent to the inability of the United Kingdom to co-operate with the United Nations in the decolonizing mission. By the same standards, and judging the performance of the United Kingdom with equal fairness and objectivity, the delegation of India cannot but criticize the administering Power for its apparent unwillingness to implement the various General Assembly resolutions concerning Fiji, namely resolutions 1514 (XV), 1951 (XVIII) and 2068 (XX).

It is this failure on the part of the administering Power to implement these resolutions which has prevented it from making a full and complete statement on the situation in Fiji. The obligations of the administering Power are clear. General Assembly resolution 2068 (XX), in paragraph 5 :

"Further requests the administering Power to report to the Special Committee and to the General Assembly on the implementation of the present resolution."

And since the administering Power has not implemented any of the provisions of this resolution and of the earlier resolutions, naturally the representative of the administering Power has nothing much to report it is in the light of the report made by the administering Power that this Committee has to consider the question of Fiji and make necessary recommendations to the General Assembly. The essential and crucial fact is the failure of the, administering Power to implement the recommendations of the General Assembly and this Committee.

In 1963, by resolution 1951 (XVIII), the General Assembly instructed the administering Power to carry out the following two measures : (a) to work out together with the people of Fiji a new constitution providing for a free election conducted on the principle of one man one vote and (b) the creation of representative institutions. Now, after three years, we find that instead of providing for free elections conducted on the principle of one man one vote, the ad-ministering Power has introduced an electoral system which divides the people of Fiji on command and racial lines and which provides certain entrenched interests, particularly the Europeans, with more voting powers than the rest of the population. This reminds us of the infamous electoral system introduced in Southern Rhodesia. We all know the disastrous consequences of that system and how it enabled the white racist minority to seize power illegally and thus trample down the fundamental rights and freedoms of the African majority population.

Until now in Fiji the Europeans were governing in the most absolutist manner. Now, after the so-called electoral reforms, which purport to introduce limited internal self-government, the Europeans will control the Legislative Council and the administration through various constitutional devices and by playing upon the artificial differences between various communities. I shall come to this later, but now may I point out that in Fiji about 15,000 Europeans were allowed to have twelve representatives apart from various nominated officials who are for all practical purposes Europeans.

We, of course, should be very grateful to the representative of the European administration who has told us that the Fijian community will have proportionately rather more than before at the expense of the Europeans. What is the practical consequence of this magnanimous gesture on the part of the Europeans ? Instead of 12 seats, the Europeans and their racial allies will have 10 seats in the elected membership of 36. This will mean that 4 per cent of the total population will have as many as 30 per cent of the elected seats in the legislative council, whereas more than 50 per cent of the population will have just 12 seats.

133

Are we to understand that this kind of repre-

sentation is fair and democratic? is this not an all too familiar stratagem to perpetuate the rule of the Europeans through devious methods? The, device of the complicated cross-voting system which has been mentioned by the representative of the administering Power, with particular emphasis, reminds us of a similar feature in the unjust 1961 Constitution of Southern Rhodesia which has been much discredited there.

The representative of the administering Power dwelt at some length on the question of taking sides or of turning down one community in favour of another. He had in mind, of course, only the Fijian and Indian communities. The European community is the master community and, as such, stands aloof in what he calls "these conflicting, attitudes". Here, I should like to compliment the representative of Tanzania who has reminded the administering Power and the whole Committee that all the people living in Fiji, irrespective of their racial origins, are Fijians. Thus, it is not proper to refer to the people of Indian origin living in Fiji as the Indian community. These people who had been taken to Fiji by the administering Power to work there as indentured labour on the European-owned plantations are Indian only in the sense that their ancestors came from the Indian sub-continent which today comprises India and Pakistan. In point of fact, however, they are as much Fijians as the group of people who are officially classified as Fijians. It is typical of colonial policy that a European going to Rhodesia and settling down there becomes Rhodesian, while a person of Indian origin going to Fiji remains an Indian. The labelling of the people of Indian origin as an Indian community is designed merely to create feelings of hatred between the two communities, which happily do not exist at the roots.

The General Assembly had also instructed the administering Power to take steps to create representative institutions. Can any impartial and fair-minded person consider the restricted internal self-government granted to a clearly unrepresented and impotent Legislative Council as representative institutions within the meaning of resolution 1514 (XV) ? We are used to the British Government granting constitutions to their colonial possessions which, while investing them with superficial powers of administration in theory, accord very little real power to the representatives of the people. In Fiji we find that the people of Fiji have neither the shadow nor the substance of real democratic control. And, to add insult to injury, the Fijian people and the United Nations are told that there is no possibility for these developments to materialize in the foreseeable future.

It is hardly necessary to point out that this Committee is charged with the task of immediate implementation of resolution. 1514 (XV). Yet, the representative of the administering Power has the courage to come and tell this Committee and the United Nations that his Government does not intend to pay any respect to the desire of the United Nations and freedom-loving people everywhere to accelerate the process of granting freedom and independence to the people of Fiji.

The second request made by the General Assembly to the administering Power, in resolution 1951 (XVIII), was:

"To take immediate steps for the transfer of all power to the people of the Territory in accordance with their freely expressed wilt and desire and without any conditions or reservations;"

As I have already pointed out, the administering Power has failed to transfer any real power to the people of the territory and it has already told us that it is not going to do this in the foreseeable future.

The General Assembly, in the same resolution, has asked the administering Power :

"To endeavour, with the co-operation of the people of Fiji, to achieve the political, economic and social integration of the various communities."

The scanty information supplied by the administering Power goes to prove that very little has been done in this all important field. In fact, we find that quite a lot has been done to achieve ends directly opposed to the national unity of the people of Fiji. This policy of the administering Power in Fiji to divide the people of Fiji on communal and racial lines is nothing new. The history of British colonial administration can be summed up in the maxim "divide and rule". Wherever they have reluctantly given up control, they have left behind division and bitterness. They planted discord and nourished disharmony in a calculated manner to create future difficulties for the newly independent States.

As the Secretary-General of the United Nations stated in the course of the same speech referred to earlier :

"... all of the current peace-keeping operations pertain to problems which arose from the process of British decolonization."

It is not just an accident that the British left behind such problems. These are the direct results of the British policy to divide nations, to destroy their territorial integrity and to break up their national unity by creating where they do not exist, and by encouraging where there is scope, communal and political differences.

It is these time-worn prescriptions which the administering Power is administering to the peo-

134

ple of Fiji, And the results of this we see in the delay of the attainment of freedom by the people of Fiji. It is indeed tragic when the representative of administering Power is emboldened to come before this Committee and state that the apparatus of division created in Fiji is designed "to encourage co-operation and trust between the communities and amongst all the people of Fiji, whatever their ethnic origin". (410th meeting, p. 18-20) And he strains our credulity to the maximum extent by stating that :

"Experience elsewhere has shown that this type of system can be very effective in bridging divisions between communities and by promoting the growth of a single national unity." (lbid, p. 17)

There can be no worse example of wishful thinking even if we concede for the sake of argument that the colonial policy of Great Britain in Fiji is sincerely meant to achieve national unity and foster communal harmony.

The history of British colonial policies is littered with experiences of broken nations and artificially divided peoples. I have already quoted our Secretary-General in this regard. And this Committee's experience in regard to the actualities of British policy is no different.

In regard to Fiji also, the administering Power has sought to build up the myth of the existence of communal differences and racial disharmony. The reality is that such differences as exist have been artificially created and sustained by the malevolent action of the administering Power. While professing not to practise racial discrimination, the administering Power tried to create educational institutions and governmental organs based on communal and racial doctrines. A reluctant population has been dragged into spheres of power politics conceived on communal lines. The Working Paper of the Secretariat and the statements made by some members in this Committee and the General Assembly testify to this fact. After creating tensions which never existed before, the colonial Power exploited them to cling to its dominions and possessions. Impartial accounts of scholars speak of the same situation. This was eloquently described by the representative of Chile while considering the question of Fiji in this Committee in 1963 and by the representative of Ceylon in the Fourth Committee during the twentieth session of the General Assembly.

It seems to my delegation that the best way of ascertaining the facts of the situation would be for this Committee or any of its Sub-Committees to visit the territory and hold conversations with the rulers and the ruled at all levels. If the colonial Power is really sincere about allowing this Committee to learn the facts first hand it should have no objection to facilitating the visit of a Sub-Committee of this Committee. In this connexion, I should like to point put that Sub-Committee II which deals with various small territories in the Pacific region is contemplating a visiting mission, depending, of course, on the co-operation of the various administering Powers. I am not making a formal proposal at this stage, but the Committee may in its wisdom decide to entrust Sub-Committee II or any part of it to undertake the responsibility of going to Fiji and reporting to the Committee on the state of affairs in that island. If the administering Power refuses to arrange for the visit of such a mission it will only prove that it does not want this Committee to learn at first hand the realities of the situation in Fiji. My delegation, for one, would be willing to

abide by the findings of such a visiting mission from this Committee. We earnestly hope that the Government of the United Kingdom with its professed passion for fact-finding will not object to this impartial proposal.

By paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 2068 (XX), this Committee has been asked to keep the question of Fiji under consideration and report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session. If we are to make a report based on the information available in the Working Paper prepared by the Secretariat and the statement made by the, representative of the administering Power, we can only make the laconic finding that the administering Power has failed to implement any of the provisions or recommendations of this Committee and of the General Assembly in regard to Fiji. Perhaps it may be better not to take any firm decision at this stage about the report we should make to the General Assembly. We may wait for the visiting mission to go to Fiji and report and we may also accede to the request of the representative of the United Kingdom to have a longer notice of the Committee's Intention to report to the General Assembly about the implementation of resolution 2068 (XX) so that it would be possible for the administering Power to arrange for people with special knowledge of the territory to come here and participate in our discussions. The Committee need not be accused of making a hasty decision. We should have no difficulty in concluding this debate for the present after hearing all the speakers and we could then resume consideration of this question after our return from Africa and after we have had an opportunity to know whether the visiting mission to Fiji could report. We can then take a final decision on the recommendations we should make to the General Assembly to find out the speediest method of implementing fully resolution 1514 (XV) in regard to Fiji.

Before concluding, I should like to stress that there is no measure of agreement between this

135

Committee and the administering Power in our basic assessment of the situation. We can play a positive role, for which this Committee has been established, and the Committee can serve the true interests of the people of the territory not by condoning the failure of the administering Power to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, not by absolving the administering Power of its design to create discord and tension in the territory, not by keeping quiet about the avowed intention of the administering Power not to hold elections on a straightforward one man one vote principle in the foreseeable future, not by shutting our eyes to the absence of representative institutions, not by accepting what the administering Power and a self-seeking European minority consider as the common denominator. of agreement, but by taking clear notice of the deliberate and wellthought out policy of the administering Power to ignore and flout the resolutions of this Committee and the General Assembly and by recommending to General Assembly measures for the speedy and complete implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). We cannot endorse or encourage the direction of events set in motion by the administering Power. That would be to endorse a reactionary colonial policy and to encourage the denial of freedom to the brave people of Fiji.

My delegation reserves its right to intervene again in this debate to explain and clarify our position if required to do so.

INDIA FIJI USA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TANZANIA PAKISTAN MALDIVES CHILE

Date : May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDO-YUGOSLAV-UAR SUMMIT

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on the Proposed Tripartite Summit

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on May 17, 1966 regarding the proposed tripartite summit meeting between India, Yugoslavia and U.A.R.:

The policy of non-alignment which has been adopted by the vast majority of newly independent States, particularly of Asia and Africa, has been recognised as making valuable contribution to peace and international harmony. India, U.A,R. and Yugoslavia have been among the countries who have played an active role in promoting the policy of peace and non-alignment.

As the Hon'ble Members are aware, President Tito, President Nasser and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru have met before twice, in Brioni and in Cairo.

Since the Cairo Conference of non-aligned nations, the idea of a meeting of non-aligned countries has been mooted from time to time. The difficulties in organising another large conference of the Cairo type are considerable and have been recognised. When the Yugoslav Prime Minister visited India, the idea of holding a summit meeting of selected countries was discussed. The Prime Minister recognised the importance of such consultations for the purpose of exchanging views on current international problems.

There have been consultations between the Governments of Yugoslavia, U.A.R. and India and it is felt that a meeting of the Heads of Governments of these countries would be useful Diplomatic consultations are still going on with regard to the mutually convenient time and place of such a meeting.

The Hon'ble Members are aware of the close ties of friendship and understanding existing between us and U.A.R. and Yugoslavia. A meeting of Heads of Governments of the three countries will not only strengthen the ties binding them on the basis of a shared common outlook but we hope it would also at this difficult and crucial time in world affairs help to strengthen the forces of pence, freedom and non-alignment.

136

INDIA YUGOSLAVIA EGYPT USA **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Extracts from Prime Minister's Press Conference

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, held a Press Conference in New Delhi on May 19, 1966, at which she dealt with a number of national and international subjects.

The following is text of the replies the Prime Minister gave to the questions relating to foreign affairs :

PAKISTAN

Question : In view of the fresh wave of Pakistan-inspired outrages in Kashmir, how long do we propose to cling to the travesty of the Tashkent Pact in a unilateral manner?

Prime Minister : I have nothing new to say. We believe that it is in the interest of both India and Pakistan to be at peace with each other. And, therefore, we would not like to do anything which will provoke conflict or tension. It is true that in Pakistan, certain statements have been made. I was bringing something to read out but I have left it behind. You may have seen recently statements made by various people in Pakistan, specially President Ayub Khan, where he has once again spoken of peace and friendship with India and so on. I think it was in a broadcast perhaps but I am not absolutely sure.

Question: Madam, a month ago, you said that you were thinking in terms of some positive steps being taken. Has there been any progress ?

Prime Minister : We, are in constant touch with our High Commissioner there. He is in constant touch with Government. Question : Is Government still considering appeals to release Sheikh Abdullah ?Is Government considering any possible meeting with President Ayub ?

Prime Minister : We are prepared to talk at any level with the Pakistani leaders on further implementation of Tashkent Declaration. But what is important is that in such discussions, progress should be made towards the implementation of the Declaration and its objectives.

With regard to Sheikh Saheb, the position is more or less the same. We have to consider whether it leads to these objectives and to peace and so on.

Question : Is another meeting between the Ministers of the two Governments going to be held ?

Prime Minister : It was talked about at the last meeting but nothing definite has been decided.

Question : Is it true that infiltration has again started in Jammu and Kashmir and war preparations are going on all along the border?

Prime Minister : We have heard something of war preparations through the newspapers but I do not think there is any infiltration.

CHINA

Question : Will you attempt to hold talks with China directly or through some one as in the case of Pakistan?

Prime Minister : At the previous Press conference I made myself very clear that we are prepared to talk with anybody but you have to find some sort of basis on which you feel the talks will lead to something. We are not the ones who want to shut the door.

NUCLEAR POLICY

Question : Can you clarify Government's nuclear policy once and for all ?

Prime Minister : How many times will it be clarified once for all. It has been clarified. Our

policy is to increase our know-how in the use of nuclear energy but to use it for peaceful purposes.

Question : There has been a report that there is a slight shift in Government's policy.

Prime Minister : I do not think so.

Question : Have you the know-how to manufacture atom bombs.

Prime Minister : I am not an expert on nuclear energy much as I would like to be.

Question : Your Government has said that it would like to have a joint nuclear guarantee from both the East and the West. Have you made some direct approaches to Moscow and Washington, and if so, what has been the response ?

Prime Minister: There was an approach made considerable time ago in Mr. Shastri's time in fact. But nothing much came of it.

Question : To both capitals ?

Prime Minister : I think that he talked with various people.

137

Question: There has been a report in American press that India will try some kind of underground test in Rajasthan Canal area to convince the Afro-Asian powers that we have the know-how and if we want to manufacture a bomb at any future date, we can do it. Is there an truth in that ?

Prime Minister: It will be a high price to pay for just a little bit of prestige.

Question : Shastriji did make a statement that we might make canals, for example.

Prime Minister : I am not aware of any such statement.

INDO-U.S. FOUNDATION

Question : You have not made any overall statement about the Indo-U.S. Foundation, though

there have been quite a few questions answered in Parliament and also there was some objection from people like university professors. When do you propose to make a detailed statement on this Foundation ?

Prime Minister : I honestly do not see any need to make any statement. First of all, your own statement is quite incorrect. Indo-American Foundation came into being in March, 1965 which is not two months ago but over a year ago-

Question : Did it come into being then ?

Prime Minister : Web, it was agreed to. Question : It was never made known to the Indian people at least.

Prime Minister : I do not know. I know it was agreed to. Although even in that preliminary agreement, there were the details of the Foundation but I felt that some of those matters should be changed. As you know, when I was in America, even in my public speeches, I talked about it everywhere and I gave the reasons why we might want to have this change.. Them are certain stipulations which do not suit us, which we would like to be different. I cannot talk about them unless something is settled. We were asked a little while ago to give our suggestions. In the meantime, because various university people and other people had expressed views, I thought it would be Setter for me to meet them and then send the views which would be more representative. Actually, I am meeting them either today or tomorrow.

Question : May I ask a subsidiary to it? Prime Minister: Yes.

Question : The Government of India and the State Governments spend about six hundred crores of rupees on education at various levels. Five crores are due from these PL 480 Funds per year. Is it necessary to have a special arrangement to spend five crores when we are spending six hundred crores through our own channels?

Prime Minister: As I had said at the previous up and it was at the disposal of the American Government' Now the suggestion was made. I do not know who made it. Anyway, it was made that we might use this money for certain special research project and it might be useful that Way. Even then it was perfectly clear that in no way would this interfere with our educational policy or any of our priorities or anything like that.

Question : In the matter of fertilisers and the Indo-American Foundation, you have been saying at public meetings and at other places that on both these scores, the previous Government had committed itself and, therefore, you are continuing it. Does it mean that you are doing so because the previous Prime Minister had done it and you are respecting his wishes? Or because you are also convinced of them? We want to know the difference.

Prime Minister : This question was also asked at the last Conference and I replied to it. Firstly, when a Government commits itself and it is the same Party Government, one cannot back out of this.

With regard to fertiliser, I do think that it is good for us to get as much fertilizer as we can and to increase agricultural production. At the same time, if one feels that anything is doing serious harm to the country, we have to try and change it to that extent.

Question : Speaking of fertilisers, a certain aid was offered by Israel and that has been rejected on political consideration. Could you please let us know what are those political considerations which prevent you from accepting it ?

Prime Minister: The Government does not think it would be wise for them to accept it. As far as I know, they get it from outside. I am not sure about it. We thought that we might as well get it from the place where they get it.

FOREIGN AND

Question : A report has appeared in the Press that the Soviet Union agrees with the Congress Party of India that right elements in the country are gaining ground and the Western countries through aid are gaining their friends in the country. This, the report 'says, is because of the weakness of, the Government. What is your idea ? Prime Minister: I have no such information of the Soviet Government's views. As far as we are concerned, the Soviet Government is helping us a great deal in the public sector and even for non-project aid now. And so other countries besides the Western countries.

138

INDO-YUGOSLAV-UAR SUMMIT

Question There are reports about the possible summit meeting between India, UAR and Yugoslavia. Would you tell us something whether anything has been decided ?

Prime Minister : No. nothing has yet been decided.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Question : About nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, is there a possibility of a blast for peaceful purposes ?

Prime Minister : I have answered this question before.

Question : Dr. Bhabha had estimated that we Could have a bomb in 18 months and that it would cost about 18 lakhs of rupees. What is the latest estimate ? Can we still do it in 18 months or a period shorter? Is it going to cost as much as 18 lakhs; or a little, more ?

Prime Minister: I think that 18 lakhs is ridiculously low figure. Its real figure would be something very, very much more.

KASHMIR

Question : President Nasser has said that they are trying to settle the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. Have you been sounded something?

Answer: President Nasser has said that they Question: In the light of the discussions you had in Washington and Mr. Asoka Mehta had, do you think we can have a Plan of Rs. 21,500 crores ?

Answer: That is still our desire and attempt.

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha-on Thermo-Nuclear Explosion by China

The following is the text of a statement made by the Minister of External Affairs Sardar Swaran Singh, in the Lok Sabha on May 10, 1966 on the thermo-nuclear explosion by China:

On May 9 China conducted its third nuclear test somewhere in Western China. As the House knows, the earlier two Chinese nuclear explosions took place on October 16, 1964, and May 14, 1965. This third nuclear test by China is in arrogant defiance of the clearly and passionately expressed desire of people all over the world to discontinue nuclear tests and to arrest the process of nuclear proliferation. Government do not, as yet, have any details or precise information about the explosion. According to reports attributed to New China News Agency, this nuclear explosion "contained thermo-nuclear material". However, the exact nature and intensity of the explosion fall-out, etc. are under investigation and it will take about a couple of weeks before our scientists can throw light on such details.

As the House is aware, this is the third nuclear explosion conducted by the Chinese Government. The first one was conducted on 16th October, 1964 and the second on 14th May, 1965.

Government cannot too strongly condemn and deplore the action taken by the Chinese Government, in persisting with these tests which constitute a threat to world peace, a grave hazard to the health and safety of people living in areas of the world likely to be affected by the radioactive, fall-out resulting from this explosion, and generally 'contrary to the interests of Humanity at large.

Turning to our own policy, we had made a careful assessment of the situation in consultation with our Service Chiefs and Atomic Energy experts even when the first nuclear device was exploded by China. The fact that there would be other such explosions was known at that time. Therefore, the mere fact that China has carried out its third nuclear explosion does not vitiate the earlier conclusion, though at the same time, the policy is kept under constant review. In any such review, account has to be taken not only of Chinese tests but also other relevant factors specially the progress made in the discussions relating to nuclear disarmament in which many countries are participating. The Partial Test Ban Treaty to which India is a signatory was an important land-mark in the progress towards nuclear disarmament. Since then, admittedly.

139

progress has been slow. Government still feel that the interests of world peace and our own security are better achieved by giving all support to the efforts for world nuclear disarmament than by building our own nuclear weapons.

In the meantime, in the matter of peaceful development of atomic energy, we are pushing ahead and giving it top priority and as the House is aware, the world recognises that we are one of the countries which is capable of becoming an Atomic Power in a reasonably short time.

Finally I would assure the House that the defence of our territorial integrity will be the paramount consideration guiding our policy in this field.

CHINA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

SWITZERLAND

Swiss Assistance for Agricultural Development Project

The Government of Switzerland has provided further technical assistance for the second stage of the experimental phase of the agricultural development project in Kerala. Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on May 5, 1966 by Mr. R. Faessler, Swiss Ambassador in India, and Shri S. G. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, providing for assistance of the value of 2.13 million Swiss Francs (about Rs. 23.5 lakhs) for this purpose. Ambassador Lindt, Chief of Technical Cooperation, Government of Switzerland, who is now in New Delhi to inspect the working of the various Swiss schemes in India, was also present.

The agricultural development project in Kerala was started with the technical cooperation of the Swiss Government in July, 1963. For the first stage, Switzerland had provided assistance of the value of 1,640,000 Swiss Francs (about Rs. 18 lakhs) for covering a pilot project on government land of about 500 acres at Munnar.

As a result of the successful completion of the first stage the development work will now cover the production of fodder, improvement of pastures, breeding and improvement of cattle, horticulture and afforestation. The Swiss contribution will be for the import of project equipment and will cover the expenditure on Swiss and other foreign experts and special research. The Government of Kerala will provide Rs. 16.65 lakhs for the implementation of the second stage of the project.

SWITZERLAND INDIA USA **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Cultural Exchange Programme

The Programme of Cultural Exchanges between India and the U.S.S.R. for the year 1966-67 was signed in New Delhi on May 12, 1966 at a brief ceremony held in the Ministry of Education. Letters embodying this Programme were exchanged between H.E. Mr. S. K. Romanovsky, Chairman, State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. for Cultural

140

Relations with foreign countries on behalf of the Government of U.S.S.R. and Shri M. C. Chagla, Union Minister of Education, on behalf of the Government of India.

The sixth Indo-Soviet Joint Committee held a series of meetings in New Delhi between May 3 and May 11, 1966.

The new programme is larger in size and covers a wide range of activities in the fields of art, culture, education, science, technology, health, radio and cinema, sports and social welfare. Over 230 persons from each country are expected to visit the other for studies, research, training, study-cum-observation tours, playing friendly matches, performances, teaching, lecture tours and for participation in each other's national and international conferences and festivals.

Some of the more important activities included in the Programme are :

- 1. Visit of 55 Indian students including up to 25 teachers for post-graduate studies and specialised training in U.S.S.R. and 15 Russian students to India for training.
- Visit of about 48 Russian teachers and professors to teach Russian and technical subjects in Indian Universities and other institutions of higher learning in India.
- 3. Visits of Indian football team, field and track team, tennis and chess team to

U.S.S.R. and Russian Volleyball, table tennis and weight-lifting teams to India.

- 4. Visits of about 37 Indian scientists to U.S.S.R. for research, training, lecture in U.S.S.R. and about 23 Russian scientists for lecture and study-cum-observation tour in India.
- 5. Visit of a 65-Member Bakhor Dance Ensemble to India and visit of a 30-Member Indian Dance and Music Troupe or a group of circus artistes to U.S.S.R.
- 6. Indian scientists will visit U.S.S.R. for training in physical oceanography, chemical oceanography, etc.

In implementation of the Cultural Agreement between India and U.S.S.R. signed on February 12, 1960, an annual programme of cultural, educational and scientific exchanges is drawn up, annually by a Joint Committee of the representtatives of the two Governments which meets alternatively in Moscow and Delhi. The fifth meeting of the Indo-Soviet Joint Committee was held in Moscow in April, 1965.

The Committee, during its deliberations, also reviewed the progress of the 1965-66 programme of cultural exchanges between India and U.S.S.R. and agreed that it was successfully implemented.

H.E. Mr. Romanovsky presented a set of books to the I.C.C.R. and Shri M. C. Chagla presented him with a set of the Lalit Kala Akademi publications.

INDIA USA RUSSIA OMAN **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Soviet Technical Assistance for Bokaro Steel Plant

Two contracts for rendering technical assistance in the construction of the Bokaro steel plant and preparation of working designs were signed in New Delhi on May 3, 1966 by Shri K. M. George, Managing Director, on behalf of Bokaro Steel Limited, and by Mr. Y. N. Kalashnikov, Vice-President, on behalf of Messrs. Tjazhpromexport, the Soviet Organisation.

The contracts are in pursuance of the intergovernmental agreement dated January 25, 1965 and the memorandum of acceptance, accepting the Soviet detailed project report for the Bokaro Steel plant. Agreement was reached between Bokaro Steel Limited and Messrs. Tjazhpromexport on April 30, 1966 for the supply of equipment and materials from the U.S.S.R. for Stage I of the plant.

Stage I will have a production capacity of 1.7 million tonnes of ingot steel and 880,000 tonnes of foundry iron for sale. The main products will be hot rolled light plates, hot rolled coiled strips, hat rolled sheets, cold rolled coiled strips and cold rolled sheets.

Out of a total of 292,000 tonnes of equipment required, approximately 36.3 per cent will be imported from the U.S.S.R. and the balance 63.7 per cent will be obtained indigenously. Out of the total 219,000 tonnes of structural steelworks, only 11 per cent will be imported from the U.S.S.R. and the balance 89 per cent will be obtained from indigenous sources. Out of the total of 187,000 tonnes of refractories, only 4 per cent will be imported from the U.S.S.R. and the balance 96 per cent will be obtained from indigenous sources.

141

INDIA ITALY USA **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreements

Agreements for three loans totalling œ 17 million (Rs. 22.67 crores) to the Government of India from the British Government were signed in New Delhi on May 10, 1966 by Shri C. S. Krishna Moorthi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Mr. David Scott, Acting British High Commissioner.

As announced on April 23, 1966, these. loans constitute an advance instalment of Britain's normal aid pledge for 1966-67 and have been offered as an emergency measure to give immediate assistance in resolving India's present economic problems.

Of the total of œ 17 million, a sum of œ 10 million (Rs. 13.33 crores) will be in the form of General Purpose Aid which the Government of India will be able to use for the purchase from the U.K. of a wide range of goods essential to India's economic development. This form of aid is of particular value to India in providing her with foreign exchange in a quickly usable and flexible form; œ4 million (Rs. 5.33 crores) will be in the form of a new Kipping loan which will be used to assist engineering industries in India which look to Britain as their traditional source of supply to purchase badly needed spares and components, and the remaining œ 3 million (Rs. 4 crores) will be used for the purchase from Britain of spares and components for the Bhopal Heavy Electrical Factory.

These new loans are free of interest and for twenty-five years as in the case of other recent loans from Britain. Repayment will not begin until after the seventh year.

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Food Agreement

Under an agreement signed with the Government of India in New Delhi on May 27, 1966 the United States will supply India under the U.S. Food for Peace Programme 3.5 million tonnes of foodgrains, 700,000 U.S. bales (856,000 Indian bales) of cotton and other commodities valued altogether at \$313.48 million (Rs. 150 crores).

The agreement implements the offer made by President Johnson on March 30 when, subject to the approval of the U.S. Congress, he announced a further 3.5 million tonnes of foodgrains for India and expressed the hope that other nations would also help India meet food shortages.

Ambassador Chester Bowles signed the agreement for the United States and Shri A. T. Bambawale, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, signed for India.

Under the agreement, which is a further supplement to the PL 480 agreement of September 30, 1964, India will obtain 2.75 million tonnes of wheat, 750,000 tonnes of grain sorghun (milo) or maize, 200,000 tonnes of maize (for the Indian starch industry), 35,000 tonnes of soybean or cottonseed oil, 700,000 U.S. bales of cotton and two million pounds of tobacco. Under the agreement maize may, to the extent practical, be substituted for moli within the specified limit of 750,000 tonnes.

Today's agreement brings to eight million tonnes the total of foodgrains supplied to India under PL 480 since December 9, 1965 when an accelerated schedule of shipments to India was announced. U.S. foodgrain commitments since last July now total 10 million tonnes. The 700,000 U.S. bales (856,000 Indian bales) of cotton provided reflect India's estimate of the quantity needed for its textile indus-

142

try. It will provide India's mills with longer staple types needed to supplement its own cotton production for the spinning of finer yarns.

U.S. foodgrain arrivals at Indian ports since March are at the rate of about one million tonnes monthly. Although slightly more than three months intervened between this and the last supplementary agreement (under which 3 million tonnes of grain was committed), there will be no interruption in the flow of food to India. Under terms of a letter furnished by the U.S. Department of Agriculture the India Supply Mission in Washington had continued to buy as much grain as could be handled by shipping and port facilities. Shipments will continue to arrive in India at the rate desired by the Government of India.

The terms of today's supplementary agreement are substantially the same as those of the last agreement of February 5, 1966. India will pay for the supplies in rupees. The United States will make 75 per cent of these rupees available to India as long-term loans for mutually agreed projects contributing to India's economic development. A further 5 per cent of rupees are for loans to Indian affiliates of American firms which are starting or augmenting industrial enterprises in India. The remaining 20 per cent of the rupees have been earmarked for U.S. uses.

USA INDIA **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Mineral Exploration Agreement

An agreement for a United States loan of \$3.5 million (Rs. 1.7 crores) to the Government of India to meet the foreign exchange costs of an intensive search for non-ferrous metal deposits was signed in New Delhi on May 25, 1966.

Shri S. Bhoothalingam, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and the United States Ambassador, Mr. Chester Bowles. signed the agreement. The agreement marks the launching of "Operation Hardrock", the combined air and ground survey of areas thought to have mineral-bearing potential.

The paucity of indigenous production of copper, zinc, lead, tin and nickel is a handicap to India's industrial development. No major deposits of these non-ferrous metals have yet been found in India. But the Geological Survey of India and the Indian Bureau of Mines have, in the course of extensive exploratory work, established a striking similarity between certain geological formations in India and in North America which have been proved to be rich in non-ferrous metal deposits. This similarity encourages the hopes that adequate deposits can be found in India.

To do the necessary survey work for this expeditiously, the Government of India have decided to utilise airborne geophysical methods. These methods, developed abroad in recent years, have greatly speeded up mineral exploration. What took ground parties years of toil is now rapidly accomplished in the course of months, if not weeks, by aeroplanes equipped with electromagnetic, magnetic and radiometric instruments.

The U.S. Agency for International Development has agreed to provide financial and technical assistance for this. The loan, covered by the agreement signed today, will finance payments to an American firm to carry out the aerial and ground survey and drilling work. It will also provide equipment for a metallurgical laboratory to be established in India to analyse samples.

An American firm will send to India two aircraft which will fly carefully plotted courses totalling 143,000 kilometres. The planes-similar to those used in America by the U.S. Geological Survey-will fly on closely-spaced parallel flight lines. Geophysical instruments on board the aircraft will simultaneously record signals set up or influenced by the minerals along the flight paths. Magnetometers will measure the intensity of the earth's magnetic field, the electromagnetic gear will detect traces of metals, and the radiometric equipment will measure variations in radioactivity.

The Government of India have chosen three zones with a total area of 117,000 square kilometres for the survey. They are Rajasthan, the Bihar Mica belts and the Ranchi Plateau and the Eastern Cuddapab Basin in Andhra Pradesh.

The second phase of the survey will consist of ground reconnaissance by team of geologists and geophysicists. They will investigate and survey favourable areas indicated by the survey. Later drilling will be undertaken at the most promising sites.

Sixteen American specialists will be employed in "Operation Hardrock". Each will have an Indian counterpart nominated by the Government of India who will work closely with the team throughout the survey. This will facilitate the continuation of the exploration by Indian Personnel after the contract with the American firm expires in approximately three years.

143

To provide advice and assistance on policy and other important matters relating to the project, the Government of India have set up an Exploration Advisory Committee. It is composed of the representatives of the Ministry of Mines and Metals, the Geological Survey of India, the National Mineral Development Corporation and the Department of Atomic Energy.

The discovery of sizeable deposits of nonferrous metals will have a significant impact not only on India's further industrialisation, but also on the nation's balance of payments.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TOTO **Date :** May 01, 1966

Volume No

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Loan Agreement

India and the United States concluded on May 13, 1966 an agreement providing for a U.S. government loan of \$100 million (Rs. 47.6 crores) to finance a broad range of commodity imports essential to India's industrial and agricultural production.

The agreement, signed by Shri S. Bhoothalingam, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Dr. John P. Lewis, Minister-Director, U.S.A.I.D. Mission, raised the total of U.S. assistance to India to more than \$6.6 billion (Rs. 3,150 crores).

This "non-project" assistance has been extended to India through the U.S. Agency for International Development. Repayment In dollars will be spread over 40 years. For the first ten years interest will be at the rate of one per cent per annum. Thereafter the rate will be 2.5 per cent.

The loan will provide foreign exchange needed for such vital imports as nonferrous metals, iron and steel, carbon black, vehicle parts and components, machinery and machine parts, sulphur, lubricants, wood pulp, pulp for tyre cord yarn, fertilizers and chemicals.

Shortage of these commodities has been felt by many industries in India. The Government of India have already begun issuing licences to cover purchases made against this loan, and it is expected that the arrival of these essential commodities will make possible a fuller utilisation of India's industrial capacity and stimulate production in both the agricultural and industrial sectors.

U.S. Vice-President Hubert Humphrey announced the authorization of the loan signed today (May 13) during his visit to India in February, 1966. In the interim, lists of commodities

covered and other details of the agreement were worked out in discussions between officials of the Government of India and of the U.S.A.I.D. Mission.

144

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : May 01, 1966

June

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record1966Vol. XIIJUNENo. 6

CONTENTS

PAGE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement on Nuclear Weapon Tests 145

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Agreement on Maritime shipping 148 Fresh Agreement for Technical Assistance 149 Indo-German Agricultural Project for Nilgiris 149

FRANCE

Indo-French Cultural Agreement Signed 150

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's letter to U Thant about Pakistani Encroachment on Cease-fire Line 153 India's Reply to Pakistani Allegations of Cease-fire Violation 153

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Extracts from Prime Minister's Press Conference 154

NORTH VIETNAM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on U.S. Bombing of Hanoi-Haiphong 156

SWEDEN

Swedish Dovelopment Aid to India 156

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U. S. Loan for Beas Dam157U. S. Loan for Indian Power Projects157

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

GERMANY FRANCE INDIA PAKISTAN VIETNAM USA SWEDEN

Date : Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement on Nuclear Weapon Tests

Shri V. C. Trivedi, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, made the following statement at the 269th session of the Committee on June 30, 1906. on nuclear weapon tests :

Mr. Chairman,

As I am speaking for the first time during this session, I should like to extend to our Brazilian colleague, Ambassador da Silveria, the warm welcome of the Indian delegation and assure him of our continued collaboration.

The Committee is now entering into a significant phase in its deliberations. It will need to pursue its negotiations with renewed vigour during the next few weeks so that it registers some positive progress in the tasks entrusted to it. Such progress should enable the Committee to submit an appropriate report to the General Assembly of the United Nations providing firm and adequate grounds to that august organisation to reaffirm its faith and its hope. in the ideal of general and complete disarmament and to direct the Committee to continue its quest for just and equitable solutions to the problems of arms control and limitation as well as of general and complete disarmament.

WORLD WITHOUT ARMS

Some of us who have spoken recently have emphasised, and emphasised quite rightly, that tangible solutions to specific problems have so far eluded us. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the issues which we debate and negotiate in this Committee are highly complex issues affecting the vital security interests of the entire international community and that the objective which we seek, namely, a world without arms, is unprecedented in the history of mankind. These negotiations, therefore, require to be conducted with care, precision and patience. Although, as I said earlier, we have not yet produced tangible solutions to specific problems, we have, in fact, made some Progress on the level of negotiations. Thus, for example, on the question of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, if we compare many of the statements being made in the Committee these days with those being made a few months ago, we shall find unmistakably that we have defined the issues dividing the different approaches fairly distinctly and that we know which are the few specific points which need to be settled in order to reach an agreement acceptable to all concerned.

This does not mean, of course, that we can now congratulate. ourselves. The fact that we have done a little does not mean that we should not or even could not have accomplished more. It only means that we should now work with greater determination and renewed vigour so that we are able to achieve concrete results during the coming weeks.

GENERAL & COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

The General Assembly of the United Nations laid down three specific priorities for us. It asked us to make substantial progress in reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The Indian delegation laid particular stress on this matter at its statement on the 3rd of May towards the end of the last session and it hopes that the Committee will continue to discuss the points on which disagreements had developed in the past. It is necessary that the report of the Committee devotes adequate space to this theme so that the members of the United Nations are in a position to gauge the extent to which we have defined the issues on this highly complex and vital problem.

INTERNATIONAL TREATY

The second item which the General Assembly stressed as a priority item was the question of negotiating an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Committee has so far devoted most of its statements to this item and, as I said earlier, although we have not reached an agreement, the issues in dispute have now been clearly defined. On its part, the Indian delegation spoke once again on the subject on the last day of the last session.

145

NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS

The third problem to which the General Assembly asked the Committee, to direct its attention was that of the nuclear weapon tests. In fact, it asked the Committee, inter alia, to continue its work with a sense of urgency on arrangements to ban effectively all nuclear weapon tests in all environments and to report to the General Assembly.

The Committee has so far allotted only a few meetings to a discussion of this subject, but it appears to the Indian delegation that from now on we need to devote much more time to it not only because the General Assembly has asked us to deal with it with a sense of urgency but also because this is one field in which there is greater hope of success between now and September. We have probed various other avenues and have encountered some serious hurdles. In view of this, it is desirable that we take a closer look at the problem of the nuclear weapon test ban, which seems to offer greater hope of tangible progress in the foreseeable future.

India has always believed that the cessation of nuclear weapon tests is the first step on the path of nuclear sanity. It was the first country to appeal to the international community that an end be put to all nuclear weapon tests. That was over 12 years ago and although the Indian appeals were unsuccessful in the early years, the United Nations finally adopted the historic resolution 1762 (XVII) which condemned all nuclear weapon tests. The last session of the General Assembly recalled this resolution in its resolution 2032 (XX) and noted with regret that nuclear weapon tests had taken place notwithstanding that condemnatory resolution and subsequent resolutions.

On the question of nuclear weapon tests, therefore, the concern of the world community has been constant and consistent and humanity demands that all nuclear weapon tests in all environments be stopped immediately. There have been nearly 450 atmospheric tests already and these have not yet ceased. Underground tests are also continuing. It is therefore, necessary, as resolution 2032 (XX) has enjoined us to do, that we in the Committee continue our work "on arrangements to ban effectively all nuclear weapon tests in all environments".

In the history of the struggle against nuclear weapon tests, there have been three hopeful and constructive features. Firstly, there has been the universal demand of all humanity for the cessation of the tests. This demand is as insistent as ever. Secondly, scientific opinion has demonstrated convincingly the hazards of the contamination of the environment and the radiation exposure of human beings from nuclear explosions and fresh explosions produce fresh demonstration. And thirdly, there was the Partial Test Ban Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water in August, 1963. India welcomed this treaty and was in fact the first country to sign it in Moscow after it was signed by the three Original Parties.

Unfortunately, however, this partial treaty has been unable to fulfil its promise. It has remained doubly partial, firstly because it has been adhered to only partially and not by all countries, with one non-signatory indulging in repeated atmospheric explosions of increasing kilotonnage and the other non-signatory announcing its intention to undertake its first post-treaty explosion and Secondly because the treaty still remains partial in its prohibited environments and does not cover underground nuclear weapon tests. The present unstable situation threatens our past achievements and poses great danger for the future. The partial satisfaction which the internatonal community experienced in 1963 is thus fast fading and it is incumbent upon us to ensure that the instrument of hope that we then fashioned is given additional strength and effectiveness.

When we talk of nuclear weapon tests, therefore, it is essential that we talk comprehensively of all nuclear weapon tests, that we talk of tests in all environments and that we remember the terms of the U.N. resolution of the last session, namely, "arrangements to ban effectively an nuclear weapon tests in all environments".

MOSCOW TEST BAN TREATY

In working out these arrangements, the first priority should logically and coherently be given to the task of making the Moscow Test Ban Treaty universally applicable. Not much thought has yet been given to this problem, as admittedly it is a difficult problem. But then all disarmament problems are difficult, some more than others. Our Committee would, however, cease to function if we avoided a problem because it was difficult. The Pugwash scientists, who met in Karlovy Vary in September, 1964, did give some thought to it and stated in a communique that "ways and means be found to convince the governments and the peoples concerned of the inadvisability of any further atmospheric testing". These ways and means have to be found for it is imperative to preserve the spirit and the provisions of the Moscow Test Ban Treaty. The General Assembly has asked the Committee, in particular, to report on these, arrangements at the next session and it is incumbent upon us to make positive suggestions to the Assembly on the matter. As the Indian delegation observed on the 24th of November, 1965, in the debate on this item in the First Committee of the General Assembly,

146

the international Community has requested and has urged, it has deplored and it has condemned; but neither its displeasure nor its appeals have borne any fruit. It cannot, therefore, remain helpless and impotent much longer and it should examine the steps which could be taken to ensure that the Partial Test Ban Treaty of August, 1963 is universally binding. That is the only way to remove a part of its partiality and make it real and abiding.

The second aspect of the problem is of underground nuclear tests and the 20th session of the General Assembly has directed the Committee to devote its attention to this aspect as well. In consonance with its past pronouncements, the United Nations was categorical oil one issue and in its first operative paragraph, resolution 2032 (XX) urged that all nuclear weapon tests be suspended. Irrespective, therefore, of differences on methods of identification and verification of suspicious events, the General Assembly has urged the Great Powers to suspend the underground nuclear weapon tests. It was the third operative paragraph which was directed at our Committee and which talked of a comprehensive test ban treaty as distinct from a suspension of tests.

TWO-PRONGED APPROACH

On the question of all nuclear weapon tests, including underground tests, India has consistently advocated a two-pronged approach, one dealing with the suspension of actual explosions and the other dealing with an international treaty embodying a formal and legal obligation prohi biting them. As far as the first aspect of the problem is concerned, India has continued to urge that all nuclear weapon tests be suspended pending finalisation of formal instruments. As early as April 1954, India forwarded to the Disarmament Commission and its sub-Committee a statement made by the then Prime Minister of India in our Parliament, proposing that these experiments should cease and that at least a standstill arrangement be arrived at in respect of these actual explosions pending further negotiations on more substantial agreements.

On the second part of the problem, namely agreement on an international treaty, India has attempted to advance several specific ideas individually as well as collectively. In this context, the Indian delegation would like to quote some relevant passages from the memorandum submitted by it to the E.N.D.C. in September, 1964. which forms Part of the Committee's report of September 15, 1964 to the General Assembly :

"(b) We regret that the negotiations, if any, between the nuclear powers. for the banning of all tests have not yet led to any results. We realise that there are differences among the nuclear powers on the question of indentification and verification of underground tests. We consider it imperative, however, 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.

(c) The nuclear powers might also take steps towards the conclusion of a formal treaty on the cessation of underground tests by stages. Thus, another partial treaty might be, entered into for cessation of tests above a limited threshold. For establishing such a threshold, it might be necessary for the nuclear powers to exchange scientific and other data. The threshold could be lowered subsequently as a result of the continuing exchange of scientific and other data and other negotiations".

The Indian delegation would emphasise at this stage that this is also the approach adopted by the U.N. General Assembly at its last session. Resolution 2032 (XX) urged in operative paragraph 1 that all nuclear weapon tests be suspended and separately in operative paragraph 3 asked our Committee to continue its work on a comprehensive test ban treaty, taking into account the improved possibilities for international cooperation in the field of seismic detection.

I said earlier that a nuclear test ban offered some prospects of progress during this session. in expressing this view, the Indian delegation had in mind in particular three important developments which took place recently. Firstly, them were two statements made during the last session by the distinguished representative of Sweden, Mrs. Myrdal, putting forward most cogently and convincingly the argument for an early conclusion of a treaty banning underground test; based on a formula of verification by challenge. (E.N.D.C./ PV.247 and 256). Secondly, the distinguished representative of the U.A.R., Ambassador Khallaf, gave us a comprehensive outline of an acceptable partial solution coupled with a total moratorium of all tests and incorporating the Swedish formula of verification by challenge. (E.N.D.C./PV 259). Finally, at the initiative of the Government of Sweden, representatives of some non-nuclear countries including India met in Stockholm last month and discussed the possibility of developing a system of exchanging seismological data through international cooperation which might be useful in connection with a comprehensive test ban. All these constructive developments and propositions are in consonance with the views of the United Nations. They reflect the deeply-felt desires of the peoples of the world and the Indian delegation welcomes them.

147

The Indian delegation believes that it is possible to reach an agreement on the lines suggested by Ambassador Khallaf. In other words, there should be, in the first instance, a suspension of all tests. Secondly, the super-powers should agree to a formal treaty prohibiting underground tests above an agreed threshold, say, that of a seismic magnitude of 4.75 or 4.8. Associated with the suspension of all weapon tests and the prohibited threshold, the treaty would include a withdrawal clause of the nature suggested by Mrs. Myrdal in our Committee on the 14th of April, 1966, so as to provide for verification by challenge. Thirdly. the constructive trend set in motion at the Stockholm conference should be strengthened and supported so that the idea put forward in the U.N. resolution could find its full scientific application. Fourthly, the scientific developments in the field of identification should be pursued vigorously so that the agreed threshold could he lowered and eliminated, converting the de facto suspension into a de jure prohibition as early as possible.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

The Indian delegation believes that it is possible to reach agreement on this basis and, in any case, to make some positive progress in that direction between now and the end of the current session of our Committee. The matter is undoubtedly urgent. We trust that we shall be able to report to the General Assembly that, at least on this issue, we have implemented its resolution faithfully and scrupulously.

The question of discontinuance of nuclear and thermonuclear weapon tests has been in the forefront of public concern from the early days of the bomb. Its imperative necessity has not lessened with the passage of time but has in fact been increasing with every additional explosion in the atmosphere and underground. Recently, many of us have been talking of the dangers of nuclear proliferation, but the menace of the continuing testing of nuclear weapons is, if at all, even more real and more awesome. Many of us have been talking of the advantage of a treaty on preventing proliferation of nuclear weapons, but the benefits of the discontinuance of atomic weapon tests are wider and more far-reaching. As the U.N. resolution 2032 (XX) pointed out, a comprehensive test ban is in itself a Positive non-proliferation measure and recently, the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearisation of Latin America in its Resolution 17 (III) adopted on the 4th of May, 1966, noted that tests of nuclear weapons constituted a form of proliferation of such weapons and expressed its conviction that it was necessary to put an end to their proliferation.

Whether, therefore, one views the problem from the limited aspect of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons or one views it from that of the health of humanity and limiting the level of environmental radio-activity or one views it from the very real danger of an immensely increased arms race which seems to be threatening us, it is essential that we devote our primary attention to the question of the discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests and of working out arrangements to ban effectively all nuclear weapon tests in all environments.

It has been said that time, is running out in the field of proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is even more true in the case of nuclear weapon tests. Continued atmospheric explosions place the Partial Test Ban Treaty in increasing jeopardy, apart from contaminating the earth's atmosphere and the international political climate. Continued underground explosions are intended only to serve the interest of an intensified arms race and are bound to lead to giant missiles and improved capability missiles and a host of new generations of offensive missiles creating a vicious circle of defensive-offensive systems. When that takes place, scant attention will be paid to propositions that we put forward in this Committee for a freeze in the production of fissile material or for a suspension of nuclear weapon tests. It is essential, therefore, that we act before it is too late.

INDIA BRAZIL USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA SWEDEN PERU **Date :** Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Agreement on Maritime Shipping

An Agreement between India and the Federal Republic of Germany for the development of maritime shipping between the two countries was signed in New Delhi on June 15, 1966. Dr. Nagendra Singh, Secretary, Department of Transport, Shipping and Tourism, signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of India, and Baron D. Von Mirbach, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany in India, signed on behalf of his country.

The agreement was originally initialled in Delhi on February 27, 1966, when a shipping delegation from the Federal Republic of Germany led by Dr. Paul Macdonald came to New Delhi for discussions on maritime relations between the two countries.

Under the agreement, both the countries have agreed to grant the most favoured nation treatment on equal terms to either country in connection with the custom formalities, levying of charges and port dues, freedom of access to and the use of the ports. This also applies to the facilities afforded to shipping and commercial operations in respect of vessels, their crew, passengers and cargoes, loading and unloading facilities and port services, etc.

With the growth of India's international trade. bilateral shipping agreements have been entered into with five countries-3 relating to the establishment of bilateral shipping services with USSR, Poland and UAR and two relating to the reciprocal recognition of tonnage measurement of ships with Finland and Denmark.

GERMANY INDIA USA MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC POLAND DENMARK FINLAND **Date :** Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Fresh Agreement for Technical Assistance

A fresh agreement was signed in New Delhi on. June 7, 1966 by the, Government of India with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany providing further collaboration for the development of the Indian Institute of Techno-

148

logy, Madras.

The agreement was signed by Baron D. Von Mirbach, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, on behalf of his Government and by Shri G. K. Chandiramani, Educational Adviser (Technical) and Additional Secretary, Ministry of Education, on behalf of the Government of India.

The agreement provides for services of 25 professors, senior scientific assistants, foremen and short-time visiting professors training facilities for studies and training in Germany for 60 teachers of the Institute and equipment for completion of 20 science and engineering laboratories already established under the original agreement as well as equipment for five new laboratories in machineelements, mechanical handling, chemistry, hydraulics and structures. Besides, replacement equipment, spare parts, accessories and technical books will also be supplied.

The Institute has so far received equipment worth Rs. 17.36 million from the Federal Republic of Germany and services of 12 German Professors and five Technicians. So far 17 Indian teachers have received training in Germany.

This is the largest technical assistance project in the world so far developed by the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Indian Institute of Technology, Madras admitted the first batch of 120 students in July, 1959 and 92 students graduated in April, 1964. During 1965-66, 1,440-students were enrolled in the Institute.

So far 207 students have obtained Bachelors' degree, 15 Masters' degree and 3 Ph.D.

The Institute has about 200 faculty members on the teaching staff.

GERMANY INDIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Agricultural Project for Nilgiris

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is to provide technical cooperation for the development of agriculture in the district of Nilgiris, Madras State, on the pattern of the Mandi Project.

Under an Agreement signed in New Delhi on June 14, 1966 between the Government of India and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for collaboration in respect of the Indo-German Agricultural Development Project, Nilgiris, the German Government will provide a team of advisers for an initial period of three years in the fields of potato cultivation, fertilising, plant protection, fruit and vegetable growing and for rural water management.

Another team of German experts comprising an agronomist, a seed specialist and such other experts as would be necessary will also be provided for a period of six to nine months. In addition the German Government will also supply quality seeds, fertilisers, plant protection agents, small implements for tillage and irrigation, etc.

149

vehicles, equipment for soil testing laboratory and such other equipment as may be considered necessary by mutual agreement.

The Agreement also declares the readiness of the German Government to provide at its expense training in Germany of Indian specialists for the project.

The Government of India's liability will be to provide the Indian counterpart for each German specialist, staff for administration and maintenance of the office of the German team and the soil testing laboratory and also necessary buildings. In addition, the Government of India will beat the cost of transporting the articles supplied by the German Government from the port of Cochin to their respective destinations and also of the running expenses for the maintenance and repair of the buildings.

The Agreement was signed by Shri B. Sivaraman, Secretary, Union Departments of Agriculture and Community Development, on behalf of the Government of India, and His Excellency Mr. Dietrich Freiherr Von Mirback, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany in India. This agreement, which is the second supplementary to the agreement of March 28, 1966, will be in force for a period of three years and carries a provision for continuing the activity by mutual agreement on the expiry of the three-year period.

GERMANY INDIA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jun 01, 1966

	Volume No
1995	
FRANCE	
Indo-French Cultural Agreement Signed	

An Agreement concerning Cultural, Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the Government of India and the Government of France was signed in Paris on June 7, 1966.

The Agreement envisages facilitating and developing exchanges between the two countries in the fields of education, letters, science, art and culture for a better mutual knowledge of each other's languages and civilisation. It also seeks to set up a general framework of cooperation in the technical field with a view to promoting economic and social development.

In more concrete terms, the Agreement will cover a wide spectrum of activity such as exchange of scholars, teachers, experts, artists, exhibitions, performing and non-performing cultural delegations, setting up in each other's territory of cultural institutes, research centres, grant of scholarships, teaching of each other's languages, etc.

Shri M. C. Chagla, Union Minister of Education, signed the Agreement on behalf of the Government of India and Ms Excellency M. Jean De Broglie on behalf of the Government of France.

The Agreement will remain in force for a period of Ave years. Thereafter it will be renewable by tacit agreement unless either country terminates it by giving a notice of at least six months.

The Agreement will come into force 30 days after the date of signature.

The present Agreement is the eighteenth such Agreement signed by India since 1951. The other Agreements were signed with Turkey Iraq, Rumania, Japan, Indonesia, Iran, Poland, United Arab Republic, Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, Mongolia, Norway, Greece, Hungary, Bulgaria and Afghanistan.

TEXT OF AGREEMENT

The following is the text of the agreement

The Government of India and the Government of the French Republic,

Desirous of facilitating and developing exchanges between the two States in the fields of education, letters, science and arts,

Determined to work out the means necessary for a better mutual knowledge of each other's languages and civilisation,

Desrious of setting up, on the basis of equality between the Contracting Parties, the general framework of their cooperation in the scientific and technical field, with a view to promoting economic and social development,

150 Have agreed as follows :-

PART I

Cultural Cooperation

ARTICLE I

The Contracting Parties will endeavour, subject to the availability of funds, to develop their cooperation in the fields of culture, education, arts. as well as science and technical cooperation.

ARTICLE II

The Contracting Parties will reciprocally promote the teaching of each other's language, literature and civilisation in their Universities and, to the extent possible, in their post-graduate institutions, higher secondary schools and in their technical, industrial and commercial institutions.

They will endeavour, to the extent possible, to give a special place to this teaching by selecting well qualified teachers, by allotting suitable time to this teaching and by keeping high the standards of examination.

ARTICLE III

The Contracting Parties, recognising the importance of the training of staff entrusted with the teaching of the language and civilisation of each other's, country, will afford mutual help in this behalf; they will, in particular, organise, to the extent possible, the training of teachers and provide lecturers for the purpose.

ARTICLE IV

Each Contracting Party will facilitate the setting up and functioning in its territory of cultural or scientific institutions, such as cultural institutes, centres, associations. research centres and teaching, establishments, sponsored by the other country. These institutions will enjoy the maximum facilities for their functioning within the framework of the laws of the respective countries.

ARTICLE V

The Contracting Parties will organise, to the extent possible, the supply or exchange of professors and. other university teachers, students, research workers and university as well as nonuniversity cultural groups.

ARTICLE VI

In order to implement the exchanges mentioned

in Article V above, each Contracting Party will try to expand the grant of scholarships to students and research workers of the other Party desirous of carrying on studies or obtaining advanced training in its territory. The selection of scholars will be made through a Selection Committee on which the Government of the other country will be represented by a nominee.

ARTICLE VII

The Contracting Parties will endeavour to find the means of granting to the studies carried out, to examinations, competitive or otherwise, passed and to the degrees and diplomas thus obtained in the territory of either party, partial or full equivalence.

ARTICLE VIII

The Contracting Parties will try to extend all possible facilities to each other for holding of concerts, exhibitions, theatrical performances and cultural functions meant for increasing the knowledge of their respective cultures.

ARTICLE IX

The Contracting Parties will, in accordance with the prevailing laws of each country, reciprocally facilitate the entry and distribution in their respective territories of the following :

 (a) Cinematographic, musical (scores or recording), radio and television material; and

(b) Works of art and their reproductions.

They will, to the extent possible, give assistance to cultural performances and exchanges organised in this field.

ARTICLE X

Each Contracting Party will endeavour to facilitate a wider distribution of scientific, technical literary and artistic books and catalogues concerning these publications and periodicals of the other country through commercial means as well as in the from of exchanges and gifts.

PART II

Scientific and Technical Cooperation

ARTICLE XI

The Contracting Parties decide to organise technical cooperation between the two States in the fields of administration, education, science and technology, inter alia through training and research missions.

151

ARTICLE XII

In order to carry out such cooperation, each Government will try, at the request of the other Government,

- (a) to place at its disposal experts for teach ing or technical advice on specific problems or organising training courses;
- (b) to help in the realisation of programmes of scientific and technical research, both fundamental and applied specially through the assistance of institutions or bodies specialised in these fields,
- (c) to grant scholarships and arrange advanced training and refresher courses;
- (d) to ensure the participation of nationals of the other party in academic courses and vocational training;
- (e) to invite its representatives to participate in scientific conferences, symposia, etc.; and
- (f) to supply literature and arrange lectures, presentation of films or other means of propagation of technical information.

ARTICLE XIII

Each Contracting Party will take necessary steps to facilitate exchange of students and organisation of refresher and training courses for scientific and technical personnel.

PART III

General

ARTICLE XIV

Each Contracting Party, will facilitate, in accordance with its laws, the stay and movement of the nationals of the other country in the performance of the functions as laid down in the present Agreement.

ARTICLE XV

A Joint Commission, consisting of an equal number of representatives of both Governments and to which experts may be added, will meet in principle every two ears by rotation in New Delhi, under an Indian Chairman, and in Paris, under a French Chairman.

The terms of reference of the Commission will be :-

- (a) to keep under periodical review the working of the Agreement in the two countries;
- (b) to advise the Governments concerned on the detailed manner of carrying out the Agreement;
- (c) to formulate cultural, scientific, and educational exchange programmes and review their progress;
- (d) to recommend to the Party concerned any items of interest to either Party in the fields within the, scope of the Agreement, and
- (e) generally to advise the Governments concerned as to the manner in which the working of the Agreement may be improved upon.

ARTICLE XVI

Nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed to affect the provisions of the Treaty of Cession of the French Establishments of Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanam of May 28, 1956 and the approved Franco-Indian minutes of March 16, 1963 relating to complementary provisions made thereto.

ARTICLE XVII

The pre-sent Agreement shall remain in force for a period of five years. Thereafter it will be renewable by tacit agreement unless one of the Contracting Parties terminates it by giving notice of at least six months.

The present Agreement shall come into force 30 days after the date of signature.

IN FAITH WHEREOF, the representatives of the two Governments have signed the present Agreement and have put their respective seats.

Done at Paris this Seventh day of June, 1966, in duplicate, one copy meant for the Indian Government and drafted in Hindi, French and English and the other for the French Government in French, Hindi and English, the Hindi and the French texts being equally authentic.

(Sd.) M. C. CHAGLA,

(Sd.) JEAN DE BROGLIE

For the Government of For At Government of India the French Republic

152

FRANCE INDIA IRAQ TURKEY INDONESIA IRAN JAPAN POLAND NORWAY SLOVAKIA USA GREECE HUNGARY MONGOLIA YUGOSLAVIA AFGHANISTAN BULGARIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Letter to U Thant about Pakistani Encroachment on Cease-fire Line

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, addressed the following letter dated June 29, 1966 to the U.N. Secretary-General as a protest against the Pakistani encroachments on the Cease-fire Line in Kashmir :

I have the honour to bring to your notice the following encroachments which the Pakistani

Armed Forces have committed on our side of the Cease-fire Line and which have been declared as such by the UN Observers.

On June 24, 1966, at about 1630 hours, Indian troops observed one SANGAR built by Pakistani troops at NW 315876 in an area approximately six and half miles South South-West of Naushera on the Indian side of the Cease-fire Line.

A patrol led by an officer was then sent towards this area to investigate. At about 1815 hours when this patrol was still about 500 yards on the Indian side of the Cease-fire Line, Pakistani troops opened fire with medium machine guns, light machine guns, rifles and 3 inch mortars without any provocation.

The Indian patrol was forced to return the fire in sell defence. At the same time, party of Pakistani troops was seen on the Indian side of the Cease-fire Line trying to encircle our patrol.

The Government of India lodged a Cease-fire violation complaint and showed the area of the incident to the UN Observers. Subsequently, at it joint meeting of the UN Observers on both sides held on June 25, 1966, the Observers indicated that the SANGAR has been built by Pakistani troops on the Indian side of the Cease-fire Line.

It is understood that the UN Observers asked Pakistani troops to vacate the encroachment. Not only have Pakistani troops not done so, but on the night of June 25/26, 1966, they constructed an additional SANGAR in the same area.

This is a blatant violation of not only the Cease-fire Agreement and the Tashkent Declaration but also the various Agreements between the COAS, India, and the C-in-C, Pakistan, concluded under the Tashkent Agreement.

I shall be grateful if this letter is circulated as a Security Council Document.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA UZBEKISTAN **Date :** Jun 01, 1966

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Reply to Pakistani Allegations of Cease-fire Violation

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, sent the following letter dated June 8, 1966 to the U.N. Secretary-General in reply to Pakistan's allegations of Cease-fire violation by Indian Forces :

I have been instructed by the Government of India to refer to the Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter (S/7310) dated 19 May 1966, addressed to you, about an alleged breach of the Cease-fire Agreement by the Indian Forces.

At the outset I am directed to say that the Pakistan Governments allegations against the Indian forces are entirely unfounded. The Chief Military Observer to whom Pakistan had complained, has given no award of violation of the Cease-fire Agreement against India in this case.

The Government of India regret that instead of waiting for the United Nations Observer's findings, the Government of Pakistan decided to unleash hostile publicity based on unsubstantiated allegations, as shown below.

On 13 May the Government of Pakistan sent a note to the Government of India on this alleged incident. It is not understood why the Government of Pakistan chose to mention in the note addressed to the Government of India that the civilians were grazing their cattle and cutting grass in the vicinity of the Cease-fire Line "on Pakistan side", but omitted the words "on Pakistan side" in their letter addressed to you. It is also not understood why the Government of Pakistan took twenty days to find out that the dead body of this civilian was found "amongst the bushes" by the residents of Battal. They mentioned no such

153

discovery in their note dated 10 May addressed

to the Government of India.

On 17 May, the alleged report was contradicted by the Government of India as completely baseless. Nevertheless, it is regrettable that Pakistan continued its propaganda drive against India, as is clear from the Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter addressed to you.

This is not the first occasion on which the Government of Pakistan has chosen to make false allegations against India in respect of the Ceasefire Agreement, allegations which were subsequently found by the Chief Military Obseever to be baseless. I would invite your attention to my predecessor's letters S/5467 dated 27 November 1963, S/5503 dated 3 January 1964 and S/5911 dated 21 August 1964 [para 10 (III)], all addressed to the President of the Security Council.

In the light of investigations by the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), the Government of India deeply regret that the Government of Pakistan should have taken recourse to such propagandist activities which can only serve to incite their people against India and create entirely unnecessary tension and ill-will between the two countries.

I shal be grateful if this communication is circulated as a Security Council document.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date :** Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Extracts from Prime Minister's Press Conference

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, held a Press Conference in Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi, on June 15, 1966, at which she dealt with a number of national and international subjects.

The following is the text of the replies the Prime Minister gave to the questions relating to foreign affairs :

NEUTRAL SUMMIT

Question : Could you say a little about the projected summit conference of the three non-aligned nations, India, UAR and Yugoslavia?

Prime Minister : I cannot really say very much about it except that both President Tito and President Nasser have agreed to its being held in Delhi, probably in October of this year. There is no agenda. As you, perhaps, know that this Suggestion for a meeting came from President Tito a long time ago. I think it was within the first month of my assuming this office. It was before I went to the United States.

Question : When this summit idea was mooted, the idea was that certain very urgent issues are to be discussed. Now what it amounts to is that the summit conference has been decided and you are looking for agenda. What is the position ?

Prime Minister : We are not looking for an agenda it is going to be a friendly exchange of views. When you go to see a friend, you don't have a list of things you are going to talk, You talk about everything that is of common interest.

INDIA-CHINA BORDER DISPUTE

Question : Will it not be better, in order to obtain a clear picture of our border disputes with China and also to end speculations going on here and abroad, to see that all the pertinent documents especially the full proceedings of the 1914 Simla Conference and also the minutes of both meetings of Nehru and Chou En-lai, in 1954 and 1956 are made public?

Prime Minister : It is just a suggestion; it can be considered.

INDO-PAK MINISTERIAL MEETING

Question: Do you think your visit to Moscow

should precede the second Ministerial meeting with Pakistan, or will the meeting be before the visit ? Is this Ministerial meeting being held before you go to Moscow ?

Prime Minister : I do not think my going to Moscow has anything to do with the meeting with Pakistan. Obviously when we talk, all these subjects may come up for discussion.

154

Question : Would the Minister's meeting precede the Moscow visit?

Prime Minister : Nothing has been decided at all.

Question : Are you likely to go to any other country after visiting Moscow.

Prime Minister : I do not know yet.

CONFLICT FOR LEADERSHIP IN CHINA

Question : Would you care to comment on the goings-on in China and the conflict for leadership and whether it is going to have any impact on us? As you may know, a well-known commentator has said that a Chinese attack may be imminent.

Prime Minister : I do not think what is happening internally there will have any effect on what they may do on our border. It they have planned to do something, whoever is purged or whoever is not purged, they will do what they had planned.

Question : Do you expect South Vietnam to be discussed at Moscow ? What will be the nature of your discussions at Moscow ?

Prime Minister: We know Moscow's view and they know our views. It may be mentioned, I cannot say.

SEOUL CONFERENCE

Question : What is the reason for the Seoul Conference on South East Asia not being attended by India ?

Prime Minister : That was a particular group

of nations and we are, as you know, a nonaligned country and we do not go to any such meetings.

VIETNAM

Question : In Pachmarhi, recently you said that your Government is against the stationingof troops ordinarily in another country but at the same time you said that a stage has been reached in South Vietnam where it is not easy for the Americans to clear out. What, in your view, should be the inducement the world should give for the Americans to clear out?

Prime Minister: It is not a question of inducement. I just said that if you look at the reality of the situation, it is easy to say 'withdraw' but it is not so easy to do it in practice. That is all I said.

Question : Are you for the withdrawal of the U.S. forces from South Vietnam or for keeping them there in view of the difficulties in with-drawing ?

Prime Minister: I am for the withdrawal. Our policy has been very clear about this.

ECONOMIC REALISM

Question: What you have done so far in regard to economic matters has been summed up as being the policy of economic realism. May we know if you propose to take a fresh look at things in regard to international relations also ?

Prime Minister : I think our foreign policy is very realistic and practical.

Question : Do you propose to be more realistic in the conduct of that policy ?

Prime Minister : I do not know how we are going to measure the extent of realism, but all policies are constantly under review, not only now but from the beginning.

Question : Would you be able to tell us something more about the broadcasting programme at district headquarters and the transmitters with the help of the United States ?

Prime Minister : There is nothing much to say about it. Some time ago, just during or after the Pakistani conflict, we made an agreement to buy high-power transmitters from various countries, including Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and at that time we got an offer from the USA whether we should like to have some small transmitters. We did not accept the proposal for having them districtwise because we thought it would be beyond our means and it would be much too expensive. But we thought that we might have some on a regional basis or something like this. It was proposed that two people might come out to discuss this matter and see what could be done. That was all that had happened.

PAKISTAN'S DEFENCE EXPENDITURE

Question : According to reports, Pakistan has given some indication of a reduction on defence expenditure. Will the Government have discussions with Pakistan on this question ?

Prime Minister : We are always ready to talk on any issue. This is not only a question of discussing the actual expenditure, but the attitude of Pakistan. They are talking war and of annexing Kashmir and at the same time they talk of reducing defence expenditure. The two do not go together. But we are always ready for talks.

155

INDIA YUGOSLAVIA USA CHINA RUSSIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC VIETNAM KOREA NORWAY SLOVAKIA

Date : Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NORTH VIETNAM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on U.S. Bombing of Hanoi-Haiphong

The Minister of External Affairs, Sazdar Swaran Singh, made the following statement in New Delhi on June 29, 1966 on the U.S. bombing of Hanoi-Haiphong:

The Government of India express their deep concern and distress at the reported bombing of the areas in the vicinity of Hanoi-Haiphong. They consider it as a serious development and are most concerned at the human suffering and the possibility of escalation of the conflict which this might involve and hope that the bombing will stop immediately.

VIETNAM USA INDIA

Date : Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

SWEDEN

Swedish Development Aid to India

Indian Ambassador Shri Khub Chand and the Swedish Foreign Minister Mr. Torsten Nilsson, signed in Stockholm, on June 29, 1966 the Indo-Swedish Development Grant and Development Credit Agreements, 1965-66.

Under these agreements Sweden has made an outright gift of Swedish Kronors 12 million (Rs. 17.39 million) for procurement of paper for textbooks for Indian schools. Provision of two research-cum-training trawlers, and a study concerning suitable types and uses of research-cumtraining in fishing trawlers are financed under the Development Credit Agreement.

The Development Credit Agreement now concluded envisages a long-term credit of Swedish Kronors 24 million (Rs. 34-78 millon) which will be utilised to the extent of Swedish Kronors 11.8 million (Rs. 17.10 million) for procurement of fishing trawlers, Swedish Kronors 4.7 million (Rs. 6.80 million) for procurement of drilling and mining equipment and Swedish Kronors 7.5 million (Rs. 10.87 million) for procurement of materials, components, spare parts and miscellaneous items of manufacturing equipment required for Indo-Swedish joint industrial ventures.

The Credit is for a twenty-year term and bears interest at 2% per annum. There will be no repayment of the principal during the first five years and the principal will be amortised at 5% per annum. over the next ten years and, 10% per annum. over the last five years of credit. Swedish development aid to India will thus amount to Swedish Kronors 36 million (Rs. 52.17 million). This is apart from the gift of 4,000 tons of milk powder and 14,000 tons of fertilisers to relieve the present food shortage in India.

156

SWEDEN INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U.S. Loan for Base Dam

The Government of India and the United States signed in New Delhi on June 16, 1966 an agreement providing for a U.S. loan of \$ 33 million (Rs. 24.75 crores) for the Beas Dam project. The dam, which is under construction at Pong in the Punjab, will be India's biggest earth and rockfill dam.

Shri C. S. Krishna Moorthi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Mr. Chester Bowles, United States Amabassador, signed the agreement.

The loan will be used to purchase in the United

States construction equipment such as shovels, tractors, dump trucks and scrapers, and spare parts.

The Beas River is a tributary of the Indus. The Indus Waters Treaty concluded by India and Pakistan allocated the waters of the Beas, Sutlej and Ravi rivers to India. The United States has provided the loan concluded today to help India develop the facilities required to make greater use of this water supply.

The dam at Pong will create a reservoir with a gross storage capacity of 6.6 million acre-feet. More than 32 million cubic metres of earth and rock will be required to construct the 116-metrehigh, 1,950-metre-long dam. As a later phase of this project a power station will be built with an installed capacity of 2,40,000 kilowatts, with provision for further increase by 1,20,000 kilowatts.

While some of the water from the reservoir will be used to supplement irrigation in the Bhakra and eastern canal areas in the Punjab, the principal purpose of the reservoir is to feed the 680-kilometre-long Rajasthan canal, the longest in the world.

The canal will bring irrigation water to an area of approximately three million acres in the arid Rajasthan desert. When the project has reached full development, this area will be turned into a prosperous agricultural region producing wheat, sugarcane, cotton and other crops. The region is now sparsely inhabited. When the canal has been completed, it is expected that two million people, principally engaged in farming and small industries, will live there.

USA INDIA PAKISTAN LATVIA TOTO **Date :** Jun 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U.S. Loan for Indian Power Projects

The Governments of India and the United States have concluded two agreements providing for U.S. loans totalling \$ 48.8 million (Rs. 23.2 crores) for financing the foreign exchange costs of expanding the capacity of the Dhuvaran and Durgapur thermal power stations. The installation of three new generators at these projects will increase generating capacity by a total of 430,000 kilowatts.

Shri S. Bhoothalingam, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Mr. Chester Bowles, U.S. Ambassador, signed the agreements in New Delhi on June 1, 1966.

The larger of the two loans, \$ 32.3 million (Rs. 15.4 crores), will be utilised to add two 140,000-kilowatt generators to the Dhuvaran thermal power station in Gujarat. Earlier U.S. loans financed almost the entire cost of the existing 254,000-kilowatt power project.

When the two new generators are commissioned in 1969, Dhuvaran will produce a total of 534,000 kilowatts and will become the largest thermal power station in India. The project will be linked by a grid with the U.S. financed Tarapur nuclear power station and other power plants in both Gujarat and Maharashtra.

The Gujarat State Electricity Board has forecast an average growth rate of 18 per cent per year in the demand for power. Gujarat has high potential for industrialization and recent discoveries of oil and gas there have laid the basis for the rapid development of petroleum refining and petrochemical industries.

Electricity from the two new generators will also lend support for agricultural development. The state government proposes to electrify 4,000 additional villages with Dhuvaran power. It is also proposed to provide electricity for 10,000 wells for irrigation purposes.

157

The second loan provides \$ 16.5 million (Rs. 7.8 crores) for installing a 150,000-kilowatt

generator at the existing Durgapur power station operated by Durgapur Projects, Ltd., a West Bengal Government undertaking. Four of the five generators now operating at the power station were financed by earlier U.S. credits. The five generators have a total capacity of 285,000 kilowatts.

The Durgapur power plant is a major source of electrical energy in the country's most heavily industrialised area. It is linked by a grid with the Calcutta and South Bihar regions where many key industries are located.

The new 150,000-kilowatt generator is the largest conventionally-fuelled unit currently scheduled for installation in an Indian power station. (The two generators of the Tarapur nuclear power station have greater capacity). It will use for fuel coal by-products from the Durgapur Washery.

The two loans have-been extended by the U.S. Agency for International Development (U.S.A.-I.D.). The Government of India will repay the loans in dollars over a period of 40 years, including a 10-year grace period. The Indian Government will pay interest at one per cent during the grace period and two-and-a-half per cent thereafter on the outstanding balance of the loans.

158

USA INDIA LATVIA **Date :** Jun 01, 1966

July

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1966 Vol. XII JULY 7

No.

CONTENTS

PAG

E AFGHANISTAN

0	Vice-President's Visit to Afghanistan	15	
,	Vice-President's Speech at his Banquet to the Afghan Prime Minister		15
9	Joint Communique on Vice-President's Visit	16	
0	-		

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

	Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement in the Economic and Social Council	16
1		
	Shri Dinesh Singh's Address to Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disard	mament 16
7		

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in the Parliament on her Visit Abro	ad 17		
0 Excerpts from Prime Minister's Broadcast, July 7, 1966 2	17		
Excerpts from Prime Minister's Press Conference in New Delh 3	ni 17		
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS			
Prime Minister's Speech at Kremlin Banquet	17		
 Prime minister's Speech at her Luncheon to Soviet Leaders 9 	17		
Prime Minister's Address to Soviet-Indian Friendship Society	18		
Prime Minister's Speech on Moscow Television	18		

Prime Minister's Press Conference in Moscow 5

18

Indo-Soviet Joint Communique 18

7

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Prime Minister's Television Interview in Cairo	19			
Prime Minister's Press Conference in Cairo	19			
Joint Press Statement on Prime Minister's Visit	19			
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA				
U. S. Loan for Non-Project Imports 2	19			
YUGOSLAVIA				
Prime Minister's Speech at President Tito's Dinner	19			
Prime Minister's Television Interview in Brioni	19			
Joint Press Statement on Prime Minister's Visit	19			

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

AFGHANISTAN INDIA RUSSIA EGYPT USA YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Vice-President's Visit to Afghanistan

The Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, paid an official visit to Afghanistan from July 10 to 15, 1966. On July 10, His Excellency Mohammad Hashim Maiwandwal, Prime Minister of Afghanistan, gave a dinner in honour of the Vice-President at the Chil Satoon Palace, Kabul.

Speaking on the occasion, Dr. Zakir Husain said :

Your Excellency Mr. Prime Minister, Excellen-

cies, and friends,

I have come to Afghanistan as a pilgrim to pay homage, as a student to rediscover a past, and as a messenger of goodwill from one brother to another.

Afghanistan has known the humiliation of imperial domination, the bitterness of a people endowed with wealth but because of circumstance reduced to poverty. But, throughout the vicissitudes of history, the spirit of man, the spirit of freedom, the love of liberty and the love for independence has never died in this country. Through the dark ages when India passed through colonial domination, this spirit of man kept Alive in Afghanistan was a source of inspiration and an example for emulation for the people of India. It is thus that I come as a piligrim to pay my homage to the valiant people of Afghanistan.

Throughout the length and breadth of Afghanistan, one sees the remnants of a glorious and hoary past; a past which perhaps dates back to the beginning of civilised man. Afghanistan has, however, not kept this great inheritance to itself. Throughout history, there has been a constant dialogue between India and Afghanistan the imprint of which can still be seen in music, art and architecture in our two countries. I thus come as a student to rediscover the common inheritance which is shared by the people of India and the people of Afghanistan.

I have noted with pride and satisfaction how the Indian community in Afghanistan has been accepted as equal members of your society and that there is not, and never has been, any incompatibility on the grounds of religion or faith. In India also there are thousands of Afghans who live and work among their Indian brothers in complete accord and harmony. All this, if I may say so, is as it should be as much of the inheritance which history has given us it has given us in common. Moreover, between Afghanistan and India there are no problems but only a vast field of opportunity for mutual cooperation and understanding in pursuit of our common interests. I can assure the Government and people of Afghanistan that it is the earnest desire of the Government and people of India to further strengthen this mutual cooperation, so that Afghanistan regains its historical glory.

I would request Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen to rise and drink with me a toast to the health of His Majesty King Zahir Shah and to the continued progress and prosperity of the Government and people of Afghanistan.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Vice-President's Speech at his Banquet to Afghan Prime Minister

The Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, made the following speech at the banquet given by him in honour of the Afghan Prime Minister, H. E. Mohammad Hashim Maiwandwal, on Thursday, July 14, 1966, at the Kabul Hotel :

Your Excellency Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Friends.

I find it difficult to adequately express my thanks for the generous hospitality and affection which I have received during the short time that I have been in Afghanistan. I had heard of Afghan hospitality but the warmth and cordiality I have received has been beyond expectation. I can assure you, Mr. Prime Minister and through you the people of Afghanistan, that we in India hold our Afghan brethren in the same affection and regard.

159

NON-ALIGNMENT

Your Excellency, on international issues India and Afghanistan have a similarity of outlook. Our two countries have worked closely together at international forums to give meaning and content to our firm adherence to the policy of non-alignment and opposition to military blocs. It is our conviction that in order to enlarge the area of peace and active cooperation among nations, we and other like-minded countries, must strengthen the forces of non-alignment. As Your Excellency mentioned the other day there must be no interference in the internal affairs of countries and there should he peaceful coexistence.

It is my country's firm belief that the principles of co-existence are of vital importance in the context of the world today. The crying need of the hour is respect for the sovereignty of nations and the creation of an atmosphere of peace to enable countries like yours and mine to give to their people the benefits of modern technology and to raise their standard of living.

Your Excellency mentioned in your banquet speech the other day that peace and security were of vital concern to people of this region and in this context welcomed the Tashkent Declaration. I would like to assure Your Excellency and through you the people of Afghanistan that we intend to observe in letter and spirit the Tashkent Declaration. We are convinced that only by the reestablishment of neighbourly relations and a climate of peace and good neighbourliness can there be a settlement of outstanding problems between India and our great neighbour Pakistan.

ANCIENT TIES

Much has been said and written about the ancient ties between India and Afghanistan and I consider my visit to this country to be yet another link in the chain of our traditional ties. But, I would be happier if my visit here helps in some measure to give a much more concrete content to our mutual relations. Both India and Afghanistan are today faced with the same challenge of the century--the challenge of eradicating poverty, the challenge of economic development, the challenge of giving opportunities for education and for the social development of our people. We in India have watched with admiration the plans which have been inaugurated, under the wise leadership of His Majesty King Zahir Shah, for the economic, social and constitutional development of Afghanistan.

I can assure the people of Afghanistan that they have the fullest sympathy of the people of India in the great tasks which the have embarked upon. India today is not a rich country but whatever experience we have, he it in constitutional organisation of government or in economic planning and technology, is fully available to Afghanistan.

Recently, an Experts' Team visited Afghanistan from India to discuss the various fields in which India and Afghanistan can cooperate for industrial, economic, educational and technological development. These discussions, I am informed, have been fruitful and implementation of various proposals made is being undertaken expeditiously. As a beginning of our joint endeavour in the building of our two countries and to strengthen our age long friendship I was privileged to lay the foundation stone of a hundredbed Children's Hospital which India and Afghanistan jointly proposed to establish. But, I consider this to be only a beginning and I am confident that there will be many other such programmes which will help the social and economic development of our countries.

Your Excellencies and friends, may I request you to rise and drink a toast to the health of His Majesty King Zahir Shah, to the health of our honoured chief guest His Excellency the Prime Minister to the progress and prosperity of the valiant people of Afghanistan and to peace and friendliness among nations.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Joint Communique on Vice-President's Visit

The following is the text of an Indo-Afghan joint communique issued on July 15, 1966 at the conclusion of the visit of the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, to Afghanistan :

At the invitation of His Excellency Mohammad Hashim Maiwandwal, Prime Minister of Moanistan, His Excellency Dr. Zakir Husain. Vice-President of India, paid an official and friendly visit to Afghanistan from July 10 to 15, 1966.

During his stay in Afghanistan, the Vice-President was received in audience by His Majesty the King. They reviewed relations between the two countries and exchanged views on international situation. The Vice-President renewed the invitation of the President of India to His Majesty the King and Her Majesty the Queen to pay a State visit to India, which was gladly accepted.

The Vice-President apart from visiting institutions in Kabul, visited Mazar-i-Sharif and Herat.

During his stay in Kabul, the Vice-President laid the foundation stone of a children's hospital

160

which is to be built through the cooperation of the peoples of Afghanistan and India.

The Vice-President of India and the Prime, Minister of Afghanistan held informal talks. His Excellency Nour Ahmad Etemadi, First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, His Excellency Dr. Nour Ali, Minister of Commerce, His Excellency Mohammed Osman Sidiqi, Minister of information and Culture, His Excellency Ataollah Nasser-Zia, Afghan Ambassador to India, Dr. A. G. Rawan Farhadi, Director General of Political Affairs and Dr. Abdul-Wahid Karim, Director of Economic Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, participated in the talks. The Vice-President was assisted by His Excellency General P. N. Thapar, Ambassador of India to Afghanistan, Mr. Jagan Nath Dhamija, Chief of Protocol of the Government of India. Mr. A.N. Mehta, Director of West Asia and North Africa Division of the Ministry of External Affairs and Mr. K. C. Johorey, First Secretary Embassy of India, Kabul.

During the talks, which were concluded in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and sincerity, both sides expressed their satisfaction on the present state of Afghan-Indian relations which are characterised by mutual trust and sincere friendship. Both sides reiterated their firm intention to enhance these relations and expressed their gratification at the recent measures taken towards further cooperation in economic and cultural field.

Both sides reiterated their adherence to the policy of non-alignment, free cooperation based on equal rights and the principles, of active and peaceful co-existence.

Both leaders believed that the policy of nonalignment is justified and useful through its contribution to the solving of international issues and the safeguarding of peace. They affirmed the need of noa-aligned countries to continue their efforts, in conformity with the Belgrade and Cairo Declarations, aimed at the strengthening of peace, independence of all States and international cooperation.

Both leaders devoted considerable attention to current international problems including the war in Vietnam, which constitutes a great danger for international relations as a whole. They are convinced that the Vietnam problem can be settled oil the basis of the 1954 Geneva Agreements, so that the people of Vietnam would receive an opportunity to settle their destiny by themselves, without any foreign interference, and would exercise their indisputable rights to peace, independence and unity.

The two leaders express their concern over the arms race and feel that disarmament constitutes one of the most important questions calling for urgent solution. In this connection they welcome the decision of the 20th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to convene a World Disarmament Conference not later than 1967.

Both leaders agreed that the Tashkent Agreement was an embodiment of the principles of coexistence laying emphasis on the peaceful solution of problems destined to create an atmosphere of mutual trust, understanding and cooperation. The Vice-President assured the Prime Minister of Afghanistan of his country's determination to implement the Tashkent Agreement in letter and spirit with a view to establish good-neighbourly relations. Both sides are convinced that the visit of the Vice-President of India to Afghanistan and the exchange of views that has taken place will promote the further expansion and strengthening of traditional and friendly Afghan-Indian ties. Both sides noted that personal contacts and direct exchange of views between the representatives of the two countries contributed to the promotion of their mutually beneficial economic and cultural relations.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND UZBEKISTAN **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement in the Economic and Social Council

Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister of State for External Affairs, and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, made the following statement at the

161

41st session of the Council in Geneva on July, 7, 1966.

Mr. President,

As this is the first occasion on which I am participating in the deliberations of the Economic and Social Council, I should like to express my appreciation of the valuable work which the Council has done. I consider it a privilege to be able to take part in the work of this important body which has come to be the keeper of the world's "economic conscience". I am also happy to have the honour of participating in the first major session of the Economic and Social Council since the expansion of its membership. My Government has long held the view that such an expansion was overdue, in view of the past increase in the membership of United Nations. The expansion of the Council has also made it possible for the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to obtain more equitable representation in this august body. I should also like to take this opportunity of saying how happy we are to have you as our President-an illustrious son of Africa and the Arab world, whose personal acquaintance with my own country has neither been brief nor superficial.

As I sat listening to the statements made on the opening day by our distinguished Secretary-General, and subsequently by other speakers preceding me, my thoughts went back to the course that has been followed by this world organisation, in surveying and affecting the economic and social problems of the world in these last twenty years. Today, as U Thant has put it, the Council "has a greater ability to do better than merely surveying the situation, as it sees it, from its central vantage point; it is in a stronger position to orient and inspire action as well." I do hope that our deliberations in this session will at least make a beginning in turning them towards more action, and fewer platitudes.

May I say at the outset that I entirely agree with the distinguished representative of Soviet Union when he says that peace is an essential pre-condition for rapid economic development, and I hope that all of us will spare no effort to see that peace is maintained and such institutions as are directly working towards this goal are strengthened. Our own deliberation here will, I am confident, contribute towards this objective.

Five years ago the world community took a solemn pledge to intensify international effort for the achievement of accelerated economic growth and social progress and in the context of this broad objective, it set for itself some targets which it hoped to achieve during this decade. The targets were by no means ambitious and yet, with more than half of the Development Decade behind us, we still face the gloomy prospect that even these modest objectives are unlikely to be achieved by the end of the decade.

Mr. President, we consider this session to be of special importance. We believe that the time has come to make a clear choice. Whether the present decade, so proudly designated as the Development; Decade', indeed turns out to be a decade of development for the developing countries or fizzles out as a decade of disenchantment, will depend on, the choice we make now. I do hope that our deliberations in this session can help the international community to make the right choice. I am sure, we would not wish future generations to judge us harshly as people who took such a keen interest in their neighbouring and even distant planets, that they overlooked trying to solve the vital problems of their own world. For wars are born in the minds of men. And hunger, frustration, inequality and disease turn the minds of men war-wards. We can ignore solving these problems only at the peril of a global holocaust.

In his searching and candid analysis of the situation as he sees it today, Secretary-General U Thant has pointed out that maintaining momentum in industrial countries is important, both for themselves and for the rest of the world. We entirely agree with this view. We wish the developed countries greater prosperity in their endeavours. We realise that it is in. their prosperity that they can make available the means to combat poverty and hunger on a global basis. We in India have,, appreciated the gestures and generosity of our friends abroad, when they have made available to us, time and again, external resources, both financial and technical, so necessary for our economic development. However, we cannot but hope that our friends of the affluent segment of the world will understand the concern we share with other developing countries, when the on again off again nature of this flow of external resources. starts threatening the entire process of economic development in the developing world. It always requires a far more serious effort to revive momentum in economic development, once it is allowed to slow down. As Ambassador Goldberg said vesterday, it is already later than most of us think. Let it not be said that the affluent nations of the twentieth century allowed years to be eaten away by locusts.

In his report on U.N. Development Decade (E/4196), the Secretary General has pointed out, and I quote, that "despite progress in some sectors the pace of economic and social development in the first half of the Decade has been disappointing and neither of the goals set by the

Assembly has yet been reached. Indeed, poverty, hunger and disease have increased in some areas during the first half of the Decade. Unless the world community is prepared to give a massive new impetus to development, it is unlikely that the objectives of the Decade will be achieved by 1970". While the industrialised countries

162

have attained a high level of prosperity in recent years, there has been a downward trend in the rate of growth of national income in developing countries.

Let us not deceive ourselves, and remember always that the basic effort for development has to be made by the developing countries themselves. For there cannot be any substitute for self-help. I am glad that there is evidence of increasing realisation on the part of the developing countries that if they wish to develop, they must place economic development as first amongst their priorities and accept its stern disciplines and obligations. However, what we have to consider here is the extent to which international cooperation in this field can and should be intensified to provide the necessary assistance to the developing countries in their efforts to secure a better economic order for themselves. In this connection I should Eke to draw attention to the first report of the Committee for Development Planning established at the last session of the Council (E/4207) in which the problem of shortage of foreign exchange has been highlighted as one of the factors which have contributed most to the retardation of the economic progress of the developing countries. The Introduction to World Economic Survey, 1965, also repeats this very conclusion, in attributing the lag in investment in the developing countries to the slackening in the inflow of capital from abroad, and not to any lag in domestic investment which has, in fact, been rising by almost 6 per cent a year to almost 14 per cent of gross domestic product in 1964. The Development Decade target, for achieving an annual rate of growth of 5 per cent, cannot but be called modest, as at this rate a country like mine will still have a per capita income of less than a hundred dollars a year at the end of the Decade. But the achievement of even this modest objective will require something like a doubling of the present rate of investment. While the major part of this investment needs

must come from the developing countries themselves, through ploughing back more and more of their savings into investment, external aid still remains a vital need. In these countries per capita incomes are abysmally low, population pressures intense, and skills scarce, thus making domestic savings synonymous with sacrifice.

The facts and figures furnished by the Secretary-General indicate that the performance of the World Community in respect of the flow of longterm capital to the developing countries has declined further instead of improving. We find from his report on International Flow of Long-Term Capital and official donations for the period 1961-65 (E/4170) that the ratio of resource transfers to the developing countries to the gross output in the capital exporting countries has continued to decline steadily during the lint half of the Development Decade. The relevant figure was 0.84 per cent in 1961, 0.72 per cent in 1962, 0.66 per cent in 1963 and 0.65 per cent in 1964 as against the modest target of one per cent set for the Development Decade. Here indeed is a matter of scrious concern for the developing countries.

In this context I am sure that we would all wholeheartedly endorse the general recommendation made by the Committee for Development Planning that "all countries and international agencies act urgently to implement the decisions taken by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development".

Recent studies by the World Bank have shown that not only the needs of the developing countries but also their absorptive capacity for external aid has grown substantially. The Bank's annual report for 1964-65 states and I quote, "while the amount of external finance has grown little in recent years after a substantial rise in the 1950s the capacity of the developing countries to make a productive use of resources has increased considerably. A preliminary Bank inquiry carried out country by country and based on the judgment and experience of the Bank's country specialists and area economists, suggests that the developing countries could effectively use, on the average over the next five years some \$ 3 to \$ 4 billion more of external capital per year than has been provided in the recent

past". In this context I should like to draw attention to the suggestion made by the Indian delegation at the last session of the Trade and Development Board that, for evolving a dynamic framework for international cooperation in this field, it would be, desirable to assess not merely the absorptive capacity of developing for gainful investment of long-term capital but also to assess growth transmission capacities of industrial nations. Such growth transmission should not, of course, be at the expense of further economic progress in the economy which transmits growth. It is quite likely, however, that an assessment of this nature might disclose unsuspected possibilities.

As I have been quoting from a World Bank report, perhaps it may be said here, that the developing countries have been inclined to heed the advice of the Bank, and to note its constructive criticism. The obligation now rests upon the developed member States to show by their acts more than words that they too give equal respect and attention to the suggestions of this Bank.

Apart from the volume of aid, greater attention has to be paid to the terms on which aid is made available. There is urgent need for increasing the relative volume of non-project aid. The importance of this form of aid has been highlighted

163

both in World Economic Survey and the report of the Committee on Development Planning. Such aid is vitally needed by the developing countries for purchasing a wide variety of materials and equipment needed by the economy as a whole. A considerable part of the industrial capacity built up by a developing country over a number of years, at substantial cost, is often forced to remain idle for want of adequate foreign exchange, for importing components and intermediate products. As a matter of fact much greater flexibility in the use of aid is needed if foreign aid is not to be an instrument for distortion in the pattern of production and trade of the developing countries. The distinguished representative of France has already touched upon the question of the use of economic assistance for political ends. Over emphasis on project aid also leads to the tying of assistance to particular sources of supply of capital goods irrespective of the fact whether the particular source of supply

offers the best terms in regard to price and quality. For all these reasons foreign aid cannot be effective, unless it is available in a form which really integrates external aid and domestic savings within the framework of the development plans of developing countries.

The Secretary-General has drawn our attention once again to the very rapid rise in the outstanding external debt of the developing countries and a corresponding increase in the cost of servicing it, which has necessitated the preempting of a growing volume of their foreign exchange resources, a good part of which comes from their exports. The problem of debt-servicing has become more and more acute not only because of higher interest rates and shorter re-payment periods but also because the burden of debt servicing falls mainly on exports which are growing relatively slowly and which are fetching relatively low prices in world markets. The burden of foreign debt is often made heavier because donor countries tic their aid to purchases from the aidgiving countries. while repayments by developing countries are not correspondingly tied to purchases from the repaying countries. In other words, poorer countries do not get the full value of the money borrowed by them, because the amounts they borrow have mandatorily to be spent within the donor country, often paying prices much higher than those that prevail in the international market. On the other hand they have to make repayments in freely convertible currencies. Sooner, rather than later, the entire range of questions involved in the problem of repayment will have to be tackled boldly and imaginatively. Perhaps repayments will have to be linked to purchases from the repaying countries thus giving an impetus to their exports. In this matter the lead has been given in the right direction by those Socialist countries which have become donors of aid---and have accepted repayments in goods, for technical and other assistance given by them to developing countries.

The need for providing an increasing proportion of aid in the form of grants and soft loans with low rates of interest and long periods of repayment can hardly be overemphasised. The UNCTAD had recommended in Annex. A. IV.4 of its Final Act, inter alia, that as far as possible aid should be a blend of grants and loans and that repayments of loans should be spread over a period of not less than twenty years and interest rates should not normally exceed three per cent. In this connection I should also like to draw attention to the report of the Development Assistance Committee of O.E.C.D. for the year 1964 which recommended that members who didn't already provide at least 70 per cent of their official assistance in the form of grants should endeavour to provide 80% or more of their official assistance at favourable terms i.e. either as grants or as loans maturing in not less than 25 years with rates of interest not more than three per cent and that average grace period of loans should be seven years. We hope that the Committee's recommendations will be endorsed by this Council.

Before leaving the subject of official aid may I mention briefly the role India has played as an aid giving country ? We have been endeavouring within the limits of our resources, to assist other developing countries with economic and technical assistance. We have been cooperating with several countries both on the bilateral and multilateral basis and we shall be happy to extend further the area of cooperation to the mutual advantage of all participating nations.

I turn now to the problems connected with the measurement of the flow of long-term capital and official donations. The group of experts which was appointed to study these problems has prepared a very useful report contained in the document E/4171. This report contains some valuable proposals for making the annual presentation of data on capital more meaningful and comprehensive and we hope that these proposals will be put into effect as early as possible. Before I leave the subject of external assistance I agree wholeheartedly with the observations made by Mr. Paul Hoffman that in our future calculations we should uniformly use the figure of net-flows rather than gross-flows of aid. In the context of the meaning of the term 'aid' as used today, this is more than a mere question of semantics. This term would express more fully what is involved in the transfer of resources to developing countries, if Mr. Hoffman's advice is accepted.

The tendency has been noticed in recent years for the quantum of aid to get established at a certain level. This would appear to be due to

164

the fact that the commitments for aid funds depend on decisions taken from, year to year, thus limiting the possibility of making a steady increase in the quantum of aid, and aid itself made sensitive to non-economic considerations. I have attempted to show how the Council by now has a body of information and data on the experience of aid-giving as well as aid-utilisation in our world. The time has thus come for the donor countries to have some guiding principle-a code of conduct whereby the commitment to give aid comes to be founded conceptually on a continuing and more objective basis without interference in the day-to-day economic life of the developing nations. This step will, I hope, result in ensuring a greater evenness in the flow of aid and lead to more efficient planning and continuity in the rates of growth. In this context I should make bold to suggest that this Council consider the following points for further appropriation action :-

- (i) Each developed country should endeavour to reach, and if possible to surpass the target of supplying financial resources to developing countries to the extent of at least 1 % of its national income annually before the end of the Development Decade;
- (ii) The proportion of soft loans in the total flow of resources should be gradually increased so as to reach at least 80% of the total quantum of loans given, by the end of the Development Decade;
- (iii) The proportion of non-project assistance should be increased, depending on the requirements and needs of developing countries;
- (iv) The supply of resources for Development should be increased in accordance with objective criteria and should be governed by economic considerations only;
- (v) Loans for projects of capital equipment or non-project assistance should not ordinarily be tied to purchases within the donor countries;

(iv) U.N. should initiate a detailed and objective study of the growth transmission capacity of developed countries.

May I now enumerate some gains made and some difficulties faced by us in India lately in the economic and social fields? We have made some gains, despite the myriad difficulties that confront us. During the last 15 years of our planned development, we have sustained a rate of growth in agricultural output at an annual average level of 3%. Our industrial production has grown at the rate of about 8% per annum. The rate of growth in agricultural output just mentioned by me takes into account the years of drought, due to the vagaries of the monsoon. In quantitative terms, while our total annual production of foodgrains in 1950 was 55 million tons; in 1964 it was 88 million tons. The story of our agricultural problems in 1965-66 is well known. Our imports of fertilisers have been increased substantially and measures are being taken to establish additional capacity for the manufacture of fertilizers, pesticides and other industrial inputs necessary to step up agricultural production. Attention is being given on a continuous basis, to the distribution of improved varieties of seed, the speedy implementation of irrigation projects, and the provision of guidance to farmers regarding the best method of using these resources.

The growth in industrial output in India has been more sustained and we are now deliberately diversifying our economy. The output of steel and electricity has increased more than four-fold since the commencement of our plans. Production in engineering and chemical industries has risen at the rate of 15 to 20% per annum in recent years. Starting from scratch in 1950, substantial progress has been made in developing a machine building industry. However our acute shortage of foreign exchange, has resulted in holding down the rate of growth in industrial production at 7% in 1964-65, compared to 8.5% in the previous year. We have tried not to allow our acute shortage of foreign exchange to stand in the way of our mobilising our domestic resources. The proportion of gross domestic savings to national income, which stood at 5% in 1950, rose to 9% in 1963-64, and is estimated to have reached 11% in 1965-66. Tax revenue as a proportion of national income has increased

from about 7% in 1950-51 to about 14% in the last year of the Third Plan. While the per caput share of external assistance in India has been the lowest in the world, the contribution made by domestic resources to the total investment in the economy, has been the highest. Despite our low standards of living, we have mobilised, through taxation and savings, \$ 4 for every \$ 1 that was received or borrowed from our friends abroad. This to us has been both exciting and challenging-the result of a combination of democracy with economic planning--both together providing evidence of the determination of our people to make all the sacrifices necessary to maintain our freedom as well as to ensure a better standard of living in the coming decades.

In this context for a long time the need was felt for a United Nations Organisation which could initiate and coordinate activities in the field of industrial development. We are happy that, at the last session of the General Assembly, a decision was taken to establish a United Nations Organisation for Industrial Development and an

165

ad hoc Committee appointed to draft necessary operating procedures and administrative arrangements for this organ. My delegation was associated with the work of this Committee, in drawing up what might be called the first blue-print of this Organisation. We look forward to the UNOID commencing its work soon. Here, may I take the opportunity to offer, on behalf of my Government, New Delhi as the location for the Headquarters of the UNOID ? India, though a developing country, has had considerable experience of industrialisation over a period of at least two decades, and will provide an environment where the aim of UNOID to assist developing countries in their process of industrialisation will be well served. The location of a U.N. organ, I may add, in a developing country will in itself have a considerable psychological impact in focussing attention on problems of economic development. We have already communicated our offer of host facilities to the Secretary General and hope that the General Assembly, at its next session, will view it with favour and take a positive decision. To facilitate the consideration of this matter by the Assembly, I would suggest that the Council might take note of our offer and request the Secretary-General to study its implications and to submit a report to the Assembly at its next session.

I wish also to inform the Council about India's offer to provide host facilities for the international Symposium on Industrial Development to be held in 1967. This is in response to the desire expressed by the Committee for Industrial Development, at its last session, that the symposium should preferably be held in a developing country. If the Assembly decides to locate the Headquarters of UNOID in New Delhi, this symposium may be the first major venture of UNOID after its establishment at the site of its permanent headquarters. This symposium, we hope, will be the forerunner of many more such meetings.

The Secretary General has rightly referred to the need for early action by developed countries, both in the field of aid and trade. The difficulties confronting the developing countries in promoting their exports are well known. Our own efforts of increasing our foreign exchange earnings from our exports are seriously handicapped by the continued application of many tariff and nontariff restrictions on our exports in external markets, some of which are discriminatory, even. illegal, in character. The difficulties of the developing countries can be overcome only through adopting and implementing a new and dynamic international trade policy at a very early date. An immediate opportunity to solve the trading problems of developing countries is provided by the current Kennedy Round of Trade negotiations and I do hope that this opportunity will be fully utilised to the benefit of developing countries.

As regards our views on the reappraisal of the co-ordination role of the ECOSOC, Mr. President, the Charter clearly and squarely lays the responsibility for ensuring co-ordination within the U.N. family of Organisations upon this Council. We, in this Council, have behind us, twenty years of experience in this field of Co-ordination in the course of these years the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination has come into being. Within the Council itself, we have devissed since 1961 the Special Committee on Coordination. We have also evolved the Practice of having joint meetings of the ACC and the Special Committee on Co-ordination. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary questions has also been brought closer to this

work, through its Chairman being associated with the Special Committee on Co-ordination. In the meanwhile, the complexity of the tasks which are performed by the U.N. and its Specialised Agencies has increased. So also has increased the need and the desire to ensure not only a greater degree of coordination but also improved quality of co-ordination. The expansion of the work of the UNICEF; the creation of the UNCTAD & UNOID within the U.N.; the merger of the old Special Fund and the old FPTA into the UNDP are all factors demanding greater and closer coordination between the U.N. and its Specialised Agencies. To put it simply, the work which mankind expects of the U.N.; has increased and multiplied? the organisations and the bodies that are required to do it, within the U.N. framework, have also multiplied. The very complexity of this work has grown. Greater effort, therefore, is now required to attain an adequate amount of co-ordination. Perhaps a new instrument to do this complex work will have to be forged by us. And if we insists, as I think we must, that there shall be no unnecessary proliferation of Committees and bodies, let us hope that this new instrument of coordination will replace the old ones, rather than be in addition to the existing ones. May I draw attention to what most of us in this Council know, that in pursuance of the Genral Assembly Resolution 2049 (XX) the Ad Hoc Committee of Fourteen Experts are meeting at the present time, in New York, and discussing this very problem, with a view to making certain constructive and practical recommendations to the General Assembly which will no doubt consult this Council in due course.

My delegation wholeheartedly endorses the remarks made by Secretary General U Thant in his statement to the Council on Tuesday July 5, 1966, regarding the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology and the newly created Committee for Development Planning. Both these Committees are indeed instruments at the disposal of this Council whose work and whose effectiveness have great possibilities and potentialities. The possibility that through the U.N. the results of

166

scientific and technological research can perhaps be made available to assist in the Developmental and economic work in those countries to whom these possibilities were not open during their period of colonial travail, is indeed an exciting one. If we succeed in this venture, this will be regarded by the future historian as one of the most valuable initiatives emanating from the U.N. The personal leadership which U Thant has provided in this context deserves to be applauded by all of us. If this Council, within the U.N, can ensure that Science and technology benefit not only the affluent of the world but also those Who are not so affluent, we will perhaps have attained more than what our predecessors in the first Session of the ECOSOC even dared to dream.

It is got my intention to comment in detail on the report of the Social Commission contained in Document E/4206. We, however, endorse, in principle, its recommendations regarding reappraisal of the Social Commission. Indeed, adequate funds for attainment of social goals are required. Obviously in developing countries the first priority has to be given to raising the standard of living of the people. Even so, since man does not live by bread alone, and the defence of ideas can be assured only in freedom, attainment of social goals cannot be allowed to await our complete emergence into an era of economic prosperity. In my own country, therefore, during the period of our last Five-Year Plan, we enthusiastically supported diversion of a sizeable amount of our very limited resources to social ends and objectives.

We are mindful of the imperative need of population control in developing countries like ours, we are taking the most energetic steps, on a national scale, and as a matter of governmental policy, to ensure speedy results. India will extend the fullest co-operation to any international effort in this field.

Mr. President, We have heard a lot about the trade gap or the payments gap; and a lot about the need for social development, or the insistence on human rights. The statements made in the Council so far and the documents under consideration before us, clearly show that these gaps, instead of being narrowed down, have widened. Inadequacies in various fields become more glaring each day. Sometimes I wonder whether all this is not symbolic of the existence of another gap-the gap between profession and performance. And I am reminded of a statement which my late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru made in 1956 to the Tenth Annual Session of the UNESCO, when he said, and I quote

"We use brave phrases to impress ourselves and others, but our actions belie those noble sentiments, and so we live in a world of unreality where profession has little to do with practice. When that practice imperials the entire future of the world, then it is time we came back to reality in our thinking and in our action".

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE RUSSIA LATVIA

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Dinesh Singh's Address to Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament

Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister of State for External Affairs, delivered the following speech at the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament held in Geneva on Thursday, the 14th July, 1966:

I am deeply grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege that you have accorded to me this morning of addressing the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. I returned to Geneva the day before yesterday from Cairo and Brioni, where I was with our Prime Minister, and I bring to you and to the members of the Committee her greetings and her ardent hope that, in the near future, your deliberations will lead to positive progress towards the conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

As I was to speak in this Committee today, a friend of mine reminded me of a prayer written by Stephen Vincent Benet, which was read out by President Roosevelt when he coined the phrase "United Nations" on 14th June 1942. Many years have since passed, and the United Nations has weathered many storms. It might be well to remember this prayer today, because it gives an insight into the minds of the founders of the United Nations and also indicates the course they had set for this august body. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read out this prayer :

"Our earth is but a small star in the great universe. Yet of it we can make, if we choose, a planet unvexed by war, untroubled by hunger and fear, undivided by senseless distinctions of race, colour or theory."

Also living in a small part of this planet, we in India have been equally concerned with the problems that President Roosevelt talked about. In our country great experiments have been made

167

with peace and peaceful coexistence. The teachings of Buddha are a living symbol of our great devotion to peace for many thousand years now. In our own lifetime, Mahatma Gandhi's experiments with peace, non-violence and human understanding are still fresh with us, and we continue to be inspired and guided by them. Our subsequent effort to establish in our country a democratic and socialist society, based on fundamental human rights and giving equality to all citizens irrespective of colour or creed, is no modest contribution towards the general establishment of those values in the larger international community.

With regard to the work of this Committee, I recall with very great satisfaction the initiative taken by our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, which culminated in the signing of the partial test ban treaty (ENDC/100/Rev. 1) on 5th August 1963. In itself the treaty does not reach the goals that the United Nations has set but it does make a beginning. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to move forward by substituting the word "complete" for "partial" in the test ban treaty. That would change the partial nature of the treaty and make it universal and comprehensive.

We have consistently urged upon the international community, over the years, the vital necessity of disarmament and peaceful coexistence. India has also advocated that as a parallel endeavour, and in order to facilitate the achievement of general and complete disarmament, collateral measures should be adopted-measures which are equitable and effective and which build up mutual confidence and reduce international tension. We are heartened to note that the desire for peace is growing. In the past, wars were fought to end wars. We are now thinking of a world without wars. The futility of war has been more than established and the yearning for peace is so great that we are all compelled to apply our minds to seeking solutions that will save humanity from all possible future armed conflicts. It is in that context that this Committee has been meeting here, and the world has pinned great hopes on these deliberations.

We recognize that the progress has been slow. This has been of necessity, because the solution we are seeking is based not only upon the willing co-operation of a group of nations but upon the active collaboration of all the countries of the world. We are engaged here in a novel experiment to accomplish something which humanity has never witnessed before-a world without arms. Besides international co-operation, measures for disarmament and for arms control affect vitally the, security of all nations. They have, therefore, to be negotiated with patience and prudence. They have to be just, equitable, balanced and of universal application. They have also to inspire confidence, without which no agreement can be workable.

We shall, however, have to strain every nerve to move forward rapidly. Only the other day I was reading about the estimates of United States expenditure in Vie Nam, and they are only an infinitesimal part of world expenditure on armaments. It struck my mind because that is a topical subject today. Mr. Emmet John Hughes stated in the magazine Newsweek of 11th July 1966 :

- "The cost of the Viet Nam war--exceeding \$ 20 billion a year-signifies a sum that could mean quite different purchases.
- "It could-each month-finance the complete, seven-year training of almost 70,000 scientists.
- "It could-each month--double the resources

of the Agency for International Development for a full year's economic programs in 38 foreign countries.

- "It could--eacb month--creatc three Rockefeller Foundations.
- "It could-each month-pay the full year's cost of state and local police in all 50 states.
- "It could--every year-provide a 10 per cent salary increase for every U.S. publicschool teacher.
- "It could---every year--double the social-security benefits paid to 20 million Americans."

Further estimates could be made of the expenditure of other countries, even if they are not involved in actual fighting but are only maintaining arms. Taken together, those figures are staggering. Is there any reason for us to spend so much money on destruction when threequarters of humanity needs food, medicine and books and is largely living on the margin of human existence ? Measures taken in those fields could help them to cross the threshold from poverty and misery to a life of human dignity and prosperity. Yet we go on investing newer and more powerful weapons of destruction. That is because we are living in fear, and it is that fear that we have to free ourselves of.

We have to remove the causes of fear, so that there can be better understanding in the world. and in such an atmosphere of confidence and understanding we may be able to find the answer that this Committee has been attempting to seek. I believe that one of the basic factors in this regard could be an agreement on complete re-

168

nunciation of the use of force. If all countries can be persuaded not to use force to settle their disputes, a climate may be created in which general and complete disarmament can become acceptable.

This Committee has been deliberating here for a considerable time now upon the possibility of reaching agreement. Many suggestions have been considered and have been very carefully debated : reduction of arms, setting limits-these are matters that the Committee is familiar with. At the same time the world has passed through tire stages of armament at different levels; yet it has not put an end to war. We have to build the desire in the hearts of the people to avoid wars, the conviction that wars should not be necessary. Only then can we hope to achieve disarmament; only then cart we hop, that some method will be found to put an end to the use of force. If we can all agree as a beginning to give up the use of force, then perhaps a climate will be created in which there will be greater understanding, less suspicion and no fear.

We in India have laid great stress on that aspect of international understanding and have given proof of our belief in peaceful methods by signing the Tashkent Declaration.

International consideration of the problems of disarmament has generally proceeded along two well-defined lines. In the first instance, these problems are being debated in many international forums, especially in assemblies comprising all the nations of the world, such as the United Nations General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations, which is composed of the entire membership of that Organization. In this context we hope also that the world disarmament conference contemplated by the General Assembly will meet next year as scheduled. There have been other efforts, too, such as the recommendations made by the Conferences of Heads of State and Government of Non-aligned Countries held in Belgrade and Cairo and by the earlier meeting of the Afro-Asian countries in Bandung.

Secondly, this Committee is endeavouring to seek a solution by negotiation. As we all know, the questions of general and complete disarmament and arms control are highly complex issues, requiring detailed and technical discussions and negotiations to be carried out with patience and understanding. I Treaties, agreements, protocols and memoranda embodying legal and formal obligations have to be concluded with care and precision. The international community has, therefore, rightly adopted simultaneously that second approach to the question of disarmament, that is, of entrusting the work of negotiation to a

small body.

I have not talked about the horror of nuclear war; it is too terrible to condense into a few sentences. All of us know full well that a nuclear war would completely annihilate the whole of humanity, indeed all life as we know it today. The urgent need to find an answer in order to save mankind from disaster cannot be over-emphasized. Much of this task of preventing disaster has to be carried out by this Committee. A way must be found to save mankind from setting the world ablaze and destroying it.

There is about this search which the representatives are making for solutions to problems of disarmament a sense of great urgency but equally a demand for the highest imagination-political, economic and technological. It is given-to few men and generations to witness so many important efforts being made in conditions in which the rest of humanity can share in the success of this Committee and read, in their own lifetime, the benefit from its efforts to secure peace without arms. We cannot afford today to be "silent witnesses of a vanished dream."

Before I conclude, I should like to quote from a statement made by our Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, to the Afro-Asian group at the United Nations in New York in April this year. Referring to the United Nations, she said that our purpose was to build :

"a world without war, a world based on understanding, tolerance and sympathy; not a world where war is just kept in check by the balance of armed strength."

That is the purpose to which all of us are dedicated.

169

INDIA SWITZERLAND EGYPT USA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UZBEKISTAN YUGOSLAVIA INDONESIA

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on her Visit Abroad

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following statement in Parliament on July 25, 1966 on her recent visit to the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union:

The House is aware that I visited the Soviet Union from July 12 to 16 in response to an invitation extended to me by Chairman Kosygin soon after I assumed office, and renewed twice thereafter, En route to Moscow, I took the opportunity to meet President Nasser in Cairo and President Tito in Brioni, in response to their earlier invitations.

UAR & YUGOSLAVIA

Honourable Members are aware of the very close and friendly relations we have with the three countries. With the U.A.R. and Yugoslavia we are bound closely by common dedication to the policy of peace and non-alignment and by close cooperation in many fields and on many occasions in international conferences. Personal contacts between the Heads of these Governments and our own have been frequent and fruitful.

It was a great pleasure for me to renew personal contacts with-President Nasser and President Tito. With both leaders I had frank and friendly exchange of views on the international situation, particularly as it affects the polices of non-aligned countries.

NON-ALIGNMENT

Both President Nasser and President Tito shared our desire to strengthen the policy of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence, which plays such a vital role in the maintenance of peace and friendly relations among States. They also shared our concern at the various pressures to which the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence is being subjected, both in the political and economic spheres.

We discussed our bilateral relations which have happily been developing satisfactorily with both the U.A.R. and Yugoslavia, and agreed that they should be further strengthened in various fields, including economic, cultural and scientific, to our mutual advantage.

I informed President Nasser and President Tito of our sincere desire for friendly and good neighbourly relations with Pakistan in the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration. I also informed them of China's hostile and provocative attitude towards us and of our friendly and cooperative, relations with our other neighbours, such as Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Nepal, Malaysia and Singapore.

President Nasser and President Tito agreed that we should cooperate with one another and with other nonaligned countries for making nonalignment a dynamic force for the lowering of tensions and for promoting peaceful co-existence in the present day strife-torn world. They said that they were looking forward to the tripartite meeting to be held in October this year in India where these matters could be discussed further.

It was agreed to institute regular consultations between India and the U.A.R. and India and Yugoslavia on matters of common interest. We agreed that personal contacts between us and between our Ministers, officials and others are invaluable and should be as frequent as possible.

STATE VISIT TO SOVIET UNION

In the course of my State visit to the Soviet Union, I had discussions with Chairman Kosygin and Mr. Brezhnev, while the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, met the U.S.S.R. Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko, and the members of the delegation had discussion with officials of the Soviet Government. My talks with Chairman Kosygin and other Soviet leaders took place in an atmosphere of frankness, friendship and complete understanding. The discussions covered a wide range of subjects of mutual interest to both our countries.

POST-TASHKENT DEVELOPMENTS

We discussed, in particular, the post-Tashkent

developments in relation to India and Pakistan. I acquainted Chairman Kosygin with certain developments on the other side of our borders which were causing us concern. I apprised him and his colleagues of the steps which India had already taken in this direction, including some of the unilateral steps such as the removal of the trade embargo and the release of confiscated cargo, and of our desire to have talks with Pakistan at any level, and without any preconditions, in the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration, so as

170

to build friendly and good neighbourly relations with that country and resolve all our disputes peacefully. Chairman Kosygin expressed positive appreciation of our position. The Joint Communique briefly reflects our discussions on this subject.

SOVIET STAND ON KASHMIR UNCHANGED

I was glad to find that there is no change in the basic position of the Soviet Union on important questions of special interest to us. I was assured that their stand on Kashmir remains to improve relations with Pakistan, they assured us that this would not be at the expense of their friendship with India. They also assured us that they had not supplied any arms or armaments to Pakistan, nor had any agreements been made in this regard with Pakistan.

IDENTITY OF VIEWS

On international questions, our discussions confirmed the identity of views on a broad range of international questions, such as peace and security, renunciation of the threat or use of force, resolution of international disputes, including border disputes, solely by peaceful means, the acceptance of peaceful co-existence as an imperative for the maintenance of international harmony, and the freedom of dependent peoples.

We also discussed the question of strengthening world peace and reducing international tensions. We agreed that it would help if all military alliances are simultaneously dissolved. We consider this a step forward and hope that sooner or later all countries will realise that military alliances hinder rather than foster mutual trust and confidence.

VIETNAM

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before my departure I had, in the course of my broadcast to the nation on the evening of July 7, put forward certain ideas as a possible basis for a peaceful solution of the Vietnam problem. The basis of my approach is that there can be no military solution in Vietnam. There is no alternative to seeking peaceful solution in order to avoid a disastrous war, with the danger of massive escalation. A peaceful solution can be reached only at a conference table, and hence the necessity for the Co-Chairmen to convene a Geneva-type conference to which we attach the greatest importance. It would be unrealistic to expect a conference until the bombing of North Vietnam is stopped. India has always been against such bombing. Once a Geneva-type conference is called, we anticipate that it might take considerable time to achiev final results. Therefore, it was suggested that during this interim period, the International Control Commission, strengthened if necessary, should assure the observance of any standstill arrangements that might be agreed upon. The objective of the conference should be to find a solution within the framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. The Vietnamese people should be able to decide their future in accordance with their own wishes without pressure or interference from any quarter

These ideas are not new; we have expressed them from time to time. I was, and continue to be, deeply concerned at the human suffering and the danger of escalation of this conflict into a wider war, with disastrous consequences not only for Asia but for the world. Already the escalation has led to a revival of cold war postures and a sharpening of confrontation. This is what prompted my suggestions. I felt that at this juncture it was incumbent on us, as an Asian country deeply interested in peace, to draw the Vietnam problem away from the battlefield to the conference table.

This question naturally figures in our talks in Cairo and Brioni. There was closeness of views between our Government and the Governments of the U.A.R. and Yugoslavia.

In Moscow also we exchanged views on

Vietnam. The joint communique refers to our basic points of agreement.

So far as our own suggestions are concerned, we stand by them. We are convinced that there is no alternative to a peaceful settlement reached at a conference table. Our proposals contain a reasonable basis for starting the process of negotiations. We are pursuing our efforts.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

In our talks in Moscow, we touched upon Indo-Soviet economic cooperation. The Soviet leaders showed their usual sympathy and understanding for our economic problems and of the efforts made by us for economic development. My colleagues, the Planning Minister, the Food and Agriculture Minister and the Commerce Minister who had preceded me, had finalised agreements on various matters. Since Chairman Kosygin was away in Bucharest during their visits and returned to Moscow a couple of days before my own arrival, confirmation of these agreements was conveyed to me. The Soviet Government announced a total credit of 970 million roubles, about Rs. 830 crores, in state and commercial credits during our Fourth Five Year Plan. This aid is mainly for more industries in the public sector. I should like to take this opportunity of expressing our sincere gratitude to the

171

Government and the people of the Soviet Union for their response to our requirements of financial credits and technical assistance in various projects during our Fourth Five Year Plan.

I emphasised that India was determined to achieve a self-generating economy in the next decade and to build a socialist order in keeping with the needs and aspirations of our people.

Both sides regard Indo-Soviet friendship as aimed against none, as a friendship that does not prevent either the Soviet Union or India from making friends with other countries.

BONDS OF FRIENDSHIP

In all three countries we were received with great cordiality and with the warmth and friendship which characterise our relations. I should like once again to express my sincere thanks to the Governments and peoples of the U.A.R., Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. I am confident that my visit and the personal contacts between us and the leaders of the three countries, have contributed to increased understanding and have strengthened the ever-growing bonds of friendship between our countries and peoples,

YUGOSLAVIA USA RUSSIA EGYPT PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN CHINA AFGHANISTAN BURMA MALAYSIA NEPAL REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC VIETNAM SWITZERLAND ROMANIA

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Excerpts from Prime Minister's 'Person to Person' Broadcast, July 7, 1966

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following observations on foreign affairs in the course of her 'Person to Person' broadcast to the nation on July 7, 1966 :

In a few hours from now, I shall be on my way to meet three very good friends of ours : President Nasser in Cairo, President Tito in Brioni and Chairman Kosygin in Moscow. I said I am visiting friends. This is true. But my journey means more than that. It symbolises the close and cordial relations between our countries and peoples-a growing friendship-which is a far bigger thing and far more important.

NON-ALIGNMENT

The world looks different from different places. This is but natural-though it is easily forgotten. Yet, a broadly similar outlook narrows these differences. India, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia share such a common outlook. This is shaped by our adherence to the guiding principle of non-alignment. India and the Soviet Union, too, share a common ideal-a belief in peaceful co-existence.

In a fast-changing world, peaceful co-existence is now more important than ever. And nonalignment has a positive role to play despite the breakdown of old alignments and the emergence of newer patterns of poly-centric power. Nonalignment can harmonise the tensions which grow out of changing alignments. Its existence permits and eases departures from the conformity of ideological power-groups. It lends support to independent nationalisms against external pressures. Its practice is consistent with friendship for all.

We are greatly concerned with the last-ditch struggle of racialism and colonialism in parts of Africa. We are no less concerned with the tensions between the rich and poorer nations of the earth.

"THE WAR GAME"

We are certainly deeply concerned over the continuing nuclear arms race and the proliferation and testing of nuclear weapons. The latest series of tests have greatly disturbed us. I remember visiting Hiroshima years ago. And I was reminded of the awful horror of nuclear weapons by a British documentary, "The War Game", which I happened to see only a few days ago. Let us have no war games.

PEACE PROPOSALS ON VIETNAM

There is at present raging in Vietnam a bitter and bloody war. This war must end and I believe that it is incumbent on all nations, singly and collectively, to give thought to how a cessation of hostilities can be brought about. Recent events have regrettably added to the grave danger of escalation that might embroil the world in a larger conflict. There, can be no military solution in Vietnam. There is no alternative to a peaceful settlement. The parties must be brought to the negotiating table within the framework of the Geneva Agreement.

Instead of debating how this might be done, the two co-chairmen, Britain and the Soviet Union,, should immediately convene a meeting of the Geneva Conference. We would appeal for an immediate ending of the bombing in North Vietnam. This should be closely followed by a cessation of hostilities as well as of hostile movements and actions on all sides throughout Vietnam in full observance of the Geneva Agreement.

172

It is quite possible that any new round of Geneva Conference talks will be prolonged and many weeks of tortuous negotiations might ensue before a generally acceptable formula is patiently hammered out. Meanwhile, it would be necessary for the International Control Commission to safeguard the standstill arrangements. India, as a member and the Chairman of the Commission, would be willing to accept whatever additional responsibility this might entail.

It is necessary to secure the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Vietnam and to insulate that unhappy country from every foreign interference so that the people of Vietnam determine their own future free of external pressures. Looking further ahead, it might be desirable for the Geneva Conference to guarantee the integrity and independence of a neutral Vietnam and, indeed, of the neighbouring States of Laos and Cambodia --as envisaged by the Geneva Agreement. The Geneva powers could also under-write a rehabilitation and development plan for all three States to repair the grim ravages of war. Such a settlement would be a victory for all and, more so, for the brave and long-suffering people of Vietnam.

I offer these proposals as no more than an idea. India is committed to a peaceful solution and not any particular solution. We would be willing to support any alternative proposal that offers hope of success. But of one thing I am certain there must be an early, an immediate turning away from war in Vietnam.

TASHKENT DECLARATION

Though the Soviet Union and India have long been friends, any reference to that country today instinctively recalls Tashkent. I know it was Shastriji's hope that the Tashkent Declaration would herald a new era in our relations with Pakistan. This certainly has been my desire. I see no purpose nor any good in the present strained relationship between India and Pakistan. It cheered me some time back to read of an Indo-Pakistan Mushaira informally arranged in Cairo a small event in itself perhaps, but so full of meaning in terms of our common heritage. There have once again been severe floods in Assam. As in previous years, the angry waters have swept down into East Pakistan leaving a similar trail of havoc there. Neither India nor Pakistan con escape geography. We have one common enemy-poverty.

INDO-PAK CONFERENCE

There was an Indo-Pakistan Conference in Rawalpindi some months ago. Unfortunately, it did not carry us very far towards normalisation of relations. We have since expressed our desire to resume discussions, at any level, to consider the further and fuller implementation of the Tashkent Declaration and the restoration of the Tashkent spirit. Let there be a greater and freer movement of people and flow of information across our borders. Let us find and extend areas of economic co-operation. Let us speedily resolve such boundary issues as are outstanding. Let us see if we cannot sort out the human problem of migration in the eastern region. If we can get these issues out of the way, I am sure that a just, fair and lasting settlement of all our differences will become possible.

EGYPT RUSSIA INDIA YUGOSLAVIA USA JAPAN VIETNAM SWITZERLAND CAMBODIA LAOS UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Excerpts from Prime Minister's Press Conference in New Delhi

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, gave the following replies to the questions on foreign affairs put to her at a Press Conference held at Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi, on July 19, 1966 :

INDO-PAK DIFFERENCES

Question: Did Prime Minister Kosygin suggest a meeting between you and President Ayub to resolve the Indo-Pakistan differences?

Prime Minister : He did not make any specific suggestion like this. As I mentioned in my statement, he is very keen that the dialogue between India and Pakistan should continue and that there should be a greater easing of tension. He did not specifically mention anything.

Question : Madam Prime Minister, could you tell us very clearly of what the Soviet Union thinks of arms supplies to Pakistan? It is not clear from your statement.

NO SOVIET ARMS TO PAKISTAN Prime Minister : Well, they have been quite clear with us. They said that they have not supplied any arms and no kind of agreement has been made with them on this matter.

Question : But the Pakistan Times has reported that the mission of Marshal Nur Khan has been successful.

Prime Minister: That is something which you have to find out from them. Well, I am afraid I can only say what I was told in Moscow.

173

Question : Did you convey to the Soviet leaders at any stage of your talks with them that if the Soviet Union supplies arms to Pakistan, it will create a lot of misgivings in this country and bitterness.

Prime Minister : My talks with the Soviet leaders or with any leaders wherever I go are confidential. I do not think it is Tight for me to go into details of those talks.

VIETNAM

Question : Did the United States ask you to intercede on behalf of American prisoners in North Vietnam with either the Soviet Union or North Vietnam. If so, what was the result ? Prime Minister : I did not intercede on behalf of anybody but when I learnt that there was great concern in the United States about the reported or intended trial of captured pilots, I did mention this to Premier Kosygin that this would create strong feelings in the United States.

Question : What was his reply ?

Prime Minister : He did not give any reply.

Question : It is said that there cannot be any peace negotiations unless the bombing is stopped and Premier Kosygin has gone one step further saying that there cannot be any peace unless Hanoi agrees to it. Now, do you have any information that if the bombing is stopped, there will be more anxiety in Hanoi to have these talks ?

Prime Minister : Naturally you cannot be categorical about it. But I certainly think it will be one step forward towards peace.

Question : You told us at the airport that Mr. Kosygin had told you that he will not take the initiative to ascertain Hanoi's views on any peace move. It will be for Hanoi to approach him. Does it indicate that he has absolutely no influence on Hanoi and he has sort of abandoned himself to whatever the Chinese may decide?

Prime Minister : Well, you see what views be expressed are his concern or what public posture he wants to take is also his concern. I doubt if they want to give up their initiative but certainly it is their stand that the initiative should come front Hanoi.

Question : There has been some curiosity about The origin of your proposals on Vietnam. You were reported to have said in Calicut on July 2 that you cannot see what India could do to solve the problem of Vietnam. But your proposals came only five days after that. What were the new factors?

Prime Minister: It was the bombing of Hanoi. I was very genuinely worried about the bombing. I started thinking whether we could do anything or not. Even as I said earlier that even when I made my appeal I had no assurance that this is something which is going immediately to make a hit or something is going to come out of it. From that point of view, the old view-point also stands. But, nevertheless, I felt it was essential to say something and do something at that point. I thought it wits better for me to do it before I went abroad rather than after.

Question : What has been the reaction of Hanoi to your peace proposals ?

Prime Minister : There has been no reaction.

Question : Can you comment on the World Court rejection of the case against South African Mandate in South-West Africa ?

Prime Minister : I have not seen that text of the judgment. I do not think it is right for me to make any sort of detailed comment on that issue.

NON-ALIGNMENT

Question : These appears to be various degrees of nonalignment. Could you say, what the objections for their not following in line at Cairo and Belgrade were with India's proposals on Vietnam?

Prime Minister : There was no objection as such. Firstly, there was no intention to have a communique at either of the places as I was not on an official visit. Secondly, Vietnam had specifically asked Cairo and President Tito that they would prefer them not to do anything in this matter at this time. There are other problems. For instance, in Cairo, they recognise the MLF in South Vietnam. They do not recognise the Government. We recognise the Government.

Question : Now the Americans have taken the position that if the bombing of North Vietnam should stop what else should stop? Have you tried to ascertain the reactions of the various leaders you have consulted on this particular aspect because that seems to be the only thing that is preventing the stoppage of bombing ?

Prime Minister : Nobody is really willing to discuss anything until the bombing is stopped. They feel that is the first step. 174

Question : Have they given any indication ? They have said that the only problem is that Americans must withdraw. Then where does the bombing come in?

Prime Minister : These things cannot be spelt out in so many words.

Question : From experience we know that China is not a peace-loving country and we also see that Russia is peace-loving, Do you find there is any difference between China and the U.S.S.R. on the question of Vietnam ?

Prime Minister : I know that the Soviet Union would like the war to stop. I do not know whether China would like it to stop.

BHUTAN

Question : The Ruler of Bhutan has told his people that you have undertaken that when Bhutan decides that the time is ripe to join the United Nations, India will not stand in the way and you will help him. Your letter to Mr. Limaye of S.S.P. leaves a contrary impression. Could you please clarify and what your Government's position is?

Prime Minister : We have had certain talks with the Ruler of Bhutan and he has been allowed to participate in the International Postal Union and one or two other such things. The movement was in that direction. Now nothing has definitely been done and we do not know how many years it will take for Bhutan to be ready. There is no purpose in looking into the future. Our policy has not changed in any way in this regard.

INDIA'S CANDIDATURE FOR SECURITY COUNCIL

Question: In your tour in UAR and Yugoslavia, did the question of India's candidature for the Security Council come up?

Prime Minister: It did, yes.

Question : What was their response? The UAR is reported to be insisting an Syria's membership.

Prime Minister: Well, I think that UAR will

probably support Syria. It is difficult for it not to support an Arab nation.

Question : Why ?

Prime Minister : Well, all kinds of pulls.

Correspondent : It cannot be a very high and noble principle of non-alignment,

Prime Minister : I think that, perhaps, you had better try to see the definition of nonalignment because non-alignment does not mean that you leave national interest. Non-alignment merely means that you do not join any military power blocs, or you do not follow a bloc for the sake of following.

Question : It has been said that our relations with the UAR are perhaps weakening.

Prime Minister. I do not think so.

Question : Jordan has already been a sitting member and it is an Arab country. Can U.A.R. not do something for the sake of India's friendship ?

Prime Minister : It is for them to consider it. I cannot say what they can do and what they cannot do.

Question : We would like to know your impressions.

Prime Minister : I did not go into the details of it.

Question : Would you like to say that whether in view of the reactions you are getting from the Arab countries, at this stage you are thinking of reconsidering our position about wanting to be on the Security Council next time ?

Prime Minister : I do not think there is any reconsideration at the moment.

Question : You have recognised the Arab League. Probably this is the only country which has recognised the League and given it a diplomatic status. Can't the Arab League take up the position that since Jordan is retiring, the Arab countries should support India ? Prime Minister: How can I say what position somebody else should take up.

Question : Do you plan at this time any further moves, any now initiative towards settling the Vietnamese issue ?

Prime Minister : No, I don't think so.

Question : What do you see as a possible next step ?

Prime Minister : I do not see the next step just now except in trying to pursue the first step.

FINANCIAL AID

Question : After your visit to the Soviet Union, are you having a clear picture of the financial aid you are going to have from the USA and the USSR ? Are you in a position to say that your Government will stick to the size of the Plan as before the devaluation?

Prime Minister : There was no Plan envisaged before devaluation because the Plan had not

175

been drawn up. Talks, discussions on the Plan are still going on. It is not yet ready and naturally devaluation has made a difference because many things will have to be recast. And also in order to really stabilise our economy, we have to look at all these things in great detail. We hope to have the Plan ready by the beginning of August and to put it before the National Development Council.

The aid from the USSR was finalised before I went there. Our Planning Minister had gone there. It had already been finalised. They did not want to put out the figures because Chairman Kosygin had been out of the country and it had not been put before him. Actually, the whole thing was finalised before Shri Asoka Mehta had returned.

Question : But we thought your visit would add to the figure.

Prime Minister : I am sorry. I did not even mention this matter.

Question : While talking of the Plan, have you given thought to the new proposal before the American Senate that in future there will be no PL 480 supplies but you will have to pay for it in dollars. This makes a vital difference to the Plan ?

Prime Minister: It does make a big difference to us and the matter is being fully examined by our Food Ministry and others.

BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Question : In your statement before your departure, you talked of an immediate Geneva conference and an immediate cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam. Therefore, to my mind there is no real order to these two steps. However, in your answer to a question a few minutes ago, you indicated that everybody seems to feel that cessation of bombing should be the first step. Does this mean that you are now of the view or were of the view then that cessation of bombing should come before the calling of the Geneva Conference or there is some such condition for calling of such a Conference?

Prime Minister: Well, I think, if you look at the question realistically it will be very difficult to call a conference while bombing is on and, that is, I found the reaction not only in the Socialist or the Communist countries but even in a country like Great Britain and many of the European countries.

Question : If bombing stops, do you have reasonable hope that a Geneva Conference or a Geneva-type conference could be reconvened ?

Prime Minister : I answered this question earlier. Nobody can make a categorical thing. I certainly think it will make it much easier.

INDO-PAK CONFERENCE

Question : Madam, can you tell us the latest position about the Indo-Pakistan Conference about which Government of India had made a formal proposal and in your latest message to President Ayub Khan while overflying Pakistan, you had indicated some hope that these problems can be settled peacefully. Is there any positive response from Pakistan or any new factor that has come to light which encourages you to hope that the Kashmir question and other questions can be settled?

Prime Minister: As you know, we believe in first settling economic problems and having greater cooperation and collaboration on other fronts and in many such common matters which can be taken up. India has already taken certain steps unilaterally in the realease of the cargo and so on and we continue to be hopeful that if we peg on, ultimately we win succeed. Otherwise our discussions will go an at a diplomatic level about meetings and so on.

176

INDIA PAKISTAN USA RUSSIA VIETNAM SOUTH AFRICA EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA CHINA BHUTAN PERU SYRIA JORDAN SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Speech at Kremlin Banquet

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid an official visit to the Soviet Union from July 12 to July 16, 1966. On July 15, 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, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said :

Chairman Kosygin Mr. Brezhnev, distinguished members of the Politbureau and the Soviet Government, and friends,

During my tour full days in Moscow, I have enjoyed your friendship and hospitality. and have had full discussions with you and your colleagues. We have met as friends and our exchanges have underlined the large area of agreement that exists between the Soviet Union and India. Our relations are growing steadily closer and stronger, for friendship with the Soviet Union has been and is one of the leading elements in our foreign policy.

We have chosen the path of socialism, democracy, secularism and non-alignment. It is on these solid foundations that we desire to build.

CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY

We Cherish our concept of democracy. To us it means something more than mere political freedom. Democracy, in our circumstances, is incomplete without socialism-without equality of opportunity, social justice, abolition of poverty and the provision of the minimum decencies of fife to every citizen, irrespective of status or vocation.

We have profited from the experience of others and we shall always continue to be receptive, to new ideas. Yet our concept of socialism and democracy is, and must remain, an Indian concept, with an Indian quality, and consistent with Indian traditions, Indian circumstances, Indian aspirations.

MARCH TOWARDS SOCIALISM

In our march towards socialism we do not wish to be prisoners of dogma. We have no doubt about our goals, and we are aware of the many difficulties to be overcome before these are attained. There must be hard work and sacrifice. This we have not sought to hide from our people. We may sometimes stumble and fall, we may sometimes pause to take breath, we may some, times lean on friends, we may sometimes have to make hard choices and make adjustment in certain circumstances at a particular point of time. All this is part of life, which we accept. But whatever the tactical adjustments we make, the strategic objective in our struggle against poverty and on behalf of socialism, is fixed and unchanging. We repudiate the dogmatists abroad and within our own country.

India is perhaps the largest composite society in the world. Like the Soviet Union, it comprises people who speak many languages and embrace many faiths. For such a society, secularism is an integral part of socialism and democracy, for without it, there could nit be equality between citizen and citizen, but new forms of apartheid. We are, therefore, steadfast in our resolve to protect and promote our secular ideal.

India has a long way to go before it can achieve goals which we have set ourselves. At present we are passing through a testing time, when progress has slowed and the strain on our economy and people has increased. But we can take heart from what we have achieved. This is not inconsiderable. Were it not for the magnitude of the country and its problems, I would venture to say that we have achieved a minor revolution-in our social structure, in our productive capacity, in agriculture and in industry. The public sector has increasingly come to occupy the commanding heights of the economy. The area of socialised trade is steadily expanding. The greatest change of all is the change in attitudes-from a traditional to a modern outlookand the coming of age of a new generation of Indians who are completely dedicated to the ideals of socialism, democracy, secularism and non-alignment. The reactionary forces are struggling to retain their position. We do not underestimate their strength. However, there is a lost cause and the sharpness of their struggle is but a sign of their desperation.

We are engaged in giving final shape to our Fourth Five-Year Plan. The Fourth and Fifth Plans will be a critical period in India's longterm developing strategy, marking the transition from the present stage of dependence on external assistance to a stage when the Indian economy will be capable of generating adequate resources for independent growth. In this transition, the key role will be that of the public sector in metals and machine building, in oil and chemicals, in

177

power generation, in the socialisation of trade, in all of which spheres the foundations have been laid in the Second and the Third Five-Year Plans.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to express the gratitude of the Indian Government and people for the assistance received from the Soviet Union in developing these critical sectors of the economy and in helping us to lay the foundations of socialism.

SINEWS OF SELF-RELIANCE

In the coming ten years, we propose to develop our agriculture to a level which puts us above want, to enlarge and diversify our industrial structure, to rapidly increase opportunities for employment, to step up exports significantly, to adopt a programme of family planning which will help stabilise our population, and to develop indigenous technology and skills. All these represent the sinews of self reliance.

Early next year the country goes to the polls again for its fourth general elections. Our democracy leaves every party free to air its views even if these are critical of Government. But it is a fact that even so-called progressive parties together with others, have sometimes abused this freedom and have resorted to strikes and violence which are against the national interest. However, I know that the heart of the people is sound and their faith in their destiny is firm.

NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

India stands for friendship with all countriesfor nonalignment and peaceful co-existence. The cordial relations between the Soviet Union and India vividly demonstrate the possibility not merely of peaceful co-existence, but of close cooperation and collaboration between States with differing social systems on the basis of equality, mutual trust and mutual benefit.

India adopted non-alignment as the cornerstone of its foreign policy on the attainment of independence. It was perfectly clear to us that both the larger interests of peace as well as the imperative necessity of the rapid economic development of newly independent nations would be best served by a policy of non-alignment.

There are some who feel that, non-alignment has now played its part and must fade away. Such an attitude reveals an imperfect understanding of non-alignment and of the new tensions which are emerging in the world. In some respects non-alignment has an even more significant role to play-in helping to build a better world and in preserving it from nuclear annihilation.

The policy of peaceful co-existence adopted

by the Soviet Union and other friendly States has strengthened non-alignment and vested it with a more purposeful role.

Non-alignment is not a spent force. India, in concert with other non-aligned countries, will continue to practise and develop non-alignment and peaceful coexistence to meet the new challenge of our time.

BANDUNG PLEDGE FORGOTTEN

However, we deeply regret that a major Asian power should have fogotlen the pledge it signed at Bandung and has by rejecting peaceful coexistence sought to weaken, if not to overthrow, non-alignment. Apparently certain powers do not desire peace. They seek to promote tension in justification of dogmatic belief in the inevitabilily of war and the use of aggressive force in the settlement of problems.

They have entered into opportunistic alliances with feudal and revivalist forces in Asia and Africa, even though these forces run counter to the national interests and well-being of the people.

NEO-COLONIALISM

The developing countries are also subject to the external economic pressures of neo-colonialism. They must be vigilant against the alliance between entrenched social and economic privilege and foreign influence which attempt to use these reactionary forces for their own ends.

The non-aligned countries must defend their freedom and integrity against different brands of reaction. These elements are in unholy alliance and claim to speak in the accents of progress and in the name of the people. We in India firmly reject all brands of reaction and opportunism. We are not going to surrender the gains we have made in 19 years.

Mr. Chairman, a great welcome awaits you when you visit India. You will see something of our achievements and the spirit of our people.

Tomorrow I go back home. taking with me the pleasantest memories of the warm hospitality and friendship of the Soviet people. Friends and comrades, I request you to join me in a toast to the health of Chairman Kosygin, Mr. Brezhnev and their distinguished colleagues, to the prosperity and happiness of the Wet people, and to the growing bonds of Indo-Soviet friendship which is a bulwark of world peace.

178

RUSSIA USA INDIA INDONESIA TUNISIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Speech at her Luncheon to Soviet Leaders

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, gave it luncheon to Prime Minister Kosygin and other Soviet leaders at the Indian Embassy in Moscow on July 14, 1966.

Welcoming the distinguished guests, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said :

Chairman Kosygin, Madam Kosygin, Your Excellencies, Friends,

Only a few months ago, I passed through Moscow. It is indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity of returning for a brief visit again.

Even before India's independence, there was an underlying sympathy between India and the Soviet Union. Today, the two countries are good and close neighbours and it is not much further from Delhi to Tashkent than from Delhi to Madras.

TASHKENT

The name Tashkent evokes mixed memories in India. It was there that you, Mr. Chairman, and your colleagues brought India and Pakistan together for a historic meeting which set out certain imperishable principles which are the foundation of our foreign policy and to which we steadfastly adhere-the renunciation of force and the settlement of disputes through peaceful means. It was also in Tashkent that my predecessor, Mr. Shastri, set the seal on the Tashkent Declaration with his own life. Tashkent. therefore, has poignant memories for India, and the suffering, caused to its people by the recent earthquakes has evoked widespread sympathy there.

CHANGING WORLD

The world is changing fast. This is a universal phenomenon and the fruit of growth. Yet, there are some in this world who would deny change or seek to reject it. They would cling to the past or some brand of orthodoxy and not move with the times. They would preach a narrow dogmatism and refuse to admit that the world can or should be anything other than cast in their own image. Such an attitude is dangerous, for it is antagonistic to peaceful co-existence.

COLONIALISM

A look at the map will indicate what transformation we have seen in the process of de-colonization. Colonialism is not dead. But it is fast dying. Nevertheless, this dying colonialism and racialism have shown ruthless violence in their death struggle. Our sympathies go out to the people of Africa and other lands who still suffer these indignities.

There is a newer and more serious danger which the world has to guard against. Wideningdisparities between the rich and the poor, the prosperous and the weak nations, have made the developing nations vulnerable to various pressures. These can be overcome only through vigorous development and healthy collaboration among nations on a basis of equality, mutual benefit and respect for one another's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Non-alignment and Afro-Asian solidarity can consolidate national independence; your country, which has the largest area in Asia, is playing an important and valuable role in this process.

THREAT OF NEO-FEUDALISM

We must also guard against neo-feudalism

which is manifest in subtle forms of religious revivalism and racial exclusiveness. Such doctrines flury in the face of history, for the nations of the world and, more particularly, the newer nations, are made up of composite societies, of people of many faiths, many races. many languages, sharing an equal citizenship. Like the Soviet Union, India is a composite society with rich cultural diversity. This is why we are resolutely opposed both to the false cry of self-determination for parts of sovereign independent countries, and the exploitation of religious groupings for political expediency. However, we are second to none in our support for the principle of self-determination in countries which are still under colonial rule.

VIETNAM

The world is beset with many problems. At this very moment a bitter war is raging in Vietnam. There is no alternative to a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. We in India like others elsewhere, are gravely concerned at the worsening turn of events in that land. We have given anxious thought to this matter and would once again propose the immediate stoppage of the bombing of North Vietnam, the cessation of all hostilities, and a return to the negotiating table within the framework of the Geneva Agreement. A peaceful solution, which respects the independence and will of the brave people of Vietnam can and must be found.

There are those who do not like the detente achieved by the great powers and who wish to undo it by aggravating tensions in Asia. They must not be allowed to endanger would peace. Men, women and children all over the world demand peace and any country which flouts this world-wide demand does so at great risk to itself and peril to mankind.

179

DISARMAMENT

However, peace will remain fragile until there is general and complete disarmament. The danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons is real and demands urgent attention. The prospect of nuclear weapons in the hands of aggressive powers must certainly cause concern for the security of nations which are either unable, or unwilling on principle, to enter the nuclear arms race. This aspect of the matter calls for wise and constructive consideration by all nations, particularly by the nuclear powers.

India, for its part, wants nothing more than to live in peace and to devote its energies to the enormous tasks of economic construction. Our principal enemy is poverty and we have no desire to divert our attention from this struggle.

Over the past 19 years, we have made considerable progress in development. We are currently facing certain difficulties. But I am confident that these are not of a lasting nature. They will soon be overcome and we shall resume the onward march of economic progress towards our goal of socialism and self-reliance.

INDO-SOVIET COOPERATION

We have consistently received generous understanding and assistance from the Government and people of the Soviet Union. In every field of endeavour-in agriculture, in heavy industry, in mining and oil exploration, in the development of power, in technical education, in trade and cultural exchange-there are living monuments to Indo-Soviet cooperation. In the tasks ahead of us too, I know that we can rely on the sympathy and cooperation of the Soviet Union. Friendly collaboration between our two countries has steadily increased in the last decade and continues to grow from year to year. Our people appreciate and value this friendship and cooperation as you will see for yourself, Mr. Chairman, when you visit India later this year. On behalf of the Indian people, I assure you a warm and affectionate welcome.

May I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your warm friendly welcome and your generous hospitality. May I also convey to you and through you to the great Soviet people the greetings and good wishes of the friendly people of India.

Friends and Comrades, may I request you to join me in a toast to our esteemed friends, Chairman Kosygin and Madam Kosygin, to their distinguished colleagues, to the friendly Soviet Government, and to the unshakable friendship between the Soviet and Indian people:

INDIA RUSSIA UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Address to Soviet-Indian Friendship Society

The following is the text of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's speech at a Soviet-Indian Friendship Rally held in the Kremlin Palace on July 14, 1966:

Chairman Kosygin, Your Excellencies; and Friends,

I have visited this great land many times and my mind is full of memories and especially of the tour with my father in 1955. The truly tumultuous welcome we received imparted warmth and added meaing to the relationship between our two countries.

From the time of the Great October Revolution the world had begun to bear a new voicethat of Lenin-and began to stir to new ideas. Our own independence struggle in India developed along somewhat different lines. Nevertheless, we were influenced and deeply moved by the heroic efforts of the new Soviet Government to establish itself and build a new social order from the ruins of Czarist tyranny and war.

We were impressed by the foresight and practical wisdom of your leaders in modifying their tactics and making adjustments to suit the needs and circumstances of the time, without surrendering their cherished goals. This has been an example for other countries, as was evident in the deliberations of your 23rd Party Congress. We followed that Congress with considerable interest in India both because of the wide international support it received and the call to peaceful construction with which it concluded.

The Soviet 7-Year Plan has registered substantial all-round gains. Your splendid successes in probing the un athomed mysteries of space are but one symbol of your great progress. May 1, on behalf of the Indian people, congratulate you, the Soviet people, on this magnificent achievement. We share your pride in the skill and daring of your scientists and cosmonauts for the conquest of nature is a triumph of all mankind.

In a very different sense, we in India too have attained certain objectives, which not many years ago, our people thought unattainable. In the nineteen years since independence, there has been a remarkable transformation of the Indian scene. Life expectancy has almost doubled from 27 to

180

50 years. We have almost completely eradicated malaria which once, claimed a million lives every year. 70 million boys and girls go to school, and admissions to technical institutions have increased fivefold. Power generation has increased seven times. Electricity has brought light to some 45,000 villages-still only a fraction of the country. The area under irrigation has been doubled. Steel capacity has increased from barely 1.2 million tonnes to nearly 9 million tonnes.

Ten years ago, peasants cultivated their fields around two little villages called Bhilai and Hatia, near Ranchi, as their forefathers had for centuries. Today, Bhilai is a mighty steel centre and Hatia the hub of a huge machine-building complex. The Soviet Union has helped its in both these projects.

Yet we face many problems. This year ha, been particularly critical due to a peculiar combination of circumstances. First and most important was the unprecedented failure of the rains last year. Never in this century has there been such serious and widespread drought. The harvest was ruined and the resultant shortage of food and other agricultural products has caused considerable hardship.

Then, thrice within the past five years, India has been involved in a military conflict which has been forced upon her. The continuing external threat has necessitated an increase in defence expenditure. We have no desire to divert resources to defence. But we are determined to safeguard our territorial integrity and independence. Only thus can we uphold our policy of peace and nonalignment.

Despite these many problems, the morale of the Indian people is high and I am confident that we shall soon overcome these difficulties. Their response to the drought holds out many inspiring examples of positive endeavour. A substantial rural works programme was launched, employing nearly three million persons in the scarcity affected areas. A number of land improvement works and permanent rural assets have been completed. These will strengthen the agricultural base.

AGRICULTURAL STRATEGY

We are according the highest priority to agriculture. Since independence, we have increased food production by 75 per cent. But even this order of increase is inadequate to the requirements of a rapidly growing population which will touch 500 million next year. Our new agriculrural strategy involves the use of large doses of fertilisers with improved seed varieties in irrigated tracts and areas of assured rainfall. With your help we plan to set up a number of State Seed Farms to provide improved varieties of seeds to the farmer. Improved dry farming practices are also being propagated in other areas.

Agriculture is vitally important. But it is not enough. It we are to provide full employment and significantly raise living standards we must build a large and efficient industrial society. Fortunately, India is well endowed with a wide variety of natural resources and has a huge market potential. These provide favourable conditions for the establishment of a diversified industrial strocture and exploitation of economies of scale.

There has in fact been a great surge in the range and quantum of industrial production --a wide variety of machinery, machine tools, chemicals, petroleum products, transport and electrical equipment, and essential consumer goods. Much of this has been developed with our own resources and skills. In fifteen years, the overall volume of industrial production has increased by two and a half times. The expansion in some of the newer industries I have cited has been far greater. The public sector has taken a leading role in the development of many key industries.

The past decade has seen a considerable strengthening of the infrastructure. Power and transport facilities have been greatly developed. There has been a tremendous expansion in technical education. A number of social and institutional changes have been effected. Intermediaries on the land have been abolished and over large parts of the country the ownership of land has passed to the tiller of the soil. Other agrarian reforms conferring security of tenure and fixity of rent have been enacted and are in various stages of implementation, The local administration has been decentralised. There are more and newer opportunities for local initiative, and the response of the people is evident, for example, in the remarkable success of agricultural service, processing and marketing cooperatives in certain States.

A new generation of Indians is rapidly coming to the helm of affairs. These young men and women have grown up in freedom. They have seized the opportunities offered by Independence and have acquired a variety of skills and experience. They have dedication, vision, and confidence. Whether workers. technicians, scientists or managers, they are second to none, I am proud of them and when I see their bright faces during my travels in the country I am inspired and filled with hope. They are dedicated to the building of a new India, a democratic and socialist India, and they shall succeed in this great adventure.

181

When we began planning fifteen years ago it was our objective to end our dependence on foreign aid, and attain a stage of self-sustaining growth and a socialist structure of society within the span of a generation. We adhere to this objective and are confident that we shall have developed a self-reliant economy within the next decade, that is, at the end of our Fifth Five-Year Plan. With this same end in view, we are proceeding to building it heavy industrial base in the public sector and to develop our exports to a point where we are able to stand on our own feet and repay the foreign loans which we have taken.

INDO-SOVIET ECONOMIC COLLABORATION

Just now we are engaged in giving final share to our Fourth Five-Year Plan. Some of my colleagues preceded me to Moscow and have had fruitful discussions with your Government on ways and means to promote further trade and economic collaboration between our two countries and people. The Bokaro Steel plant is a Central project in our march towards selfreliance. The Soviet Union is assisting India in building this project and I should like to avail of this opportunity to thank Chairman Kosygin and his colleagues for the great interest they have taken in furthering our aspirations with regard to the construction of this project, much of the equipment for which will be assembled from the Soviet-aided machine building plant near Ranchi to which I have referred earlier. Having now begun to build machines which make machines, we are equally anxious to widen and deepen our own technological, design and engineering skill. Here again the Bokaro Steel Plant will rise as shining symbol of constructive Indo-Soviet cooperation.

India is engrossed in peaceful development. It is engaged in one of the most meaningful and vital struggles of our time-the struggle against poverty. Everywhere, nations are becoming; free, though some dark spots of colonialism and racial oppression still disfigure the map of the world. Yet political freedom is incomplete and has little meaning without economic independence. And until the battle for economic independence is won, the newly emerging nations-the developing nations--will be subjected to external pressures which must be resisted. The widening gulf between the rich and poor nations is also creating new tensions which it must be the Object of international economic diplomacy to relieve. In this task, India though herself in the throes of development, has sought to contribute her mite in assisting other developing nations in Asia and Africa. As our economy develops, so will our ability to enlarge our contribution.

The world will achieve freedom from want, only when it is able to secure freedom from war and freedom from fear. That is why India has consistently and from the inception of her independence, stood for non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. Our entire State policy has been built on the four pillars of socialism, democracy, secularism and non-alignment. We have held fast to these principles and, over the years, have been gratified to see their growing acceptance around the world.

NON-ALIGNMENT

There are some who say that non-alignment has served its purpose and has no further role to play. This is a misreading of the international situation. It is the policy of alignment and not of non-alignment which has failed. This is evidenced in the disintegration of SEATO and CENTO. The nature of group tensions might have changed but tensions continue to exist. Non-alignment, cutting across as it does racial and regional barriers and rival power blocs, has got an even more vital role to play in easing these tensions, safeguarding, security. strengthening national independence and consoficlating peace in our troubled world.

Let us look around Asia and Africa. These are continents, newly liberated from colonialism, encompassing a multitude of emerging nations in various stages of social and economic development. One attribute is common to them all -nationalism, a sense of national identity, a pride and hope in national aspirations. There are also broader streams of regional nationalism. such as Arab nationalism which are proud and strong. In the exuberance of their newfound expression they are assertive, restless. They cannot be ignored.

It is hardly surprising that the focus of danger and of international insecurity has moved from Europe to the developing world, the so-called "third world" of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Here it is that we find (be tensions of development and growth, of nationalist upsurge, of external economic pressure and intrigue, of subversion and coups, coming to a boil. Here it is that certain powers seek to create and accentuate tension by calculated attacks on nonalignment and rejection of peaceful co-existence.

India belongs to Asia. And it is of Asia that

I should like to speak. and more especially, of South East Asia.

VIETNAM

The tragedy of Vietnam has filled us with anguish. War will solve nothing. It can only extend the area of damage and destruction and embitter relations for years ahead. Vietnam is

182

today a power-keg. An escalation might substantially enlarge and intensify the conflict with grave consequences for the peace of the world. There is no alternative to a peaceful settlement and it is to this end that we must all bend our energies.

We in India certainly cannot afford to be bystanders especially when a part of Asia is ablaze. No power should be allowed to block the path to peace. It is for this reason that I ventured to give expression to certain ideas on the eve of my departure from Delhi last week.

It seems to be almost universally agreed that the best, perhaps the only constructive, course would be to get all the parties concerned around the negotiating table within the framework of the Geneva Agreement. Meanwhile, there must be an immediate ending of the bombing of North Vietnam. This would create the climate for the holding of a conference and a swift cessation of hostilities and the complete withdrawal of foreign forces and armed personnel from Vietnam, in full observance of the Geneva Agreement.

There is nothing particularly novel in these suggestions. Nor is it our intention to present them in a package, as a rigid formula of any kind. There might be more suitable or acceptable alternatives. If so, we would be willing to support such proposals. Our sole objective at this movement is to focus attention on some simple, fundamental propositions and to deny the inevitability of escalation and destruction by the prolongation of the conflict. We have put forward our idea for a Conference on Vietnam in the same constructive spirit which prompted you to propose the Tashkent Conference.

Peace in Vietnam would also go a long way

towards bringing about conditions of greater stability in South-East Asia which like most other parts of the world, is in a state of flux. We are glad that the confrontation between Malaysia and Indonesia is ending and we hope this will lead to widening the area of peace and the strengthening of non-alignment.

WEST ASIA AND AFRICA

Our interest in West Asia and Africa is no less keen. The embers of colonialism and racialism might appear to glow in the wind of change. But these are dying embers. In cooperation with other countries we shall continue to make all possible efforts to wipe out these remnants of a shameful past. We support the people of Zimbabwe, South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, so-called "Portuguese" Guinea, Southern Arabia, Aden and other dependent territories in their struggle for freedom and independence. We consider our own freedom and independence incomplete until all countries under colonial domination achieve freedom.

Certain reactionary forces are at work in Asia and Africa. Some of these seek to exploit religion for narrow political advantage. Others are allied to entrenched social and economic privilege. It is not enough to condemn these forces. They can be influenced in positive directions and it is for the progressive forces to devote themselves to this task.

CHINA AND PAKISTAN CLOSE NEIGHBOURS

China and Pakistan are close neighbours of ours. We wish them well and make no claims on either except those of good neighbourliness and friendship. We are willing to come to a just and honourable settlement with China at any time.

The conflict in which we were involved with Pakistan last year was not of our making. We are grateful to the Soviet Government, and especially to Chairman Kosygin, for the patience with which they helped bring about the Tashkent meeting.

TASHKENT DECLARATION

India stands committed to the Tashkent De-

claration and is willing and anxious to implement it fully, both in letter and in spirit. It was the hope of our late Prime Minister, Mr. Shastri, that this would mark a point of departure in Indo-Pakistan relations. The Tashkent Declaration is a notable document because both parties have agreed to abjure the use of force in the settlement of disputes. The Tashkent Declaration is a manifesto of peaceful co-existence and postulates the pacific settlement of differences between States. We in India bear no ill-will towards Pakistan. We remain ever willing to enlarge friendly contacts between our two countries and Peoples-through cultural exchange, economic cooperation and collaboration, an easing of travel and transit restrictions, and in numerous other ways. I am sure that there is no problem between India and Pakistan which cannot be peacefully settled in a manner consistent with the honour and interest of both countries. We have extended the hand of friendship to Pakistan and hope that they will no longer hesitate to grasp it. We are prepared to meet with Pakistan at any level to discuss our problems and work out just and honour solutions.

DISARMAMENT

One other issue is of deep concern to us and to all mankind. This is general and complete disarmament. We believe that non-proliferation cannot be an end in itself. It can only be an interim stage which facilitates a movement

183

towards nuclear disarmament. Neither India, nor any other countray, can unilaterally impose a self-denving ordinance on itself if the nuclear powers themselves go on proliferating nuclear weapons and do not come to rational agreement regarding arms control. It is our hope that discussions on the banning of underground tests will mature into a formal international agreement. Meanwhile, the Moscow Test Ban Treaty is threatened by certain nuclear powers., While some kind of international guarantee to safeguard non-aligned, non-nuclear powers against the threat of a nuclear attack from a nuclear power may be useful, we do not think it is enough. Nor do nuclear free zones adequately answer the basic problem. These are only first steps. The real answer to nuclear armament is general and complete disarmament. This global

problem must be faced without delay.

UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations is the main hope of the world. We have always sought to strengthen that body and, despite our differences with China, have continued to support the principle of universality in its membership. We believe also that the United Nations should more truly reflect the present state of the world which has greatly altered since 1945 with the emergence to freedom of a very large number of Asian and African nations. These new nations deserve better representation in the various organs of the United Nations.

Our discussions with Chairman Kosygin and his colleagues on all these and many other matters have been frank, friendly and fruitful. For me this visit has been a rich experience-rich not only because of the understanding and wisdom of your leaders, but richer still because of Me sincere friendship and desire for peace of the great Soviet people. The people of India rejoice in your success and in your progress.

I bring greetings to the citizens of Moscow. May the spirit of peace and friendship always triumph.

May the bonds of Indo-Soviet friendship and cooperation grow stronger.

May cooperation between our two nations and all other friendly States help consolidate and promote peace in the world.

Bharat Soviet Maitri Amar Rahe. (Long Live Indo-Soviet friendship).

INDIA USA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND PERU UZBEKISTAN INDONESIA MALAYSIA ANGOLA SOUTH AFRICA ZIMBABWE GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE CHINA PAKISTAN

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Speech on Moscow Television

The following is the text of the Prime, Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's speech on Television in Moscow on July 15, 1966: Dear Soviet friends,

I bring you India's warm hearted greetings and good wishes. I am grateful to Soviet Television for the courtesy of being invited to your homes. I have come several times to the Soviet Union since 1953 and have known Soviet friendship and hospitality. In the name of the Indian people I should like to thank you personally for the kindness shown to me and to my party.

We are glad to have more and more Soviet visitors in our country-technicians, experts and others. There are also a large number of Indian students and technicians in the Soviet Union. I welcome these people to people contacts, for this will strengthen our friendship.

Compared to the Soviet Union, India is much smaller in size, but much larger in population. By next year you will have 500 million Indian friends.

India became independent 19 years ago. We have made tremendous progress in many directions. However, our agriculture still has to keep ahead of population to provide the food and fibre we need. We have taken up many large and small irrigation works including some giant schemes like the 680 kilometre long Rajasthan Canal which is converting a sandy desert into a garden and is irrigating the Soviet-aided Suratgarh State Farm. Our foodgrains production has increased by 75 per cent since 1950 and we hope to be substantially self-sufficient in grain by 1971.

Before independence we had a negligible industrial base. This has grown in size and sophistication. We are, today not merely building heavy equipment and machines but machines which build machines. We have developed and are further expanding a substantial steel industry. Amongst other articles, we manufacture motor cars, locomotives, ships and aircraft. Within the next decade, we hope to attain a stage of self-reliant growth.

The pace and quality of industrialisation has been greatly influenced by the generous assistance we have received from the Soviet Union both in terms of plant and equipment as well as of technical assistance. The most notable examples

184

of Indo-Soviet collabroation are in the field of heavy machine-building, steel, heavy electricals, oil refining and the manufacture of drugs. A second integrated iron and steel works is being established at Bokaro with Soviet assistance In Delhi, Russian is one of the languages spoken in some of our leading shops, and we have an Institute of Russian Studies.

INDO-SOVIET TRADE

Indo-Soviet trade has expanded very rapidly and the Soviet Union is one of our most imporant trading partners. The character of this trade has also undergone a change. Whereas previously the Soviet Union used predominantly to export capital goods to India and India raw materials to the Soviet Union, the current pattern of trade reveals a considerable amount of Indian manufactured exports to the Soviet Union-shoes, shirts and knitted garments-and Soviet raw materials and intermediates to India. We place great value on this trade, for experience has taught us that trade in terms of equality and mutual benefit is more valuable than aid.

SOCIALISM

Socialism is one of the cardinal principles of our State policy, along with democracy, secularism and non-alignment. The attainment of socialism in terms of equality of opportunity, social justice and reasonably comfortable living standards is still a long way off. But we are moving in this direction. The public sector occupies a position of increasing primacy in our economic affairs, especially in key industries. This is increasingly true of trade-foreign as well as internal. The cooperative sector is fast expanding and stimulating the process of socia-

lisation of trade.

Alongside, there is the equally important process of social transformation. Agrarian relations have been reformed. There is vast, improvement in health conditions. There, has been a tremendous boom in education. Women, are playing an increasingly active role at all levels of national life. There is an ever widening pool of skill and talent.

NON-ALIGNMENT

Our foreign policy is based on the principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. These principles are the best safeguards of the independence and integrity of development nations. our relations with the Soviet Union and other friendly countries have strengthened non-alignment. This policy is an active, not a passive one.

We are deeply concerned with war and human suffering and at this moment would like to add our voice to the urgent pleas for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. Our heart goes out to the courageous people of Vietnam. They must be left free to decide their own destiny without interference from outside forces or pressures. The bombing of North Vietnam must stop, Peace talks should be held to facilitate the cessation of all hostilities, withdrawal of all foreign armed personnel, and a political solution.

We are grateful to the Soviet Union for helping bring about the Tashkent Declaration between India and Pakistan. India fully supports this Declaration and is anxious to implement it. Our position on racialism and colonialism, our desire to see complete disarmament, and, our concern to narrow the dangerously widening gulf between rich and poor nations is well-known.

WARM GLOW OF INDO-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

On these problems and others the Soviet Union and India have been and are in a large measure of agreement.

I have had useful discussions with Chairman Kosygin and his colleagues. I shall carry back with me to India the warm glow of Indo-Soviet

friendship.

I know that we have a good friend in the Soviet Union and I should like you, the Soviet people, to know that you have no less a friend in the Indian people. This friendship is not merely a fact. It is an important factor in international relations.

I wish the Soviet Government and the friendly Soviet people success in their endeavours for further progress at home and peace in the world.

Spasiba !

Dosvidaniya !

RUSSIA INDIA USA LATVIA TOTO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC VIETNAM UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Press Conference in Moscow

The following is the transcript of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's Press Conference in Moscow on July 16, 1966:

VIETNAM

Question : Before you left India, you advanced some ideas for the settlement of the Vietnam

185 problem. Could you tell us what has been the

Prime Minister : Everybody appreciates our effort and motive, but the stand of the Soviet Government is that any proposal for a solution of the Vietnam problem should first have the ap-

Soviet Union's response to your proposals ?

proval of North Vietnam before it could be considered by the Soviet Union. The North Vietnamese are the people most concerned.

Question : What are your impression of the North Vietnamese attitude to your proposals?

Answer : They have not commented on our proposals so far.

Question : What is the Indian Government's view of keeping a United Nations Peace Keeping Force in Vietnam like the one in the Gaza Strip?

Answer : We believe that the best way for a solution of the Vietnam problem is through Geneva Agreements.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Question : What are the propapets of further economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and India after your visit?

Answer : Some of my Ministers preceded me to Moscow and economic collaboration was discussed. Details of this will be announced soon. During India's Fourth Five-Year Plan, the Soviet Union has agreed to help us to the tune of under 1,000 million roubles.

CYPRUS

Question : What is the Indian Government's position on Cyprus ?

Answer : We have supported the people of Cyprus for their independence.

Question: Would the Soviets like to wait for North Vietnam's views before taking any steps towards the solution of the problem ?

Answer: The North Vietnamese must ask them to intervene or expect their views before the Soviets would like to act. Stoppage of American bombings of North Vietnam is one of their preconditions for any peace talks.

TASHKENT DECLARATION

Question : Six months have elapsed since the Tashkent Declaration was signed. Are you

satisfied with the way things have been developing since then ?

Answer : There are two ways of looking at a thing. While the situation is not as good as might be, still it could have been much worse. We are not only willing but most anxious to implement it in letter and spirit. We are taking all steps In that direction.

Question : In view of the continuing American bombing of North Vietnam, will not the Indian Government undertake some steps to stop it ?

Answer : How can we take any steps, except appeal to them to stop it.

INDO-SOVIET TALKS

Question : Could you give us your general appreciation of the results of your negotiations with the Soviet leaders ?

Answer : I did not have any negotiations. I came here for an exchange of views. I have had very interesting and use talks which were held in an extremely frank and friendly atmosphere. Such exchanges of views are very necessary. have found them very valuable. Apart from the discussions which my Delegation had with the Soviet side, I had very long personal talks with Chairman Kosygin and Mr. Brezhnev also. Apart from getting to know the views and trends in this country, these talks helped us to know the persons at the helm of affairs in this country which is also very necessary. I am grateful to them for having given so much time.

IMPRESSIONS OF MOSCOW VISIT

Question : What are your impressions of the visit to Moscow ?

Answer: I am no stranger to Moscow. Every time I come here I see changes, growth, development and I think, each visit not only mine but of other Indian colleagues, strengthen the bonds of friendship between our two countries and creates greater understanding between us. My visit has been extremely useful and valuable. As Chairman Kosygin pointed out in one of his speeches, we have different systems in our countries, but there is also a large area of agreement and that is the whole basis of our relationship-non-alignment and co-existence, cooperation and collaboration with friendly countries.

Question : You are on the last leg of your visit to the U.A.R., Yugoslavia and Soviet Union. What are your impressions of the trip as a whole ?

Answer: The whole purpose was to meet old friends and to exchange views. This is what I have done in all these places. I have known President Nasser as also President Tito for many years. I exchanged views on a number of matters of mutual interest to our countries. All of us are neighbours in a sense and concerned about what is happening around us. It is useful to have other people's judgment and experience and knowledge on different matters.

Question : What part Indian-Soviet relations play in strengthening peace in our troubled world ?

Answer : Indian foreign policy has been based on the principle that we should find areas of

186

agreement, areas of peace and enlarge them. In that context, Soviet-Indian friendship is a factor for world peace. There are many matters on which we think alike and work together in the United Nations and other international forums, like anti-colonialism.

RUSSIA VIETNAM INDIA USA SWITZERLAND CYPRUS UZBEKISTAN YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Joint Communique

The following is the text of a joint communique

issued in Moscow on July 16, 1966 at the conclusion of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's 5-day official visit to the Soviet Union :

The Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid an official visit to Moscow from l2th to 16th July, 1966, at the invitation of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Prime Minister of India was accompanied by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, and high officials.

The Prime Minister of India and the members of her party were accorded a cordial welcome by the Government and the people of the Soviet Union, which attests to the feelings of sincere friendship harboured by the Soviet people towards the great Indian people.

The Prime Minister of India expressed her profound gratitude for the friendly and warm reception given to her and the members of her party in the Soviet Union.

The Prime Minister of India took part in a mass meeting of Soviet-Indian friendship at the Kremlin where speeches were made by the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, A. N. Kosygin, and the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

During her stay in Moscow, the Prime Minister of India had meetings and talks with L. I. Brezhnev, A. N. Kosygin and other leading figures of the Soviet Union.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet side were : A. A. Gromkyo, Minister of Foreign Affairs, N. S. Patolichev, Minister of Foreign Trade, S. A. Skachkov, Chairman of the State Committee for Economic Relations with Foreign Countries, N. P. Firyubin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, I. A. Benediktov, Ambassador of the USSR to India, and V. I. Likhachev, Chief of the South Asia Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, USSR.

Taking part in the talks on the Indian side were : Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, Shri L. K. Jha. Secretary to the Prime Minister, Shri T. N. Kaul, Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shri R. Jaipal, Charge d'Affaires of India in the USSR, and Shri B. G. Verghese, Information Adviser to the Prime Minister.

In the course of the talks, which were held in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, the two sides exchanged views on important international problems of mutual interest. They also discussed bilateral Soviet-Indian relations, and the prospects for the further consolidation and development of these relations.

Both sides were gratified to note the identity or closeness of the view-points of the two States on a broad range of international questions.

The Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of India declared their determination to continue to be guided in international policy by their common goal of ensuring peace. They believe that the creation of a strong foundation for peace and security throughout the world requires that inter-State relations should be based on the renunciation of the threat or use of force and the resolution of international disputes, including border disputes, solely by peaceful means. They also reaffirmed their faith in the principles of peaceful coexistence which call for respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and national independence, non-agression, equality and mutual benefit and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. In the opinion of the two sides, the consistent implementation of these principles generates favourable conditions for creative endeavour and for the improvement of the living standards of all peoples, opens up vast opportunities to direct the efforts of the developing nations towards strengthening their political and economic independence, and promotes the successful development of anti-colonial national liberation movements and the social progress of all mankind.

Proceeding from these high principles of foreign. policy the two sides expressed their firm determination to spare no effort in the search for ways to settle promptly outstanding international questions and eliminate the threat of war. They declared their intention to uphold by every possible means the cause of peace and combat attempts aimed at heightening international tensions.

Both sides noted the great importance in the present-day world of the policy of non-alignment

187

in the cause of Preventing war and strengthening peace, alleviating international tension and developing international cooperation.

The two sides expressed their concern over the deterioration of the international situation and the mounting war danger which have occured lately as a result of the aggressive actions of imperialist and other reactionary forces, The two sides believe that the heightening of international tension is a direct consequence of the application of force in international relations and the result of interference in the internal affairs of other countries and peoples.

In this situation, fraught with grave danger for the cause of peace between peoples, the two sides call upon all Governments to renounce the use of force and strictly observe the principles of Peaceful co-existence in relations between States. They believe it a vital necessity for all States to agree to put an end to foreign interference in the internal affairs of States and to refrain from exerting pressures. In this connection they appeal for respect for, and observance by all countries of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Interference in the Domestic Affairs of other States and the Safeguarding of their Independence and Sovereignty, which was unanimously approved at the 20th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The particular concern of the two sides is aroused by the dangerous situation in South-East Asia that has appeared as a result of the intensification of hostilities in Vietnam, and the extension of the bombings of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to the vicinity of Hanoi, its capital, and the port of Haiphong.

The two Governments state once again that the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam 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.

The Government of India shares the opinion of the Government of the USSR that the existence of foreign military bases constitutes an obstacle to cooperation between States. The Government of India shares the opinion of the Government of the USSR that the existence of Foreign military bases constitutes an obstacle to cooperation between States.

The Governments of India and the USSR agree that it would be in the interests of strengthening world peace and reducing international tensions if all military alliances are simultaneously dissolved.

Considering the task of easing world tensions as of utmost importance, the Soviet Union and India attach great significance to the problem of maintaining lasting peace and security in Europe.

A German peace settlement which corresponds to the interests of peace in Europe and in the whole world occupies an important place in the cause of maintaining European security and the achieving of an international detente. The two sides favour the necessity of undertaking appropriate measures for Its attainment.

The two sides feel that a constructive approach to the question of a German peace settlement and to other aspects of European security is possible solely on the basis of reality.

The Indian side reaffirmed the statement made by the late Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in the Soviet-Indian Communique of the 20th May, 1965 that 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.

The Soviet Union and India reaffirm their support to the peoples' struggle against colonialsm and neocolonialism in all its forms and manifestations. They express their sincere support for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are struggling for the attainment of freedom and strengthening of independence. Being convinced that every people should enjoy the right to determine their destiny in their own way, the two sides express themselves in favour of the complete elimination of the remaining colonial regimes in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1960.

Both sides strongly condemn the colonial regimes in Angola, Mozambique, so-called "Portuguese" Guinea and Southern Arabia. They denounce the racist policy of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and call for the full implementation Of the relevant UN resolutions.

The Soviet Union and India vigorously demand the ending of all interference in the affairs of nations which have freed themselves from connial domination.

Both sides continue to regard the achievement of general and complete disarmament, nuclear and conventional, under strict international control as an urgent necessity and they would welcome the convening of a world conference on disarmament with the participation of all the States in the world.

The two sides note the importance of an early agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in accordance with the principles approved by the 20th Session of the UN General

188

Assembly, intended to eliminate any possibility of the proliferation of nuclear weapons through their direct transfer by nuclear States to nonnuclear States, or through military alliances, groupings and association of countries, or by any other means. At the same time the two sides attach importance to measures, the implementation of which would reduce nuclear armaments, promote the elimination of the arms race, lessen world tensions and thus help towards a solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament.

It is the opinion of the two sides that it would be desirable inter alia to achieve early agreement on such measures as the elimination of military bases in alien territories, the banning of the use of nuclear weapons and the establishment of denuclearised zones in various parts of the world.

The Prime Minister of India expressed the determination of her Government to fully implement the Tashkent Declaration singed at the

meeting between the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan in Tashkent, and highly appreciated the positive and peaceful role played by the Soviet Government in bringing about this meeting through their good offices and in its successful conclusion. The Prime Minister of India informed the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, USSR, of the details of the steps that had been taken by India in pursuit of the Declaration. as well as the difficulties that had been encountered. The Soviet side assessed positively the information given by the Prime Minister of India and expressed the hope that the Governments of the two neighbouring countries, India and Pakistan, would exert all efforts to normalise their relations in all fields, step by step, and create a friendly atmosphere conducive to the solving of outstanding problems by direct bilateral negotiations on the basis of mutual non interference in internal affairs and renunciation of the use of force. no Soviet Government expressed its willingness to support any initiative displayed by the two parties concerned towards the further normalisation of Indo-Pakistan relations in accordance with the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration.

The Soviet Union and India reaffirmed their loyalty to the UN Charter and their firm intention to promote the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument of maintaining international mace and security on the basis of strict observance of the UN Charter.

In the course of the talks held in Moscow detailed consideration was given to the present state of the existing friendly relations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and India, and prospects for their further development were discussed.

The two sides expressed their intention to continue developing their political cooperation in the international area in the interests of the peoples of both countries and for the purposes of safeguarding and consolidating universal peace and security.

The two sides note with satisfaction that economic and technical cooperation between the two countries is developing successfully to their mutual benefit. It contributes to the strengthening of India's national economy. With the aid of the Soviet Union important new industries have been and are being established in India's public sector such as heavy engineering, oil, instrument-making and other industries; the problem of training and helping Indian national personnel to master modern technology is being successfully solved.

On behalf of the Government and the people of India the Prime Minister of India expressed deep gratitude to the Government and the people of the Soviet Union for economic and technical assistance for the development of India's economy.

In response to the wishes of the Indian side. the Government of the Soviet Union expressed its readiness to assist India in the construction of several State enterprises and projects envisaged in her fourth Five-Year Plan in the field of ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, mining, oil, power and other fields, as well as in the training of technical personnel.

The two sides have noted with satisfaction that as a result of the successful fulfilment of the Soviet-India trade agreements, trade between the two countries has in recent years considerably increased both in volume and in the variety of mutually delivered goods. The two sides have noted that the new long-term trade agreement between the two countries for 1966-1970 creates favourable conditions for the further successful development of trade between the Soviet Union and India.

Taking into account the great significance of commercial ties for the successful development of Soviet-Indian relations, the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of India expressed their willingness to ensure the successful implementation of the existing trade agreement on the basis of full equality and mutual benefit of both sides.

The two sides expressed their intention to continue developing scientific and cultural ties and to make every effort in order to consolidate friendship and understanding between the Soviet and Indian peoples.

Both sides attach great importance to personal contacts and exchanges of views between the

leading statesmen of the two countries. The

189 visit by the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to the Soviet Union is yet another important milestone in the development and strengthening of friendly Soviet-Indian relations.

The Prime Minister of India renewed the invitation to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, A. N. Kosygin, to visit India. The invitation was accepted with pleasure.

RUSSIA USA INDIA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND CHINA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA SOUTH AFRICA UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN MALI

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Prime Minister's Television Interview in Cairo

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid a visit to the United Arab Republic from July 8 to 10, 1966. On July 8, the Prime Minister gave a television interview in Cairo, an official summary of which is given below :

In a television interview on the night of July 8 in Cairo, the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi emphasised the close and friendly ties between India and the United Arab Republic and wished the continued growth of such friendship and cooperation. She said that such relations dated back to ancient times and they had considerably grown in the days of late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru when brotherly relations were developed between him and President Nasser.

Replying to a question on the points of similarity between the U.A.R, and India, Shrimati Gandhi said that both countries had similar problems which were different, however, in, their details. She said that the two countries were trying to develop a society based on traditions into a modern and progressive state. Both U.A.R. and India have ancient civilizations since the dawn of history.

Asked about her opinion regarding the relations between the two countries, present and future, the Indian Prime Minister said that such relations have been and still are good and they will be further strengthened in the future in the interest of both the countries. These relations established long ago were particularly strengthened under Jawaharlal Nehru when powerful brotherly ties bound him with President Nasser.

Answering a question on the women's role in developing nations, Shrimati Gandhi said that women who form half of the community are capable of playing a very major and important role in shaping the future of their countries. Indian women have also played a very effective role in the budding up of their country and now many of them occupy important positions. But this is not the ultimate objective. The point is not to have important positions for women so much as raising the women's level generally to make them play a useful role in their country's service. She said women in India and all parts of the world have proved that they can endure many hardships and this was particularly apparent during India's struggle.

Replying to another quetsion about family planning, she said that in India there was no resistance found. The main difficulty, however, was the application of sound and healthy means of family planning and making the required means and equipment easily known and available to the vast population of India. Our objective now, she said, is to reduce the birthrate from 40 to 25 per thousand.

Replying to a question on the most effective mass communication medium in India the Prime Minister said that as television had not developed in India the broadcasting service is the most important medium for reaching the masses. The cinema and documentary films are also effective instruments of mass communication,

Addressing a television audience Shrimati Gandhi wished the U.A.R. people success in

achieving prosperity and progress and expressed the hope that the bonds of friendship and brotherhood between the U.A.R. and the Indian peoples would be further strengthened. She also wished Egyptian women all success in the important role which they will have to shoulder in the near future.

190

EGYPT INDIA USA **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Prime Minister's Press Conference in Cairo

The following are the excerpts from Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's Press Conference in Cairo on July 9, 1966 :

Question : Has there ever been any change in your point of view on the policy of non-alignment ?

Answer : No, there has not been any change. In fact I think, it is more important today than it has been at any other time.

Question : Did South Vietnam figure in your talks and did President Nasser support your peace proposals made on July 7 ?

Answer : Yes, we talked about it and the President was in broad agreement with our point of view.

Question : Were any new concrete measures discussed ?

Answer : No new measures.

Question : Has there been any favourable

response from Moscow and London to your call for reconvening the 1954 Geneva Conference ?

Answer : Prime Minister Wilson is going to Moscow and presumably he will discuss the question.

Question : Do you think the convening of this conference will help a great deal towards the solution of the Vietnamese issue ?

Answer : I think so. Shooting would cease and in a situation which is so fraught with danger anything which might lead to the cessation of hostilities is worth trying. We seem to be in a deadlock and any measure that may give us opportunity is worth trying. The convening of the conference might lead to stopping of bombing and withdrawal of forces.

Question : Are you satisfied with the implementation of the Tashkent Agreement ?

Answer : No, I am not entirely satisfied. A great deal more can be done. We would like to implement the Tashkent Declaration both in letter and spirit, We think it is important for India and Pakistan to have peaceful and friendly relations in all matters.

Question : What are your views on what is called an Islamic Pact in this area?

Answer : India's views are well known. We do not approve of religion being used for political purposes. We are against this kind of pact.

Question : Were items for the tripartite Conference in Delhi discussed ?

Answer : No. That meeting is also informal. There is regular agenda for the meeting. We naturally talked about the conference.

EGYPT VIETNAM USA RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM SWITZERLAND UZBEKISTAN INDIA PAKISTAN **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Joint Press Statement on Prime Minister's Visit

The following is the text of a joint press statement issued in Cairo on July 10, 1966 at the conclusion of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's visit to the United Arab Republic :

On the invitation of President Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, accompanied by the Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh and Minister of State, Shri Dinesh Singh, paid a visit to the United Arab Republic from July 8 to July 10, 1966. Apart from meetings at personal level between the President and the Prime Minister, meetings' were also held between Ministers and officials of the two sides, The President and Prime Minister exchanged views on important international issues and discussed further development and strengthening of mutual relations. Discussions took place in an atmosphere of cordial frankness and warm friendship in keeping with the close relations that exist between India and the United Arab Republic.

These discussions and exchange of views are of special significance in the context of the international situation, need for the strengthening of non-alignment and increasing areas of peace and cooperation.

The two leaders stressed the vital importance to world peace of non-interference in the internal affairs of states and of policies of peaceful coexistence and active cooperation between states to bring about a lessening of tensions in the world.

The President and the Prime Minister exchanged views on important world issues affecting world peace. They agreed to exert all efforts in contributing to the establishment and consolidation

191

of world peace. They also agreed to meet in India on 21st October next for further consulta-

tions

The President and Prime Minister considered in some detail ways and means of further expanding the cooperation and friendly relations between India and the United Arab Republic in the economic, commercial, cultural and scientific fields to the mutual benefit of both the countries. They agreed that there should be periodic consultations at appropriate levels to further their common objectives.

The Prime Minister of India expressed her own and her government's high appreciation of the progressive policies followed by President Nasser and his government.

The President expressed his own and his government's admiration for the steadfast adherence by the Prime Minister of India and her government to the principles of democracy, socialism and non-alignment.

EGYPT USA INDIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U.S. Loan for Non-Project Imports

A United States Joan to India of \$ 150 million (Rs. 112.5 crores) to finance a broad range of commodity imports to help increase industrial and agricultural production is provided in an agreement signed in New Delhi on July 8, 1966.

The \$ 150 million is the amount immediately available as part of U.S. non-project assistance in support of India's, import liberalization programme. In May 1966, \$ 100 million had been made available to finance a broad range of commodity imports. The U.S. Government is giving consideration to the making of additional nonproject loans after Congress has acted on the current aid bill.

The agreement, signed by Shri C. S. Krishna Moorthi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Mr. Chester Bowles, United States Ambassador, raises the total of U.S. agreements for assistance to India since July 1965 to \$1,071 million (Rs. 803.3 crores), a record for a single year since the U.S. aid programme to India began 15 years ago.

Including the loan concluded today, the United States has during the Mt twelve months signed loans providing \$ 385.3 million (Rs. 289 crores) in foreign exchange. The foreign exchange assistance comprises \$ 250 million for non-project imports of important raw materials and spare parts, \$ 50 million for fertilizers, and a total of \$ 85.3 million for mineral exploration and for three power and irrigation projects. During the same period agreements have been concluded for the import of food, cotton and other agricultural commodities valued at \$ 685.6 million (Rs. 514.3 crores) under the U.S. Food for Peace (P.L. 480) programme.

The loan will provide foreign exchange needed for such vital imports as tinplate, flat steel products, special and alloy steel, spare parts for machinery,, vehicles, and construction equipment, non-ferrous metals, newsprint, fertilizers, pesticides, pesticide raw materials, and lubricants.

USA INDIA LATVIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's Speech at President Tito's Dinner

The following is the text of the Prime Minister,

Shrimati Indira Gandhi's reply to President Tito's toast at a dinner given in her honour by President Tito and Madame Jovanka Broz at Brioni on July 10, 1966 :

President Tito, Madame Broz, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure for we to be here this evening on this beautiful island.

192

Your words, Mr. President, bring to mind memories of a great friendship between you and my father, both partisans of peace and the larger friendship it symbolised between the people of Yugoslavia and India. Your thoughts reflect the feelings of my own country and people. Your people and mine share similar hopes and aspirations.

The courageous people of Yugoslavia have always stood and struggled for freedom and are fulfilling their aspirations under your determined and dynamic leadership. These aspirations include not only the reassertion of the national personality but the realisation of a social and economic revolution ensuring equality, progress and prosperity. Your bold and far-reaching experiments in the social and economic spheres have aroused world-wide interest and are of immense value to us in India.

Mr. President, you have referred to the historic meeting here ten years ago between my father and yourself together with our mutual friend President Nasser. I am glad that India will have the honour and pleasure to welcome you and President Nasser in October this year. This will be a meeting of three friendly and likeminded countries who are dedicated to the concept of non-alignment as an instrument of peace and peaceful co-existence. It will be a revival of the practice of holding periodic meetings between our three friendly governments. It is only natural that such discussions should be held from time to time to take stock of our common problems and to coordinate and collaborate our efforts in pursuance of our common objectives.

Mr. President, the dangers of the cold war and armed intervention are no less today than they were eleven years ago. Although some problems have been solved, new tensions have developed. The principle of non-alignment has as much validity today as it had when it was first conceived.

VIETNAM

When the world has become one neighbourhood Vietnam is no longer a far away country. The suffering of the people of Vietnam is the world's peril. That is why on the eve of my departure I gave expression to some ideas on this problem. We cannot be silent and helpless spectators of a situation which entails so much human suffering to the people of Vietnam. Peace is not the concern of great powers only, but of vital interest to all mankind. A special responsibility devolves on the non-aligned countries, as indeed upon all countries, to find war, and means of a just solution which meets the legitimate rights and hopes of the people of Vietnam. There is no alternative to a peaceful solution, except a bitter and bloody war that could engulf the entire world.

NON-ALIGNMENT

Mr President, we must build a better world, a more prosperous world. We must give greater social and economic content to non-alignment and co-existence, for how can there be a stable and peaceful co-existence between affluence and poverty, between very rich and very poor nations. Colonialism is dying but its ghost will haunt the world until political independence is matched with economic viability. Non-aligned nations have a positive and a creative role in promoting economic development and social change in protecting developing nations from external pressures.

More and more nations are today subscribing to non-alignment while military alliances are steadily weakening. Ten years ago non-align ment did arouse suspicions in certain quarters Today it is accepted and respected as an area of peace and disengagement, a bridge between conflicting blocks, an instrument for reducing world tensions. The world is not yet free from the threat of nuclear annihilation. Proliferation of nuclear arms constitutes a real danger. We have a responsibility to urge and assist general and complete disarmament.

MUTUAL COOPERATION

Our two countries differ in size and historical background; yet our problems are similar. We are composite societies comprising diverse ethnic and linguistic groups. We are both developing nations. We are both on the path of socialism, though Yugoslavia is far more advanced along the road than we are. We are both convinced that the tasks of economic transformation and social justice demand two pre-requisites, peace and international cooperation. Sharing so much in common it is but natural that India and Yugoslavia should draw closer together. I welcome your words, Mr. President. I too should like to see cooperation between our two countries grow and grow more rapidly in every field-in trade, industrial development, exchange of technical personnel and other fields. I also attach value to greater contacts between the younger generation through our universities and research establishments.

Our ties are close. Our friendship is firm. May our friendship grow stronger and, our relations closer.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I request you to join me in drinking a toast to the health of President Tito and Madame Broz and to the progress and prosperity of the friendly people of Yugoslavia.

193

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA VIETNAM **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's Television Interview in Brioni

The following is the text of an interview given by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. to the Yugoslav Radio Television in Brioni on July 11, 1966 :

Question : Mrs. Gandhi, this is your first visit to Yugoslavia in the capacity of Prime Minister of India. At the same time in this capacity it was your first meeting with Presidents Tito and Nasser, If you agree I would like to start this interview with a question : Which issues have been dominating in your talks with the Yugoslav and the United Arab Republic statesman?

ECONOMIC VIABILITY

Answer : Well, primarily how to strengthen non-alignment to face the new problems which are threatening, and confronting it, if non-alignment is now to function in a different framework-of polycentric power and of economic pressures and pressures of social change. But naturally it is also important for me to know the views of these world leaders about the various international affairs. President Tito is a man of great experience and it is very useful for me to know what he thinks of all these issues. For our countries, developing countries, it is important now to achieve economic viability or economic freedom because only that can give real meaning to political freedom. So these are some of the economic and political issues which we discussed.

Question : I would like to put a question about your country. As you know we in Yugoslavia ate saying a great attention to the development of India, her programmes and ambitions. Would you like to say which are your priority objectives concerning the development of your country ?

Answer : Well, our basic problem is the problem of Poverty and, therefore, to remove it and to develop the country the first priority is that of agricultural production specially in view of recent crop failures which we have had because of the unprecedented drought in the last year. But along with it we believe it is important to have a strong industrial base. We think the two things are linked up. You cannot really have agriculture alone completely divorced from industry especially from the point of view of a certain thing which agriculture itself need-, and also because of Providing employment. Then it is also necessary to brine about certain changes in administration to make it much more efficient and able to create an atmosphere in the country and to implement our policies and programmes.

U. N. ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Question : Mr. Prime Minister. you have the possibility to follow very closely development of other neighbouring countries and the whole Asian continent. Do you see in the conserted attitude of all Asian nations and other development countries at the forthcoming second U.N.Economic Conference a starting point towards more effective efforts to promote and speed up the development of those developing countries ?

Answer : Well, we certainly welcome this trade conference and trends. I think that much can be achieved if developing countries help one another even though they cannot do so on the same scale as the so-called advanced countries can but nevertheless I think that it is very important that they do help each other and support each other to the extent possible. Most of our countries and all of them are receiving aid and aid is important for us at this stage of our deve lopment but I think that trade is more urgent and more important because that will help the countries to be more independent and ready to build themselves up and to be not so dependent on aid.

Question : Now one personal question. Your personality and your name Mrs. Gandhi is very well-known in Yugoslavia. You were in politics before and you have a great experience in this field. But now as Prime Minister you certainly do have more conflicts between your wishes and your achievements. How do these conflicts influence you?

Answer : I would not say that I have more conflicts because I think my wishes were the same before as they are now because the primary concern is for having better standards of living for our people. There is naturally a very big gap between this wish and achievement of it, But I think that if one realises, that there is no magic cure for this kind of problem. that it can only be solved by dedicated persident hard work and in trying to promote certain policies and programmes then one can see that one is very slowly and steadily advancing towards the aim.

Question : We know about your close collabo-

ration with your late father Jawaharlal Nehru. Today in your practical polity and activities do the philosophy and ideas of your father play a decisive Part in your aspirations and dealing with problems?.

Answer: I think so because the policies which he worked were not the result of any Personal whim. They were based on a very thorough study of history of geography, of the circusdances in which India finds herself. And all those things are still the same. Our problems are basically the same and therefore. I believe that the path which he set out is the right path to solve those problems. But of course sometimes in matters of detail one may have to choose new

194

answers or choose a slightly different answer which I believe he would himself have done had he seen a change in the circumstances. We are sure that his were the right policies and they are correct policies for us to follow,

NON-ALIGNMENT

Question : It you allow, Mrs. Prime Minister, I would ask once again something about nonalignment. The policy of non-alignment had a very prominent place in your toast. How do you see the future of non-alignment and the expanding role of countries which have adopted this policy?

Answer : Non-alignment only come about when the world was divided into two hostile power blocks. And it was a way of not being involved with these two and of judging each issue on its own merits. Now, that is something that is so unexceptionable that you cannot really move away from it and in fact we have found in the last years that it is alignments which have cracked and not non-alignment. There are many countries which would not perhaps say they are nonaligned or say that they would like to belong to any third grouping but in fact they are moving away from these alliances. I think that nonalignment is the only way for a nation to really keep its independence, especially smaller developing nations. And it is also the only way in which world tensions can be reduced and, therefore, it enables us to work for peace. And peace is not only an ideal in itself---a good ideal--but also a necessity for all of us who have so much

to do within our own countries for development and progress.

Question : And my last question : Does the very high post which you are holding take much of your time you would like to devote probably to other intellectual activities and preoccupations?

Answer : Well, of course, it not only takes much of my time, it takes all of my time. But my life has been like this since I was quite small. I do not remember any time when I could say that well this time is for such and such work and that another time is for another and also I believe that life is one, you cannot shut off one part at any time, I mean intellectual activity goes alongside with all the others and I think in my present work there is plenty of scope for both intellectual exchanges and other types of activity.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA

Date : Jul 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Joint Press Statement on Prime Minister's Visit

The following is the text of a joint press statement issued on July 12, 1966 at the conclusion of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's visit to Yugoslavia :

On the invitation of President Josip Broz Tito and of the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, accompanied by the Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, and the Minister of State, Shri Dinesh Singh, paid a friendly visit to Yugoslavia from the 10th to 12th of July, 1966.

During the visit, President Josip Broz Tito,

the Chairman of the Federal Executive Council, Petar Stambolic and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and their associates had several meetings in the course of which they exchanged views and discussed in detail the present situation in the world and many important international issues as well as further promotion of cooperation between the two friendly countries.

The talks took place in an atmosphere of cordial frankness and complete mutual understanding which have once more manifested the tradition of friendly relations between Yugoslavia and India.

The President and Prime Minister noted that the developments in the world during the last years and the present situation justify the importance that the two countries attach to the policy of nonalignment as an instrument of peace and peaceful co-existence, which is the only alternative to war in the present nuclear era. They expressed, at the same time, their deep concern over the continued pursuit of the policy of force, interference and armed intervention in some parts of the world which constitutes a direct threat and a danger of wider escalation that could plunge the world in a major conflict.

The President and Prime Minister reaffirmed their belief in the necessity for increased and responsible initiative by all peace-minded countries and peoples with a view to joining their efforts in order to prevent a new catastrophe for mankind and to strengthen the political independence and economic viability of various countries, and in particular of the developing countries. They both attach special importance to frequent exchange of views, collaboration and coordination of efforts of non-aligned as indeed of all peace-loving countries, in pursuance of their common objectives which have already had a positive and vital role in reducing international tensions

195

and promoting peace and equitable international relations, and to which, both Yugoslavia and India will contirbute in the future.

The President and Prime Minister noted with satisfaction that the relations between Yugoslavia and India had been developing successfully and fruitfully for a number of years reflecting the close ties of friendship and cooperation between the two countries based on their adherence to the policy of non-alignment and on the common aspirations of their peoples towards peace and free and unhampered progressive social and economic development. They reaffirmed their positions and views, as stated on the occasion of the visits to Yugoslavia of President Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan and the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri in 1965, and the visit to India of the Prime Minister of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Peter Stambolic, earlier this year. The President expressed appreciation of India's efforts to solve peacefully the differences with her neighbours.

The President Josip Broz Tito and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi have expressed their satisfaction at the opportunity offered to them to continue the present exhaustive and friendly exchange of views and to meet with the President of the United Arab Republic, Gamal Abdel Nasser, in October, in India, to which they are looking forward.

The Prime Minister of India extended a cordial invitation to President Josip Broz Tito and Madame Broz to pay a State visit to India. which has been accepted with pleasure.

196

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1966

August

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1966 Vol. XII AUGUST No. 8

CONTENTS

PAGE

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Independence Day Message 197

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha opening the Debate on Fore ign

Affairs 199

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to the Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 205

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement welcoming the Malaysia-Indonesia Agreement 212

NEPAL

Joint Statement on the Visit of Nepalese Trade Delegation to India 212

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Resumption of Arms Aid to Pakistan by t he

U.S.A. 213

Shri Y. B. Chavan's Statements in the Parliament on Pakistani Military Bui ld-up 214

SOUTH WEST AFRICA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on the World Court's Judgmen t on

South West Africa . . 215

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

USA INDONESIA MALAYSIA NEPAL INDIA PAKISTAN **Date :** Aug 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Independence Day Message

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, broadcast to the Nation the following message on the eve of the ninteenth anniversary of the Independence Day (August 15):

Friends, I am glad to have this opportunity, on the eve of the nineteenth anniversary of our Independence Day, to say a few words to our nationals at home and abroad.

Though we are facing many difficulties, and all is not well with us, there is no need to be depressed. If we do not get lost in the clamour and bitterness of our day-to-day struggle, we will realise that there is much in us that is good and great. We have faith that we can overcome the difficulties by sustained and determined effort. We must be guided by an overall sense of direction and purpose.

We have adopted a democratic Constitution. It helps us to maintain our individuality in the face of mounting pressures for standardised thinking and acting. It makes for a good society, if not a great one. The only Government which can survive in the present climate of the world is one which tolerates dissent and criticism. Governments which impose uniformity of belief may last for a time but not for long. Democratic assemblies serve as safety valves for social tensions and prevent dangerous explosions. In an effective democracy, its members should be willing to accept lawful authority. No man, no group, can be his or its own law-giver. If we look around, we see on all sides growing lawlessness. Strikes, demonstrations, agitations for trivial issues are increasing. Our people, honest and hardworking in fields and factories, in educational institutions, in government offices, are stirred to a sense of deprivation and indignity, and are persuaded to indulge in activities, which result in a loosening of their moral fibre and loss of national property. We should not do anything which will harm our good name and well-being, In these difficult days it is the duty of us all to preserve democratic institutions and habits of behaviour. It should not be said that the agitational approach is the only way to have grievances redressed.

Early next year, we will have our general elections. Our representatives in the legislatures should represent our culture which has left an imprint on civilisation, through its philosophy, and religion, literature and art. Our teachers of pure ethics, satyam eva jayate, are listened to by millions all over the world. For over three thousand years their tireless appeal for intellectual integrity, for social justice, for the protection of the weak, has been a mighty driving force in our history. Their words and concepts have still the power to affect the minds and hearts of mankind. Our representatives, who will speak on behalf of our nation, should be cultured, disinterested, public spirited persons and not those who are lost in petty, personal, local, caste and communal squabbles and succumb to the seduction of power. The future of our country depends on the education of our masters.

Education is the instrument for social, economic and cultural change. If we are to work for social and national integration, if we are to foster moral and spiritual values, and increase productivity, agricultural and industrial, we have to use education in the proper way. Science and technology will help us to solve the problems of hunger and poverty, of disease and illiteracy, of superstition and deadening custom, of vast resources running to waste, of a rich country inhabited by a poor people. We have to free ourselves from the inertias and inefficiencies which have bogged down our programmes of development. Our administration, at all levels, should become clean and efficient.

Take the food situation. When we find that

in our country over seventy per cent of our population is occupied with agriculture, and yet we have to import foodgrains in considerable quantities' it shows that we are still a primitive society where vast areas of agriculture depend entirely on rain' In times of relative plenty we do not do enough to conserve stocks. In times of relative scarcity we fail to organise fair distribution. The shortages are aggravated by the selfishness of people, by boarding, speculation and mismanagement. We are not willing or able to take action against anti-social elements. An

197

honest and firm Government should be energetic in the matter of putting down corruption. It should to remove deceit and falsehood, intrigue and pusillanimity.

By a supreme national effort, we should improve conditions that will enable us to become self-sufficient in the matter of foodgrains in a few years. Agricultural development should be our first concern. Our farmers are intelligent and ready to learn. Our agricultural output has increased though it is not able to meet the requirements of an ever-growing population. From 361 millions in 1951, our population rose to 439 millions by 1961 and it now stands at 485 millions. The growth of industry and agriculture cannot keep pace with this rate of increase of population and it is essential to control our population

We have been debating the value and validity of devaluation. Recrimination does not help. Our concern today is to adopt drastic measures which will increase its gains and counteract its adverse consequences. We have taken the risk in the hope that we will have aid to finance imports and new projects and effect quick economic recovery. We are taking steps to prevent a wage price spiral, to augment production, to scale down expenditure in the public and private sectors. Strict monetary and fiscal restraint is called for. We have to face tough times and accept austerity measures. We must learn to live without many comforts and accept hardships without a murmur. Our health and character will improve by this salutary discipline. This should start, however, with those at the top for the large majority of our people are already leading austere lives by necessity.

Whatever arguments and attitudes may have justified wars in the past, the conditions of modern warfare and the growing conscience of mankind make it clear that wars cannot be ethically justified. Nuclear and bacteriological war means death to millions of men, damage to man genetically and contamination of earth, water and air. All these will nuke human survival difficult, if not impossible. In a nuclear war defence would bring its own destruction. We may arm ourselves with the most terrifying weapons, but a mortal blow will destroy the enemy and ourselves. Deeply disturbed by the horrors and brutalities of war and the sufferings of the people of Viet Nam and gravely concerned about any further enlargement of the conflict into world conflagration, we suggested the 'de-escalation' of the conflict in Viet Nam as the first stop to lessen tensions and prepare the atmosphere for an honourable settlement. The longing for peace represents the deepest feelings of the world, We should not deliberately store up anger and passion. We must fight prejudices and suspicions and develop the open mind and heart. There is no chance of understanding, if we think, that whatever comes from the other side, is fiendish and machiavellian. We should aim at conciliation and not capitulation.

While we should be prepared to resist aggression, we should aim at friendship with all nations and strive to achieve good neighbourly relations with Pakistan and China.

The economic development of both our countries-India and Pakistan-requires our making up with each other. Friendship between the two countries is not difficult. We are ethnically the same people. We have the same cultural background and common history. We speak the same languages. Why should we not become good friends? That is what we should work for. The obligations accepted at Tashkent, to renounce the use of force, not to interfere in each other's internal affairs, not to indulge in hostile propaganda, apply to all issues that now divide us. Given goodwill, we can cooperate immediately in the matter of refugees, border adjustments, river waters and trade. If, however, we persist in misunderstanding and resort to building up of arms, both our countries would be enfee-bled and endangered.

China and India will sooner or later, sooner than later, learn to live together in peace and cooperation. A just settlement of the questions dividing us is not impossible.

Nothing should be avoided because it is thought impossible. The only relevant question is, 'Does it require to be done ?' Then we must try and do it.

Each one of us should play his full part in setting things right. Our future belongs to the young, the young in spirit, the heroic- and the adventurous. The world has been generous to us in our need but we should not assume that it is obliged to sustain us. We have to build ourselves un and reduce our dependence on others. Long, hard, hazardous years lie before us. Let us enter on them with mature minds and clean hearts and above all with faith in our future.

198

USA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM CHINA PAKISTAN INDIA UZBEKISTAN

Date : Aug 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha opening the Debate on Foreign Affairs

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on August 8, 1966, opening the debate on international situation.

"Sir, I beg to move :

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Sir, it is not my intention to make a long speech at the beginning of this debate. I would like more time of the hon. Members to be utilised in making their own suggestions and their own assessment of the international situation, and I shall try to cover in my final reply the points of importance that are bound to be raised in the course of the debate. In the beginning, however, I feel that I should give some important information, and our assessment of the international situation, particularly in relation to our neighbours, and on one or two other important matters. In a sense, Mr. Chairman, the discussion on the international situation already started when the Defence Minister made a statement about the Pakistani military build-up, because this is the most important matter which is the concern of our country. This House and the country are naturally exercised over this issue. I will also in the course of my remarks say something about our relationship with Pakistan. Before that, Sir, with your permission I would like to say that our relations with other neighbours of ours are at the present moment particularly good.

NEPAL

Our immediate neighbours, Nepal, Burma and Ceylon are on very friendly terms with us. His Majesty the King of Nepal paid us a visit. The members of the Rashtriya Panchayat also came here and met Members of Parliament of both Houses here. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Nepal also visited us and met not only the Government leaders in Delhi but he also went round the country and had an opportunity of seeing for himself the great friendship and affection that the Nepalese people and the Nepalese Government enjoy amongst the people of our country. We am conscious of the great effort that is being made by His Majesty the King of Nepal in improving the living standards of the people of Nepal. We ourselves, to a small extent, are contributing our share and we are happy to do so notwithstanding our own difficulties to be able to render some little assistance as a token of our friendship and as a token of our desire to cement and strengthen the bonds of friendship that exist between the people of Nepal and the people of India.

BURMA

Sir, the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Burma, General-Ne Win, also paid us a visit some time back, and our relations with Burma are very cordial and very friendly. There has been cooperation between us in many spheres and we were particularly happly, and I want to acknowledge this with your permission that there was a spontaneous response from Burma when we made an urgent appeal to the Burmese for supplying us more rice to lighten our difficult rice situation in the country, and we are very happy that our difficulties were appreciated and there was a ready response and a friendly response from Burma to meet our requirements. There is glowing co-operation in several other fields, and collaboration in various spheres between Burma and India.

CEYLON

Sir, with Ceylon we have had very good relations, and the important question of the future of persons of Indian origin, who are now in Ceylon, has happily been settled, and the present Government is fully seized of this question and they have got a great deal of understanding about the difficulties and complexities of the situation and the resent Government of Ceylon are also in touch with the representatives of persons of Indian origin, who are in Ceylon, and are trying to work out the modalities and procedures for implementing the Agreement that had been signed between the Government of Ceylon and the Government of India.

AFGHANISTAN

Sir, going a little further, we have got excellent relations with Afghanistan. You, Sir, yourself as the Vice-President of our Republic, paid a goodwill visit to Afghanistan and you know, Sir, what was the feeling of friendship and the feeling of brotherly relations that were exhibited during your visit to Afghanistan. Our relations with Afghanistan have always been cordial and friendly and we have got several fields of collaboration, of providing training facilities, educational facilities in our educational institutions, particularly technological institutions, for the

199

students of Afghanistan, and I am sure that there

are several areas in which we can extend our cooperation and collaboration with Afghanistan wan whom we in India have bonds of traditional friendship.

Sir, I am sorry I cannot say the same about our two neighbours-I will come to that a little later-namely, China and Pakistan.

INDONESIA

In Southeast Asia, there are very significant developments that have taken place and are in the process of taking place. Out of this turmoil a new situation is emerging. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we are very happy that the present Government of Indonesia have expressed their desire to strengthen and improve relations between Indonesia and India. Our relations with Indonesia were traditionally very close and we had close collaboration not only bilateral but also in the nonaligned world, in the Afro-Asian community and in the United Nations. There was always a good deal of cooperation and understanding between us and Indonesia. This' unfortunately, received a rude shock about two or three years back and thereafter we were rather concerned about the sharp deterioration in our relationship, and the climax was reached at the time of the unfortunate Indo-Pakistan conflict. We on our side were always confident that there is inherent goodwill among the people of Indonesia for the people of India. There are historical bonds, bonds of culture and of common endeavour to end colonialism and we in India had always been greatly involved in the processes which led to the ultimate emergence of Indonesia as a free independent country. It was, however, unfortunate that these essential bonds of friendship and understanding between the people of two great countries, India and Indonesia, got a temporary setback and there were several incidents which I do not want to recall. I am happy that the patience that we had shown in this respect has yielded results and even on very difficult occasions we always continued to entertain the hope that the day was not far off when our relations would revert to the normal equation of friendship and understanding and comradeship. There are distinct signs of that developing now and taking a concrete shape. Hon. Members of this House must have noticed several statements

which have been made by the Foreign Minister, Dr. Adam Malik, and I greatly welcome the sentiments that be has expressed and I look forward to the pleasure of welcoming him when he visits our country'. because we have got everything to gain not only bilaterally but also we can be a factor, both Indonesia and India working together, for stability and for the maintenance of peace and for lowering of tensions in this part of the world.

MALAYSIA

We are also, Mr. Chairman, very happy that the two countries, Indonesia and Malaysia-Malaysia with whom we have got such close and friendly relations-are taking steps I which will be to the mutual advantage of those two countries, and the unfortunate confrontation which had bedevilled relations between Indonesia and Malaysia appears to be ending before long. It is our hope that this will happen very soon. These are our friendly countries. As for Malaysia we have always understood with a great deal of appreciation their peculiar difficulties. And we can add that Malaysia also has always understood our problems and there has been a special friendship between Malaysia and India. We are naturally happy, therefore, that the difficulties that were being faced by the government and people of Malaysia on account of the confrontation now appear to be on the point of being resolved and we would wish that this process is hastened and the relations between Indonesia and Malaysia, two countries which are neighbours of each other and which have several bonds which bind them together, bonds of history and culture and of common interest and respect for each other's severeignty and independence, these things will emerge as a positive force which will contribute, to stability and for lowering tension and for the development of healthy relations.

VIETNAM

Sir, the situation in Vietnam about which our Prime Minister made a statement on the 7th July, is a situation which is a matter of great concern for the whole of the world. We are very much ourselves gravely concerned, because it is a country which is in our neighbourhood. They are our brother Asians and the people of Vietnam are suffering from one difficulty or another, from one type of war or another type of conflict and war, for the last twenty one years. They have suffered very much and naturally our sympathies go out to the people of Vietnam. Sir, the present unfortunate situation has, therefore, naturally caused us concern. When we saw that there is grave risk of escalation of this unfortunate conflict, when the bombing of the areas in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong took place, we could not remain silent spectators because we thought--and rightly thought--that this is a situation which is fraught with very serious danger, the danger of escalation, danger where the human sufferings would increase, danger which might engulf other areas and other parts. So we made suggestions which were incorporated in the Prime Minister's statement. In essence, Mr. Chairman, this was a continuation of the policy that we had always adopted in this very difficult Vietnam situation. We have always held the view that there cannot be a military solution of this problem, that his problem must

200

be taken away from the battle field to the negotiating table and there should be a dialogue, a conference, a Geneva type conference, so that the agreements, the Geneva Agreements, may be implemented and the people of Vietnam may have an opportunity to decide about their future without any interference from any outside force, without any pressure from any side, direct or indirect.

This has been consistently our position. How to bring this about, how to take this difficult problem from the battle field to the conference table or to the negotiating forum? We came to this conclusion after a very careful study of the various aspects of the situation that this is not possible so long as bombing of North Vietnam continues. We made it therefore guite clear that the objective of finding a peaceful solution through a Geneva conference type of negotiation with the objective of implementing the Geneva Agreement, the hope for this could only be if the bombing of North Vietnam were to stop to be followed by a conference and a cessation of other hostilities. Now it is true that this suggestion made by our Prime Minister has not resulted either in a cessation of bombing or in other processes which we thought were likely to follow if bombing stopped. But I put it to this august

House that this appears to be the only hope if South East Asia and in fact the world is to be saved from a grave risk of escalation which might develop into a holocaust, which might engulf larger parts of the world and which might also involve other parts.

It is therefore very necessary for us to appreciate the situation. The dangers in the situation unfortunately persist and the extension of hostilities to the demilitarised zone is a further factor towards escalation. If the situation is to be saved, if the position is to be retrieved, there must be some move towards de-escalation and some beginning has to be made somewhere. If the whole world continues to throw up its hands and give this up as a difficult matter for which no solution is possible, this would not be a correct attitude and notwithstanding the immediate difficulties that any proposal or any suggestion is likely to meet, there must be a set of voices raised, powerful voices raised, which might open some way of finding a satisfactory solution of this very difficult and very complicated problem.

We are not adopting an attitude of trying to apportion blame. The most immediate thing which must attract our attention, which must attract the attention of the world community, the international community, is to find out some reasonable way of de-escalation and of trying to create conditions in which some dialogue might start. It is from this point of view that we made these proposals. Now, there have been some harsh critics, I think, more in this country perhaps than in other countries, of ideas which were put across very clearly and very boldly by our Prime Minister in her broadcast on the 7th July It is quite interesting that but for China which came out with a very clear statement denouncing these suggestions, the reactions from other countries have been very restrained. There has been a large volume of support for these ideas. Some of the countries have expressed it openly; others have conveyed to us in the course of our contacts with these countries but I cannot recall any other country except China which may have denounced them squarely and categorically. Well, that is not difficult to understand ...

The reactions from North Vietnam, I would like to repeat, have been very restrained. We should understand their attitude. So long as the present bombing continues and the present fighting continues in different parts of Vietnam it is not easy to expect that they would readily agree to the various steps. Naturally their expectation would be that they would think of them when something happens. They cannot be expected to give out their reactions in a totality of contingencies where one is contingent or dependent upon something else happening. Therefore, I would like to place this thought for the earnest consideration of this House that this very difficult situation which has dangerous potentialities is a matter of grave concern for the world and any effort that is directed to opening some way, some hope of de-escalation and of starting the other process of taking it away from the battle field is most welcome and as Prime Minister herself made it clear, we are not wedded to these proposals in the sense of trying to insist upon the actual formulation thereof. These are ideas and there can be suitable modifications, if necessary, provided they are acceptable. We are not opposed to any such modifications.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding the difficulties that we foresee it is our intention to continue our efforts in this direction and we are in touch with friendly countries and other concerned Powers and we will continue to do our best to contribute whatever we can to see that peace returns to these unfortunate people and the people of Vietnam are left to decide their future without any outside interference.

Sir, it is quite interesting that this formulation of Government of India's ideas is being criticised from two different angles. Some volume of opinion thinks it is too much to one side and the other thinks that it is too much to the opposite direction. The reactions which we know would be there are not unexpected but the main object in putting across these ideas was to open some hope in a situation which did not appear to open out any possibility of a peaceful settlement.

201

Sir, unfortunate feature of the situation in Vietnam is that it has its repercussions in other adjoining countries also. It has its repercussions in Laos and naturally we are greatly concerned; not only because these countries are our neighbours we have got historical ties, cultural ties, with these countries but also because they are suffering and suffering so terribly...

LAOS AND CAMBODIA

Our admiration goes for the heroic effort that Prince Souvanna Phouma is making to give a neutral Government to the State of Laos. He is facing very great difficulties and we have every sympathy for the difficulties that are being experienced by the Royal Laotian Government but we are confident that the situation in Laos will also take a turn for the better when the situation in Vietnam improves. The unfortunate position now is that the two situations are very much interlinked and there is little chance of the situation in Laos improving without an improvement of the situation in Vietnam. Sir, Cambodia also has under the very dynamic leadership of Prince Sihanouk, succeeded in maintaining its independence and sovereignty. Prince Sihanouk has been able to give a stable government to Cambodia. We have always been strongly and stoutly in favour of maintaining the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cambodia. The troubles which the Cambodian people are facing, particularly on their borders, are troubles which naturally are a matter of concern. Some proposals have been made by Cambodia towards strengthening the functioning of the International Control commission and the matter is receiving the attention of the two Co-Chairmen, i.e., the Soviet and the British, and no final decision has yet been taken.

JAPAN

Sir, our relations with several Southeast Asian countries, viz., Japan, Thailand and the Philippines, are friendly. With Japan particularly we have got not only increasing economic relations, but also we have establised a system whereby there am periodical consultations between the representatives of the Government of Japan and the Government of India, so that there can be exchange of views on important issues that affect us bilaterally and also the bigger issues of peace and war. (Interruption).

PHILIPPINES AND THAILAND

With the Philippines and Thailand we have had several contacts. Our Speaker and Members

of Parliament paid a goodwill visit to the Philippines some time back and they were well received. There is a great deal of understanding of our position. Although we are conscious of the fact that our views are not always identical, particularly on political issues, this is a case where friendship and understanding has grown notwithstaning differences on several issues. Our endeavours to strengthen our relations with these countries will continue.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

The Australian and New Zealand Governments have helped us a great deal in the economic field in a concrete manner. I am mentioning all these things, so that the House may have some idea of the. situation in our neighbourhood and this is a matter which will be of interest to this House and the countries concerned. With Australia and New Zealand, both of whom are members of the Commonwealth, we have numerous contacts and we work together in several fields in the United Nations and the Commonwealth. Our friendship and relations are good.

PAKISTAN

Now, Sir, I wish I could say the same thing about our two other neighbours, Pakistan and China. Now, about Pakistan, in continuation of what the Defence Minister has stated this morning about the military build-up in Pakistan. I would like to say only this. We have signed the Tashkent Declaration with Pakistan. It is our earnest belief that the Tashkent Declaration does provide a basis for improvement of relations between the two countries. If this Declaration, the undertakings and the obligations which have been taken on by the signatories-India and Pakistan-are adhered to, it would open up the prospect of reversing the unfortunate trends of deterioration in the relationship between the two countries. We are still hoping that the wisdom of developing good neighbourly relations will not be lost sight of. The various steps, which are clearly mentioned in the Tashkent Declaration, for settling several matters, which affect the lives of millions of people both in India and Pakistan, would open the way for reversing the trend of deterioration and open the way for the development of good neighbourly relations.

Mr. Chairman, for some weeks after the signing of the Tashkent Declaration there were indications that Pakistan would take some steps towards implementing the Tashkent Declaration. In pursuance of this we ourselves took a very high-powered team to Rawalpindi for discussion and settlement of several matters which required urgent consideration, discussion and settlement between the two countries. I would not be far wrong if I were to say that the team that went to Rawalpindi was the most high-powered team that ever left India for any other country, including Pakistan. There were- three Cabinet Ministers, four or five Secretaries to the Government, several other members of the subordinate staff. because we were anxious that matters should not remain pending and that there and then, as soon

202

as some settlement, in principle, was in sight, follow-up action might be taken immediately, so that concrete things might emerge as a result of the discussions. We were, however, disappointed. We have continued our efforts. There we had agreed that we would meet again. We have made an offer, as the House is no doubt aware, to the Pakistan Government that there could be and should be a meeting at official level, which could prepare the ground for a meeting at Ministers' level. There was response from the other side, which was not very helpful. We have again proposed to the Government of Pakistan that there should be a meeting at the official level and this meeting should be without any pre-condition and there should be freedom for either party to raise any point that they like. It should not be circumscribed by any condition. That is a very fair proposal and it is our earnest hope hat, even at this stage, Pakistan will react positively to our suggestion, and a meeting at official level might be possible and thereafter a meeting at Ministers' level and other levels, so that we might be able to take concrete decisions in the economic field and several other fields. In the field of communications we, on our side, have taken several initiatives and our endeavours will continue towards implementing the Tashkent Declaration and we are hoping that Pakistan would also respond. At the same time, the burden that is cast upon us of continuing to take steps towards strengthening our country cannot be ignored. It is in that context the statement made by the Defence Minister this morning is relevant.

This means a heavy burden, which we have to carry, but there is no option. Still it is our earnest hope that in a situation like this the crying needs of the people of India and Pakistan should not be forgotten, the needs of improving their living standards, of taking steps to improve their day-to-day life which obviously is very seriously affected when large resources are diverted to this armament race about which mention was made this morning; whereas, if positive steps are taken under the Tashkent Declaration, then a situation develops in which greater resources can be earmarked for the real development purposes of the country and for the benefit of crores of people in India and Pakistan. It is in that direction that we must have the ultimate objective and should work to ensure a state in which this type of craze for acquiring armament does not exist. The hon. Defence Minister gave some information and it is amazing how Pakistan went to all and sundry in the world getting arms from all conceivable sources, some openly, some even surreptitiously. This is a very dangerous and, I Should say, a very senseless approach.

India is a big country. We have also got our responsibilities, and if Pakistan ever feels that it can browbeat India by this type of attitude, I think Pakistan is sadly mistaken. We on our side am fully conscious of the role that we should play and which we am determined to play, namely, to work for improvement of relations, and it is my earnest hope and desire that there will be a response from the side of Pakistan. If we go on tying knots, it is easy, but if we put one contingency or one condition as a condition precedent for anything else happening, it is easy to build up a case and build up an atmosphere of that type. Where does it take us, the two countries 7 Where does it take the people of our two countries who are neighbours and who have a common heritage of history, of culture, of language and several other points of contact ? So it is our hope that our efforts which are genuine and sincere and about which I have no doubt in my mind will succeed, and that the people of Pakistan, the 10 crores or 11 crores of people in Pakistan, do want to live in peace and friendship with the people of India as good neighbours, and it is our hope that these forces which are forces of lowering of tension and of improving relations will prevail and the present difficulties would be got over.

An hon. Member: We are the same people.

External Affairs Minister: We are the same people, the hon. Member has rightly reminded me. He himself was brought up in Rawalpindi which is now the capital of Pakistan, and there are several other persons there who were born here in India, and it is therefore in the mutual interest of the people on either side that our relations should improve.

CHINA AND TASHKENT DECLARATION

Sir, I cannot help remarking that this unfortunate, intransigent attitude, an attitude of going away from the Tashkent spirit, has been greatly instigated by the attitude of China. It is quite interesting that China is the solitary country in this world which condemned the Tashkent Declaration as soon as the Tashkent Declaration was signed by the two countries. It is amazing. Two countries through their Heads of Government solemnly sign a declaration which is not directed against China. It is the determination of the two countries to resolve all their differences by peaceful means and to take positive steps in the economic, cultural and several other fields to improve relations. It is difficult to imagine any country in this wide world at any time in hostory, I would add, which might have objected to an agreement of this type, and it goes to the credit of our at neighbour, the Peoples Republic of China that they came out strongly to condemn this Tashkent Declaration. It is difficult for me, to imagine as to what could be the reason for doing this, but probably the rulers of China do not always look to reason and if they have got any particular objective before them, then they would not be influenced either by logic or by the hard facts of history but would just go in in pursuit of their

203

own notion of keeping up conflict in all parts of the world. Unfortunately there is one country in the world today, China, which does not believe in the efficacy of peaceful means for resolving any disputes, and this is the main question that divides China today from the rest of the world. Other countries, even though they do not agree with each other, which are ideologically completely different from each other or countries that have difficult, basic points of difference and potential conflict between them, continue to hope that it is possible to resolve even the most diffi-Cult and complicated problems by peaceful means. But China does not accept that. They somehow or other continue to toe this fine, the inevitability of war and conflict for resolving anything; but the world knows that conflict and war do not solve any problems. If anything, they complicate those problems apart from unleashing misery and suffering on the people of the world.

So this intransigent attitude of Pakistan is traceable to this collusion and this alliance between China and Pakistan. Sometimes I have every sympathy with the people of Pakistan when their leaders slip into this China way of thinking. But it is for them to decide. It is not for me to give any advice. I know that to anything that we say in the present unfortunate relationship the reaction on their minds is the opposite. It is for them to see as to what is happening in other parts of the world, for them to be convinced as to whether the path that they are pursuing is even in their own best interest or in the best interest of their people. It is amazing, Mr. Chairman, that not people did they condemn the Tashkent Declaration, I think, on the very first or second day after it was signed but later on took other steps. In this connection I would like to mention the visits of Chairman Liu Shao-chi, Foreign Minister Marshal Chen-vi and later of Premier Chou En-lai to Pakistan. In the course of these visits it was amazing to we the way they tried to create an impression, the Chinese leaders, in the minds of the people of Pakistan that the Chinese were their real supporters, and they made statements even which went far beyond Pakistans attitude on many issues. So this is how this instigation has worked. About China, we have on several occasions stated that they are our neighbours and that the Colombo Proposals could form the basis of further discussions, further talks. They opened a way for resolving our differences. But all these things were cornpletely rejected by China and they continue to reject them and now there attitude is one of total Hostility, of complete opposition to whatever India says. And India now is generally clubbed with others-what the chinese describe as imperialist USA, revisionist USSR and reactionary

India.' Now these days, in any Chinese formulation this is the phraseology that they generally employ. These are the three expressions that they are using. Fortunately for us, I think, we have not got that vocabulary, abuses which can match the abuses that are hurled by China against us. (Interruption).

Sir, I was saying that the attitude of China which unfortunately has now developed into one of complete opposition and hostility to India is something which imposes a greater burden on us to be vigilant and to strengthen our unity and our determination to face whatever may be the difficulties that might be created by this type of attitude and by this type of collusion between Pakistan and China.

MEETING OF THREE HEADS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chairman, there are only one or two more points which I would like to say at this stage. As you know, our Prime Minister paid a visit to Cario, Brioni and Moscow and after that a statement was made by her on the floor of the I louse. We welcome the forthcoming meeting of the three Heads of Government which is proposed to be held in Delhi. President Tito, President Nasser and our Prime Minister are meeting here in India some time in October and this will be an opportunity to exchange views on factors that not only affect our relations inter se but also the international situation, the ways to strengthen non-alignment and to successfully combat the dangers that non-aligned countries are facing. These are important matters that are bound to be discussed.

RHODESIA

About the African situation, I would like to make a mention only of two matters. One is the situation in Rhodesia which, unfortunately, continues to be very very difficult. The sanctions which the United Kingdom had imposed against Rhodesia do not appear to be yielding results. And we have always held the view that not only economic sanctions but all other sanctions including the use of force should be employed so that the illegal, racist regime of Rhodesia should be ended and power restored to the majority people of Rhodesia.

SOUTH WEST AFRICA

About South West Africa, I made a statement the other day about the judgment of the World Court. That is another very important issue and I am sure, the support that this Parliament gives to the legitimate aspirations of the majority people of South West Africa would not only hearten them but would create an atmosphere in the United Nations which will mount up the requisite measure of pressure against South Africa so that they can end their hold upon South West Africa and the mandate of the United N ions is restored and that South West Africa is enabled to

204

achieve their cherished goal of freedom which is the legitimate and rightful expectation of the majority of the people of South West Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I have in answer to some questions given information to Parliament about the efforts for disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. I do not want to say anything more except to remind the House that at the present moment the difficulties are many and real. But ultimate peace depends upon the efforts that are being made for disarmament and the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. They open the only hope for the world and for maintaining the forces of peace in the world.

USA INDIA PAKISTAN NEPAL BURMA AFGHANISTAN CHINA INDONESIA PERU MALI MALAYSIA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LAOS CAMBODIA UNITED KINGDOM JAPAN THAILAND PHILIPPINES AUSTRALIA NEW ZEALAND UZBEKISTAN SRI LANKA RUSSIA SOUTH AFRICA

Date : Aug 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Shigh's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Replying to the debate on international situation in the Rajya Sabha on August 10. 1966, the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, said :

Madam Deputy Chairman, I have listened with great interest to this debate. Although normally the function of the Minister is to reply to the debate, on going through the debate and listening very carefully to the debate I feel that there is not much to reply for a variety of reasons. On the opposition side several sets of formulations have been made which are mutually contradictory, and I have not been able to find any coherence of approach on any single issue of international importance.... Therefore the actual points that have been raised really do not call for reply in this sense that on all important international issues, whether it is the question of Vietnam, our attitude to Pakistan, our assessment of the Chinese intentions and what we do. or even on the German question or the question of international security, there is hardly any coherence of approach amongst the Members of the opposition. Therefore, there is not much to reply if I may again repeat, but I have a duty to perform not of replying but of winding up the debate, and that is what I propose to do. They have themselves replied to each other although in their own way, and much of their argument and much of their anger and of their criticism are mutually exclusive.

Further, Madam Deputy Chairman, my task has been greatly lightened because to some of the specific issues that have been raised by different representative spokesmen of the opposition groups effective replies have been given by my colleagues on this side of the House, and some of the speeches that have been made in the course of this debate are really noteworthy. My colleague, Shri Karmarkar, in a very lucid speech countered some of the points that had been raised by Shri Dahyabhai Patel. Several other speakers on this side, my esteemed friend, Mr. Govinda Reddy, Mrs. Khan, Dr. Anup Singh and Shri Sri Rama Reddy, have given very cogent replies, also Diwan Chaman Lal replied to our friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Shri Rajnarain was not present yesterday; otherwise sonic of our colleagues might have replied to him. Normally we do not reply to the remarks made by any Member if that Member is not actually present in the House.

My task therefore has been very much lightened by this effective intervention by the Members of the Congress Party who have given replies to the points that were made by several speakers from the opposition benches. That does not however mean that I am absolved of the responsibility of placing before this august House and the country, Government's attitude on important issues. In that the absence of coherence of approach in the opposition parties places even greater responsibility upon the Government and the Party which is running the Government to see clearly in this maze of conflicting criticism the correct attitude that has to be adopted in all these difficult, complicated and controversial issues, and it is in that spirit that I would touch upon some of the important points that have been raised.

At the very beginning I would like to say that several points by way of suggestions have been made from this side of the House and from the opposition benches, suggestions to improve the working of our Missions and our publicity arrangements. These are non-controversial points, and I would say that I have greatly benefited. by these suggestions which will certainly receive very careful consideration, and continuous effort will be made to improve the working of the Ministry and its Missions in all the various spheres. It might be recalled that in my opening remarks I gave my assessment of the situation mostly of the Asian continent, particularly South East Asia, and I made a brief reference to two important issues about Africa. In the course of the debate several points have cropped up and I will venture to give Government's stand with regard to some of these issues.

EUROPEAN QUESTION

Madam Deputy Chairman the European question has been referred to from various angles. I

205

would say that the European question is very important from the point of view of international peace. Let us not forget that the two last world wars originated in Europe. The international community cannot therefore remain unmindful of what happens in Europe, what are the forces that interact and what are the, effects of that interaction upon the maintenance of world peace. Europe does occupy a central position not only in the economic world but in the political field also. It is in this background that we have to view some of the European problems that have cropped up in the course of the debate.

We were happy that the process of relaxation, the process of detente, the, process of gradual understanding was emerging in the European situation. The original rigidity and the cold war postures which were the characteristics of the post-war period were gradually giving way to these forces of relaxation. The principle of peaceful co-existence was gradually accepted by both the Eastern and the Western Blocs and there were signs of growing co-operation in the economic field between the East European countries and the West European countries, including the USA. As a result of this process of relaxation and detente, the Moscow Test Ban Treaty came into existence. The basic advantage of that treaty is not only the substance or the actual terms of the treaty but the principle of confidence which is the basis of that treaty. There are several lacunae in that treaty and in the United Nations and elsewhere, serious efforts were being made to make countries who have not done so to sign the partial nuclear test ban treaty. Also it has been suggested that it may be extended to underground tests. But all this process has received a definite setback and this is a disquieting development. Again, the attitude that had been adopted by certain members of the NATO Alliance as also by the Warsaw Pact group of countries was indicative of a greater assertion of their individual personality and independence. I am not suggesting, as some lion. Members have suggested, that these pacts were crumbling or that their validity had ceased to be of any great significance. I do not accept that. But it is true that the individual members of both these Pacts were trying to adopt postures which showed an independent, individual approach, a national approach, a freshness of approach, about the appreciation of the international situation. This was all to the good. I am sorry, however, to inform this august House that this process has received a certain setback and this again is traceable to the happenings in Vietnam. It is for this reason that we attach importance to Vietnam. Some lion. Members asked

why I should bother about what happens in Vietnam. This world has now become so complex and the processes of building up tensions or of generating relaxations are so intermixed that it is difficult to consider any part of the world in isolation. Peace has become indivisible and disturbance of peace in any part of the world has got its ramifications all over. 'Be full impact of it, if you examine it superificially, cannot be fully appreciated. It is in this background that we have to examine the, whole of this international complex and this international situation. The Viet am situation has had a direct effect on this process of detente in Europe and I now find that in many respects, even in the 18-nation Disarmament Committee which was making some progress towards the evolution of an acceptable principle for disarmament, there is a distinct setback in the functioning of that Committee and the main super powers are adopting very rigid attitudes even in the Disarmament Committee. In fact, in private, some of these countries have expressed their viewpoint that any purposeful talk about disarmament, about non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, appears to be unreal so long as the process of escalation continues in Vietnam and there is a great deal of validity in this attitude. The European situation, therefore, is important from the world peace point of view and every country has got a vested interest in peace. In respect of a country like India, not only on account of the pursuit of a policy of trying to work for peace, but even in our own self-interest, we are very much into-rested in the maintenance of peace in the world. Otherwise, all our plans for the fulfilment of our dream of raising die standard of living of the people of this sub-continent cannot be realised. It is essential therefore for us to always continue to have the correct type of attitude on all these important issues, issues of peace and war, because on this depends the future progress of the world, and also our own progress.

GERMAN QUESTION

The German question also has to be viewed in this context. The German question is one of the most difficult and most complex problems and we have adopted a certain attitude with regard to the German question. This was stated on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other House by our leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, on several occasions, and the passage of time had only demonstrated unmistakably that the attitude that our leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, had taken in this respect was the correct attitude and continues to be the correct attitude. Sometimes I feel surprised when critics from the extreme right or from the extreme left assail our policy in this respect. We continue to follow the policy which was enunciated after a great deal of consideration and the validity of which continues even today.

In precise terms I would again like to state the position because there is some confusion in this respect. There has been criticism that we have shifted from our previous stand on the German question in the Indo-Soviet Joint Communique.

206

This is an unfounded criticism. The substantive paragraph on Germany in that joint communique is not different from what was said in several joint communique with the Soviet Union in the past. What is stated is almost exactly the same as was stated in the Shastri-Kosygin Joint Communique of 20th May, 1965, in the communique issued on the occasion of our President's visit to the USSR on September 19, 1964 and going further, in what was stated in the Jawaharlal Nehru-Khruschev communique of September 10, 1961. We have friendly relations with the Federal Republic of Germany., We understand the strength of feelings on die question of German reunification....These feelings are but natural. We can sympathise with such aspirations. The German question, however, is a complicated one. It is mixed up with the question of European security and a future German peace treaty. In our view it is a question which must be resolved by the European States concerned in a spirit of mutual understanding of each other's point of view. No pressure or force should be exercised to secure any particular solution. By any positive action on our part we do not wish to introduce further complication in an already difficult situation. We have not given recognition to East Germany. It is, however, our policy to develop further trade and cultural relations with East Germany which have been growing rapidly in recent years. The Federal Republic of Germany themselves have flourishing trade with East Germany. We are happy that the people of East Germany are friendly to India and have shown

their friendliness in very many ways.

Madam, I considered it necessary to re-enunciate the policy that we have pursued so far so that there may be no scope for criticism from either side. It is absolutely incorrect that in subscribing to the last Indo-Soviet Joint Communiquewe were in any manner pressurised by any country. Any such suggestion is absolutely incorrect. This Was a policy which we had followed and this is a policy which we continue to follow. What is done in the Indo-Soviet Joint Communique is nothing more and nothing less than a mention of this policy which we have consistently followed.

Then, again, Madam Deputy Chairman, the speakers from the benches opposite complained of pressures. The extreme leftists these days is the Swatantra Party because they sit on the extreme left side of the House. Then we have the Communist Right and the Communist Left. Some voices were raised, without naming anybody-because I cannot name while answering the criticisms-that in giving aid some of the countries are pressurising us on political matters. Now this has become a very favourite theme these days and this is considered to be relevant to remark while speaking on the floor of the House on any matter, economic, non-economic, political or internal or outside situation. In all these matters they try to say that we have been pressurised, according to one sect of people, by one group of countries and, according to the other sect of people, by the other group of countries. To a certain extent it is some satisfaction for me to recall, rather it gives me some satisfaction that the pursuit of policy is the correct one. The critic-ism from the extreme sides has given me some sort of satisfaction though I do not depend upon that satisfaction because my attitude in this respect is positive. But I got confirmed in the belief that the policies that we are pursuing are the correct policies. Now what are these pressures ?

A great deal has been said about these pressures. It is true that in the economic field we have received very massive help from a large number of friendly countries. Now this House is no doubt aware of all those countries who have helped us in this respect. The largest quantum of help that we have received, in our economic aid, in our industrial growth, has been from the United States of America and we have always acknowledged the help that has been so generously given to us for our economic development. Then, again, we have received a very large measure of economic help from the Soviet Union in building our important basic industries and critical sectors of our economy. We have always acknowledged that, and I am very happy to reiterate our thanks to the Soviet Union for the understanding they have always shown to the needs of our development and the concrete help that has always been forthcoming for our economic development. (Interruption)

Then, again from the West European countries, from the United Kingdom, from West Germany and other West European countries we have received a large measure of help in the form of machinery, in the form of technological knowhow and in the form of credit and we greatly value that. From our own brother Asian countries, Japan, we have received help. We have received help from the East European countries.

An hon. Member: Begging.

External Affairs Minister: We have not been begging. We know what are the problems that face our country. There is no question of begging. It is the duty of developed countries that they should participate in the development of undeveloped countries. We have always made the position quite clear. Just as peace and war are indivisible, similarly, poverty and affluence also are indivisible. We refuse to accept the proposition that it is only this attitude of begging which is the motive for persuading other countries to give aid. We do not accept that. It is the duty of developed countries to come to the help of other countries which are not developed.....

207

Madam Deputy Chairman, in the economic development, in meeting our difficulties and in ensuring the progress of our country we have received help from East European countries, from the Soviet Union, from Western democracies, from the United States of America, from Japan. And what are these pressures I would like to understand. Who is pressurising whom? And in which direction are we going to be pressurised by these various pressures ? I am sorry for the people who cannot get out of this complex of begging or who cannot think that a big country like India, with its huge population and a vigilan, Parliament can be independent of pressures; even if they think that such a big country cannot withstand the so-called pressures. I have no other word except to say that I sympathise with their own diffidence and I cannot come to their rescue.

Again, what is this question of pressure? Who will pressurise me against whom ? What I am saying is that the pursuit of Indian policies by us has been such that even countries that follow different social systems, different political systems, have felt attracted to participate in this "citing experiment that is going on in our country of development of our country. Therefore, they have come forward in that spirit. Even if there was some idea or some feeling or somebody has whispered into the ears of some of them that there might be pressures, the pattern of assistance is such that these pressures, if anything, will mutually exclude each other, and we will emerge as a country which is pursuing an independent policy. There is no question of succumbing to any type of pressure

Some hon'ble Member said that we are trying to alter the policy after the time of Panditji. He traced it to Panditji's time that we have started deviating from the last Non-alignment Conference at Belgrade. These are far-fetched, silly ideas, I would say. One really feels disgusted with our own nationals trying to denigrate our attitude and our national prestige by trying to import things by some sort of an eye on either the elections or for political reasons. These are not valid reasons at all when they put forward such objections. I would strongly commend for the consideration of this House that the policy that we have pursued in the political field, in the international sphere, has enabled us to get economic assistance from all friendly countries and there is no question of any alteration in our economic policy or in our international postures, on account of the economic help that we might receive from one or the other country.

There are some friends in this House who always believe in this concept of spheres of influence and balance of power. These are typical imperialist concept of balance of power or spheres of influence. We do not accept this concept at all. India is much too big a country to go into any sphere of influence of one or the other country and those who say these things are really showing diffidence rather than confidence in our capacity and in our ability to face and tackle these problems with success. On the political side I have already covered this question of the pressure from the so-called aids from any country, or economic collaboration. Now I have not been able to see how anybody can say that we have altered our attitude on important international issues over the last 2 or 3 years. The one thing I found was that my friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta, said a good deal about the joint communique that was issued after the visit to India of President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam. My colleague Diwan Chaman Lal there and then refuted it and the entire Congress Party supported him by thumping the tables when he made that statement. There is not a single word in that jointcommunique which was issued after the visit of Dr. Ho Chi Minh to which we do not subscribe to-day. We fully subscribe to the ideas contained in that communique and I do not see why Mr. Gupta was waxing so eloquent in presuming that we are changing our attitude with regard to that communique. Our struggle and our determination to fight the colonial forces, the neo-colonial forces, wherever they are, continues unabated. (interruption)

I have stated our position on these issues in a very very clear and forthright manner on all conceivable occasions-in the U.N., in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, in the Nonalignment Conference, in the Preparatory meetings of the Afro-Asian Conference and on all these international forums our attitude on these issues of colonialism, issues of apartheid or racialism have been absolutely clear....

RHODESAI

On Rhodesia I have made several statements in this House and even in the opening speech I said very clearly our attitude to Rhodesia and I said that we are completely dissatisfied with what has been done by the British Government in the matter of enforcing economic sanctions and we are strongly in favour of invoking all sanctions, including use of force for ending the racist illegal Smith regime, which has illegally and unconstitutionally seized power and we will do everything to induct the majority people there to manage their own affairs according to the normal democratic way of life.

ZAMBIA

An hon. Member: Do you support the views of Zambia in which it was said that the Rhodesian independence has to be secured by means of military onslaught on the fascist Smith regime ?

External Affairs Minister : I thought that the use of force covered the use of military force. You would agree that it was not an important

208

point for him to intervene but I am glad that he has mentioned Zambia because in this Rhodesian question our sympathy goes to the Government and the people of Zambia. President Kuanda and the Government of Zambia have been very friendly with us and we have worked together in the U.S., in the Non-alignment Conference, in the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference on all these important issues. We know that this illegal regime in Rhodesia is putting a special burden and responsibility on the people and the Government of Zambia, and all our sympathies go out for the people of Zambia and for the Government of Zambia. In a small measure, we also, as a token of our strong feelings, brotherly feelings, with them, did give them also some help to meet the economic difficulties that they experience on account of the disruption of supplies and the disruption of communications. Tire House will be glad to know that the Vice-President of Zambia and the Foreign Minister of Zambia are paying us a visit and they will be here with us in another five or six days and we will discuss all these matters with them again and we will give them all possible help and support in meeting the difficulties that they are facing an account of the Rhodesian trouble and we will also coordinate our activities for ending the illegal recist regime in Rhodesia.

SOUTH WEST AFRICA

About South West Africa I have already made a very clear statement and I do not want to say anything more except to inform the House that India, along with other African countries and also Asian countries, is working now for concrete steps that should be taken in the next General Assembly Session to tackle this difficult problem. There are several propositions with which we are now trying to coordinate the activities and trying to canvass support and it is too early for me to make a clear statement as to what is going to be the line of action but the African representatives know that our sympathies in this respect, our support in this respect, will be there in abundance and in full measure for taking any action that might be considered necessary for ending or resolving the difficulty that has been created by the judgment of the World Court. To a certain extent it is good because the basic political question of South West Africa has shot into prominence by this one-sided judgement of the World Court. So we will have to deal with it not purely from the legal, constitutional, juridical angle but as the political issue which is calling for a solution and I am sure that the united efforts of the Afro-Asian countries and India will yield some tangible results during the next General Assembly Session.

GUYANA

There are two other countries that I want to mention about. One is the emergence of Guyana as an independent country. You know that we welcome the emergence of Gyuana as an independent country, and they are also members of the Commonwealth. The majority people there are of Indian origin. They are all Guyana citizens. We continue to feel disturbed by the denial of real democratic rights to people of Guyana on account of a faulty system of elections. We have always been opposed to it and our endeavour will continue to support the processes which might result ultimately in the establishment of true democracy, and any method that divided people on any basis, racial or otherwise, we have always opposed and we will continue to take the same line.

MAURITIUS

Another country, Mauritius, is on its way to independence, and we have already lent an officer, who is going to Mauritius to be associated with the watching of the preliminary electoral processes, and it is our hope that the true democratic processes would result in giving a Government to that country, stable according to democratic principles, and Mauritius will emerge as an independent country friendly to us, and on account of the cultural ties we are always very vitally interested in its well-being and in its development. (Interruption).

We are in favour of the normal democratic system of one man, one vote unhampered by any other encumbrances. That was our attitude in Guyana. That is our attitude in Mauritius. That was our attitude when India got independence. And that is the basis of our Constitution. So we are wedded to this principle and we feet that this is the normal principle that should be applied....

PAKISTAN

On our relations with countries nearer home, I have very little to add to what I have said. I have gone through again what I said in my opening remarks on our relations with China and Pakistan and there is very little more that I intend to say. I feel that the policy that we are pursuing in relation to Pakistan is the correct policy. We are keen and we are anxious that our relations with them should improve, and there is a basis for this. If the two sides adhere to the spirit and the letter of the Tashkent Declaration and if Pakistan ceases to lay emphasis on its searching for armaments and trying to build tensions of all types, and comes back to the Tashkent spirit, and the two sides sit together and discuss and settle their differences, a way can be opened whereby, gradually, the process of relaxation can develop.

Now some suggestions have been made and they are at two extremes. One extreme is this, "Do not talk to them at all" and the other extreme is, "Unilaterally make some concessions and suggestions and then stick to them" Now

209

in a situation like this it is neither proper nor wise. It does not help if you go on making suggestions on substantive questions unilaterally. Whereas I am prepared to take all initiative for helping the procedures which should help in settlements or in agreements, you cannot expect me unilaterally to make suggestions on the substantive questions. So our approach should be to continue our effort for starting a discussion, and in those discussions all the questions, all the substantive questions, all the matters that come in the way of friendly relations, they should be picked up one by one and resolved, and nothing should be contingent or dependent on anything else. And this is the only way by which we can settle this problem. It is not in our interest unilaterally to pronounce our opinion on controversial questions, which can always be settled in the course of discussions.

CHINA

The same would be my reply in relation generally to our attitude to China. Now on this guestion of China, again the advice from the opposition is again on two extremes. The hard reality is that China today is the. one country in this wide world which has not accepted the basic principle of international behaviour namely that of peaceful co-existence, settlement of disputes by peaceful means and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. These are the three fundamental principles which govern international relationship, although China has, from time to time, been paying lip sympathy to these principles. On certain occasions they have even subscribed to certain documents incorporating these principles. They have even subscribed to certain documents where these principles were embodied, by putting their signature. Now it is very well theoretically to say, but it becomes unreal and academic if some were to say, 'Start some, dialogue. Take some initiative. There must be some basis for starting a dialogue. We thought that the Colombo proposals did provide that basis. Now it is suggested that "Well, If the other side does not accept the Colombo proposals, find some other basis." I thought that that basis cannot be regarded by any person as unreasonable. Now if one reasonable basis is rejected, and there is no other basis, I do not see, even with the best of will, what other initiative I can take. Now the other thing that has been suggested is that we should exchange Ambassadors. Well, this is a matter about which perhaps, I need not make any comments because, to my mind, it appears at the present moment to be only academic and theoretical. We have not broken off diplomatic relations with the Peoples' Republic of China, We have got our Indian Mission functioning in Peking, and the Peoples Republic of China have got their Mission functioning in Delhi. We have got them, but what they are doing is that they are exchanging angry notes which run into hundreds

and hundreds. So a dialogue is going on though it is not a very palatable dialogue. It is not for want of a dialogue but for want of a basis for any serious talks that we are not making any progress on this front.

An hon. Member: Dr. Gopal Singh says that our offer of arbitration also stands today.

External Affairs Minister: Yes, our late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, himself had made that position clear, that if it is a question merely of borders and some dispute on either side, there can always be some method of resolving it by discussions or by some other methods which might be mutually acceptable, but we cannot ignore the realities of the situation. The reality of the situation is that China is the one country which continues to believe that war and conflict are inevitable, and that nothing can be resolved without war or conflict. Therefore, this suggestion which was made from the other side by two hon. Members, that I should make an offer of a no-war pact to a country which does not believe in the efficacy of resolving disputes by peaceful means really fit something, which is an advice which is given to me, but I do not find any basis for the validity of that advice.

Now the whole world community wants that China should give up its attitude of arrogance, that is, should give up its attitude of total opposition to India and total opposition to the normal international behaviour. And then the way can be opened for resolving all these disputes because there is nothing that cannot be resolved if there is the will on either side to resolve it. In the absence of that will, one side howsoever reasonable it may be, cannot succeed in getting results. There is no use airing these views purely in an academic atmosphere, because China is one country, one nation which unfortunately then days is in a fit of arrogance and even a suggestion of this type would have an opposite effect in their mind and they may take it to be a sort of supposed weakness. We on our side have always taken a reasonable attitude, but a firm attitude and we should appreciate the situation and take our attitude taking into consideration this attitude of China. Unilaterally you cannot be pretending to be reasonable, afford to risk the vital interests of our country. It is therefore in

this context that we should view all these academic, hypothetical postures which on the face of them may have some semblance of reasonableness but once you scratch them you find they are not worth anything, that we cannot build our future policy on the basis of that attitude.

210

SHASTRI'S DEATH IN TASHKENT

I am very sorry that an hon. Member raised this question of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's unfortunate demise in Tashkent. The matter had been explained more than once on the floor of this House. Even so it is a highly emotional matter and it is wrong really to refer to it again and again. I was particularly sorry that in referring to it he tried to throw some sort of suspicion against our hosts which was very unfortunate. Chairman Kosygin and other Soviet leaders had looked after the Indian delegation and their personal comforts very well and all the arrangemerits were done in a most perfect manner. To suggest that they were interested in suppressing facts or presenting facts in any other form is, to say the least, very improper and I would strongly repudiate it.

There is another point. He said that the first doctor who came had not appended her signature. There were half a dozen others who had not appended their signatures. I know because I was here in the locality. She was a very junior doctor who generally came as a sort of first help. But when the senior doctors came and took charge of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri then obviously the senior doctors will append their signatures. There were several other doctors who did not place their signatures. To think or to suggest that other doctors were not asked to sign It is not proper and I would strongly urge that we should refrain from making such statements which come in the way of our good relations with other friendly countries. (Interruptions).

NUCLEAR POLICY

Another matter that was referred to was about our nuclear policy and about that also some statements have been made. We have stated our position quite clearly on the floor of this House and I would like to mention only three things in this connection now. Our policy is to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and this policy will continue. There is no change in it. Pakistan and certain other countries carry on propaganda against us to create misunderstanding amongst our friends and we should be quite clear about the policy that we pursue. At the same time we are developing our technological know-how so that technologically we may not be behind any other nuclear power.

On this question of the Nuclear Test-ban Treaty and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, our attitude continues to be to make the test-ban treaty more effective so that it covers all the countries and also covers underground tests. On non-proliferation we are in line with what was decided in the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, namely, that there should be serious thought given to nonproliferation and a situation should be created where the non nuclear powers do not develop or tend to acquire either by getting the know-how or by transfer of possession any of the nuclear weapons. Also there should be a counter balancing responsibility on the main nuclear powers to make some mom towards disarmament because non-proliferation is not an end in itself. It is linked with disarmament and so they must take some steps to halt the nuclear race. Otherwise the danger to the world from the addition to the nuclear arsenal by the main nuclear powers would continue. I know that in the present state of tensions in various parts of the world probably significant progress is not being made and perhaps it cannot be made. It may take some more time. But as I have often said-and I have no hesitation in repeating it-the only hope for the world if the world is to escape a nuclear holocaust is to ensure conditions in which the world may move towards nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. And then this will yield good results.

INDIAN ABROAD

Madam, I have practically covered all the points except one which was mentioned by some hon. Members about Indians abroad. Now the problem of persons of Indian origin in the African countries and in several other parts like Burma, Ceylon etc., is a difficult one and the condition varies from country to country.... We have been in touch with the Indian community. There cannot be the same type of approach to this problem with regard to all these countries. It should be appreciated that new forces have emerged in all these countries that have become independent. They have their own national aspirations in these countries, their own desire to have a dominating say not only in the political set-up but also in the economic picture which is developing and the persons of Indian origin are by and large adjusting themselves to this changed situation although their condition is not the same in the various countries. It varies from country to country. In some countries the pressures are great and they are finding it difficult to stay on; in some others they have taken the citizenship of those countries and are trying to work in cooperation with the local population and are playing a significant role in the development of the new economic systems that are emerging in these countries. So far as East African countries are concerned, I think in Uganda most of them have already taken the Uganda citizenship. In Tanzania, in Zanzibar, the situation has always been difficult while in the former Tanganyika part it is not so difficult.

An hon. Member: The latest reports are that they are fast deteriorating in Zanzibar.

211

External Affairs Minister : About Zanzibar I have already said. In Kenya they are good. I wish that a larger number of persons of Indian origin in Kenya should have taken the Kenyan citizenship but that is over now and a fairly large number have taken the citizenship but many of them have not taken it. When I give that information I am conscious of the fact that the only way in which we can serve them is to encourage them to take greater interest in the new forces that are developing, to work in co-operation with them, to work in a spirit of understanding and to take over to certain other lines which are still open. If the normal distributive trade is not available they can do something else in industry and the like and we ourselves have initiated some projects for establishing new industries in some of these countries so that our friendship with these might grow and that might open fresh avenues for co-operation and collaboration with the

countries that have become independent. The way to solve this is not by taking up any socalled strong attitude but to understand the situation, to understand its complexities and to work in co-operation with these countries to see what is the best that could be done with regard to their future or with regard to their problems, both economic and social, that might have developed as a result of the generation of these new forces, This is a thing which in the course of time, I feel, will find its level. I cannot give any ready answer for each country because the situation varies from Country to country.

Then I would like to give one more information. I am glad to inform the House that the Prime Minister of Singapore is coming and paying us a visit. He will be here in another three weeks' time. Our relations with Singapore after its emergence have been very friendly and I am sure that this visit will further strengthen the friendly relations between our two countries.

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN VIETNAM RUSSIA POLAND INDIA GERMANY JAPAN YUGOSLAVIA ZAMBIA GUYANA MAURITIUS CHINA UZBEKISTAN SRI LANKA BURMA UGANDA TANZANIA KENYA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Date : Aug 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement welcoming the Malaysia-Indonesia Agreement

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in New Delhi on August 18, 1966, welcoming the agreement signed by the Governments of Indonesia and Malaysia:

The Government of India are very happy to learn that an agreement has been signed by the Governments of Indonesia and Malaysia, ending hostilities and re-establishing friendly relations. Both Indonesia and Malaysia are countries with which India has very close relations. The re-establishment of amity between these two countries is, therefore, a matter of special gratification and happiness to the Government and the people of India. This is an event which I am sure will be greeted by all peace-loving peoples in the world and particularly by the countries in South-East Asia, as friendship between Indonesia and Malaysia will make an important contribution to friendship, peace and progress throughout Asia.

INDONESIA MALAYSIA USA INDIA

Date : Aug 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Joint Statement on the Visit of Nepalese Trade Delegation to India

The following is the text of a joint statement issued. in New Delhi on August 6, 1966 on the talks between official delegations of Nepal and India on matters relating to trade between the two countries;

At the invitation of the Government of India, a Nepalese Delegation led by 'Shri K. A. Dikshit, Acting Secretary for Commerce, His Majesty's Government of Nepal,' visited Delhi from August 3 to August 6, 1966 and discussed with a delegation of the officials of the Government of India, led by Shri B. D. Jayal, Joint

212

Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, questions relating to trade between the two countries. The discussions were held in an atmosphere of cordiality, friendship and mutual understanding, The main subjects discussed from Nepal's side were export of Nepalese manufactures to India, increase of quotas of various goods being received by Nepal from India and from the side of India differential Nepalese tariff and re-export of Indian goods from Nepal to third countries.

The Nepalese Delegation stated that India should permit import of manufactured goods from Nepal freely. The Indian Delegation stateed that Government of India appreciated the desire of Nepal to find a market for their manufactured goods in India, but such goods could not be accorded a preferential treatment over similar Indian manufactures. Both the Delegations expressed a sincere hope and desire that a mutually satisfactory solution to this matter may be worked out in future talks between the representatives of the two Governments.

The Nepalese Delegation asked for increased supply of maida, iron and steel, lubricants, and fertilisers to meet the growing demands in Nepal. The Indian Delegation assured the Nepalese Delegation that India would consider these requests and would endeavour to meet Nepal's requirements as far as possible despite shortages in India's own pressing requirements.

The Indian Delegation raised the question of differential Nepalese tariffs. The Nepalese Delegation stated that whenever instances of discriminatory tariff had been pointed out in the past, they had been remedied and would be similarly remedied in future also. It was agreed that as soon as the Indian budget is presented in future, information about changes in Central Excise, if any, should be sent to His Majesty's Government of Nepal, so that necessary corrections may be made in Nepal's tariff to prevent discrimination.

The question of Nepal imposing a ban on re-exports of Indian goods was discussed. The Nepalese Delegation stated that Nepal has been taking, and would continue to take, all necessary steps as far as feasible to ensure that goods exported by India to Nepal are not re-exported to other countries. The Nepalese Delegation desired that India may also take steps to prevent diversion of goods exported from Nepal to India.

The Nepalese Delegation extended an invita-tion to the Indian Delegation to hold the next round of talks in Kathmandu. The Nepalese Delegation, during its stay, called on the Minister of Commerce and the Commerce Secretary.

NEPAL INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Aug 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Resumption of Arms Aid to Pakistan by the U.S.A.

The following is the text of a statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the Rajya Sabha on August 9, 1966 regarding the resumption of supply of military equipment etc. to Pakistan by the U.S. Government :

Hon. Members have referred to certain Press reports that have appeared, both in India and the United States, regarding the resumption of arras aid by the United States to Pakistan.

We have been in touch with the U.S. authorities through our Mission at Washington and have conveyed our views to them. My colleague, the Minister of Defence, informed this House vesterday about the nature of military equipment and sources from which Pakistan has been augmenting its arms arsenal and the grave consequences that follow from this. We have informed the U.S. authorities that the reported resumption of military supplies, such as spare parts for tanks and Jet aircraft to Pakistan at a time when the U.S. Government cannot be unaware of Pakistan's continuing belligerent postures against India, its massing of forces along the Cease-fire Line and acquisition of large quantities of Migaircraft, bombers, tanks and ordnance factories etc. from China, will only encourage Pakistan in its aggressive and hostile designs against India.

A second round of hostilities against India, is

213

being freely talked about in Pakistan, and it has been proved beyond doubt that the aim of Pakistan in acquiring arms from the USA, is to use them against India and not against China or the Soviet Union or any other state. We have informed the US Government that the Indian Government and public opinion, would, therefore, with good reasons regard the, supply of arms to Pakistan, as a very serious threat to the security of India.

So far, we have been assured by the United States Government that they have not agreed to give any armaments or military supplies to Pakistan.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CHINA **Date :** Aug 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shri Y. B. Chavan's Statements in Parliament on Pakistani Military Build-up

The Defence Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan made, two statements in the Parliament on August 1 and 8, 1966 about the military buildup in Pakistan.

The following is the text of his statement on August 1 :

Since a large number of questions have been asked by Hon'ble Members about the military build-up in Pakistan, I have considered it appropriate to make a brief general statement on this subject. As members will no doubt realise, I can only give broad indications. It will not be in public interest for me to discuss details. Government are aware that ever since the period of Indo-Pakistan conflict in September 1965, Pakistan has been making all-out efforts to increase its armed strength. Very sizable new raisings of armed personnel have been taken up and equipment for the Pakistan Army, Air Force and Navy obtained. New fixed defences are being constructed and others improved. Ordnance factories are being set up and expanded.

In the Pakistan-occupied area of Jammu and Kashmir there has been an increase in the strength of Armed Forces. Communications improvement, from the military point of view, has also been going on apace. The training of irregulars has been continuing Pakistan has also increased its troops and air force in East Pakistan.

In these large-scale preparations Pakistan has been receiving a large measure of help from China, by way of supply of equipment, including tanks and aeroplanes, and foreign exchange for purchase of arms elsewhere. Chinese assistance for training of armed personnel has also come to notice. Pakistan has also obtained assistance of one or two other countries for the supply of arms and equipment and, as intermediaries, for purchase of equipment in countries which would not directly sell to Pakistan.

We hope that Pakistan will honour its obligations under the Tashkent Agreement not to have recourse to force. As a step necessary towards this. Pakistan should normalise its relations with India. Be that as it may, the House may rest assured that Government are alive to their primary duty of maintaining the security and territorial integrity of the country and will deal with any development according to the needs of the situation.

The following is the text of the Defence Minister's statement on August 8

On the 1st August I made a statement on the military build-up in Pakistan. In view of the interest shown by the Members to have further information on this subject I am making this statement. Contrary to expectations flowing from the Tashkent Agreement, all reports indicate that Pakistan is rapidly increasing its military strength. By and large it has recouped the losses in arms and equipment it suffered in the September 1965 operations. It has a programme to increase its army from 5 divisions to 11 divisions. It has already got two armoured divisions but the losses in armour it suffered in the September 1965 operations had depleted the strength of these divisions. Pakistan has received over 200 tanks from China which should go a long way in recouping the losses it suffered Simultaneously a number of new POK divisions have been raised and the POK manpower has increased to over 30,000 men.

The new raisings are at various stages of training and equipment. In equipping its forces, Pakistan has been largely assisted by China-China has agreed to supply enough equipment to arm at least two divisions. In addition, China and other countries have Provided financial accommodation and with this help Pakistan. hag been able to procure through certain Other countries large unspecified quantities of arms and ammunition.

The Pakistan Air Force has also recouped RS losses of fighters/lighter bombers and has today 5 more squadrons of fighters/fighter bombers than in 1965. It has been able to build UP its Air Force primarily by the supply made by China

214

of, MIG-19 and MiG-15 aircraft. It has also acquired a number of F-86 aircraft. These aircraft were originally in West Germany and are reported to have arrived in Pakistan through Iran. There are also reports that China has supplied Pakistan some IL-28 bombers.

Pakistan is also engaged in building defences and improving communications. We have information that Pakistan is improving its communications in Skardu and also trying to build up its forces in that area.

Till 1965 the equipment of the Pak Army consisted essentially of arms and equipment received from America. The stoppage of supplies of supporting spares and ammunition following the September 1965 operations had limited the utility of this equipment. But while the United States has imposed an embargo on such supplies, Pakistan has been able to replenish materially its supplies of spares and ammunition with the assistance of certain other countries which had such supplies received from U.S.A.

Pakistan has also a comparatively long-term programme of augmenting its Navy.

Unlike India which is threatened by China, Pakistan has no threat to its security from any quarter. We have given Pakistan repeated assurances. Yet, Pakistan is arming at a frantic rate and in this it has been assisted in a very large measure by China-in training its men, in equipping its forces and in building roads and communications. This action of Pakistan constitutes a grave threat to our security.

It is unfortunate that notwithstanding the agreement arrived at Tashkent, Pakistan, with the instigation and assistance of China, should be making these warlike preparations. This is going to be a long-term threat. We cannot, therefore, afford to relax in OUT defence efforts. I am confident that, despite the strains which Pakistani build-up will impose on us, the country will not shirk its responsibilities and will face any threat to its security, coolly and calmly. It is regrettable that Pakistan should engage in such a massive build-up which must be taxing its economic resources considerably. Both our countries have a big enough task of improving the economic well-being of our peoples for which resources are badly needed. Till the Chinese threat develop. ed, India maintained a comparatively small force. We continued to do so notwithstanding the fabulous U.S. arms aid to Pakistan. But Pakistan which has no enemies on its borders and no threat to its security has now embarked on this programme of expansion of its armed forces and is leaving us no option but to take adequate counter measures. It may suit China to try to attack India through the agency of Pakistani forces. I hope Pakistan will see the folly of any attempt to seek a solution by force; this we are bound to resist. I trust Pakistan will decide to solve its problems with India strictly in accordance with the spirit of the Tashkent Agreement and desist from piling up armaments. We on our part have no intention of joining in such a race but at the same time, we have to and are taking the necessary steps for the defence of our country.

Volume No

1995

SOUTH WEST AFRICA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on World Court's Judgment on South West Africa

The following is the text of a statement made in the Parliament on August 2, 1966 by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, regarding the judgment of the International Court of Justice on South West Africa :

The Government of India has seen with deep disappointment the judgment of the, International Court of Justice on South West Africa. The Government of South Africa has persistently refused to place the territory of South West Africa under UN Trusteeship as required under the Charter. On the other hand, the South African Government has been taking measures to incorporate South West Africa as one of its provinces applying to it all the evils of apartheid to which it has subjected its own non-white population.

It will be recalled that certain aspects of the question of South West Africa were referred by the General Assembly to the International Court for advisory opinion which was given in 1950 in 1955 and again in 1956. These opinions

215

clarified certain issues and were generally helpful; where after the UN Committee on South West Africa was asked to consider what legal action was open to ensure that South Africa fulfilled the obligations assumed by it under the mandate until such time as it is placed under the trusteeship system. The UN Committee on South West Africa suggested taking the matter to the International Court. In 1959 the General Assembly welcomed this suggestion as a result of which in 1960 Ethiopia and Liberia, both original members of the League, filed their application in the International Court. The General Assembly commended the two applicant Governments upon their initiative, thereby indicating the importance the UN attached to the issues placed before the World Court for a decision.

The judgment is not likely to inspire confidence in the International Court or in the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs. The fact that it took nearly six years for the Court to decide that Ethiopia and Liberia have not established any legal right or interest in the subject matter of their complaint is regrettable. In 1962 the Court rejected the preliminary objection of South Africa that the Court had no jurisdiction and that Ethiopia and Liberia had no standing to bring the cam. Yet four years later the Court has decided that Ethiopia and Liberia have no locus standi in the matter. It would seem, therefore, that the Court has reversed its own judgment of 1962.

It is unfortunate that the Court has failed to answer the substantive questions raised, namely, that since the mandate has not been converted into a trusteeship it continues to remain in effect; that South Africa continues to be subject to the obligations of the mandate and cannot unilaterally alter the status of South West Africa without the Consent of the UN; that South Africa must accept UN supervision of this territory and submit annual reports and forward petitions to the UN General Assembly. that South Africa has violated the obligation of the mandatory Power to "promote to the utmost the material and moral well being and the social Progress of the inhabitants" by the application of apartheid and other arbitrary, unreasonable and unjust measures detrimental to human dignity,

In our view the answer to all these questions is in the affirmative. Indeed the General Assembly has adopted numerous resolutions condemning the Government of South Africa for its persistent refusal to cooperate with the world body in applying the Principles of the UN Charter and implementing the various resolutions of the General Assembly on South West Africa.

India's attitude has been throughout to strongly support the African countries in their legitimate demand for the grant of independence to South West Africa. As early as 1946, the Government of India were the first to raise this issue at the United Nations, and expressed their opposition to what amounted to the annexation of South West Africa. We urged that the territory should be put under the trusteeship system which would lead progressively to independence. The international community has long recognised the basic fact that the problem of South West Africa is not only a judicial one; it is more basically a political and colonial problem. The UN General Assembly has passed numerous resolutions, the last one being Resolution-2074(XX), 1965which reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of South West Africa to freedom and independence and has called upon the Government of South Africa to remove immediately all bases and other military installations located in the territory of South West Africa.

Whatever the judgment on the, limited legal issue of the competence of Liberia and Ethiopia to seek redress from the International Court, the problem of South West Africa remains and demands urgent attention of the UN. The Government of India continues strongly to support the view that the General Assembly and, if necessary, the Security Council must ensure that the Governmerit of South Africa is not permitted to take any further steps-administrative. legal-or constitutional--to incorporate the territory of South West Africa into South Africa, and such steps as have already been taken are declared null and void. Further, that the future of South West Africa must be governed by the UN Resolution on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Res. 1514). Finally, till such time as the people of South West Africa attain independence in accordance with the freely expressed will' of the people, the mandate should be replaced by effective UK presence in place of the administration by the Government of South Africa.

It is now for the UN to take firm and decisive action in support of the people of South West Africa to thwart the aggressive plans of the South African Government. As in the past, the, Government of India would lend vigorous and full Support to all Afro-Asian and like minded members of the UN towards the achievement of these objectives. For this Purpose, the Government of India is in touch with the members of the Organisation of African Unity and the Afro-Asian Grout) at the UN. We are actually participation in the Sub-Committee appointed by the Special Committee of 24. We are also in touch with others so as to cooperate with them to end this vestige of racialism and colonialism. Unless this is done in the near future, there is grave danger that the present situation may lead to a most serious racial conflict throughout Africa endangering international peace and security.

216

USA INDIA SOUTH AFRICA ETHIOPIA LIBERIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Aug 01, 1966

September

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Re Vol. XII	cord 1966 SEPTEMBER	No. 9	
	CONTENTS	PAGES	
COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE			
Communique on Rhodesia		217	
Final Communique		219	
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS			
Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the General Assembly on South			
West Africa		223	
Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the General Assembly in reply			
to Pakistan Foreign Minister		227	
Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly on			
Admission of Guyana to the U. N		230	

INDONESIA

Joint Communique on Indonesian Foreign Minister's Visit231Joint Communique on the Visit of Indonesian Trade Delegation232

INTERNATIONAL ROUND TABLE ON NEHRU

President's Inaugural Address 233

SINGAPORE

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner	in honour of the Singapore
Prime Minister	234
Singapore Prime Minister's Reply	235
Joint Communique	237

SWITZERLAND

Indo-Swiss Technical Co-operation Agreement 238

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Indo-UAR Trade Protocol Signed 238

WHO REGIONAL CONFERENCE

Prime Minister's Inaugural Address

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA PAKISTAN GUYANA INDONESIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE SWITZERLAND **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

239

1995

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS CONFERENCE

Communique on Rhodesia

The following is the text of the communique issued by the Commonwealth Secretariat in London oil September 14, 1966 on Rhodesia:

The Commonwealth conference devoted a major portion of its discussions to the problem of Rhodesia.

As at Lagos, in January of this year, the members of the conference reaffirmed that the authority and responsibility for guiding Rhodesia to independence rested with Britain, but they acknowledged that the problem was of wider concern to Africa, the Commonwealth and the world.

They reaffirmed the view expressed in the communique issued at the end of the Lagos conference as follows :

"The Prime Ministers declared that any political system based on racial discrimination was intolerable. It diminished the freedom alike of those who imposed it and of those who suffered under it. They considered that the imposition of discriminatory conditions of a political, social, economic and educational nature upon the majority by any minority, for the benefit of a privileged few, was an outrageous violation of the fundamental principles of human rights. The goal of future progress in Rhodesia should be the establishment of a just society based on equality of opportunity to which all sections of the community could contribute their full potential and from which all could enjoy the benefits due to them without discrimination or unjust impediment. To this end, several principles were affirmed. The first was the determination of all present that the rebellion must be brought to an end. AU those detained for purely political reasons should be released. Political activities should be constitutional and free from intimidation from any guarter. Repressive and discriminatory laws should be repealed."

They further reaffirmed the statement made in their London Communique of 1965 and repeated in Lagos that "the principle of 'one man, one vote' was regarded as the very basis of democracy and this should be applied to Rhodesia".

They remain unanimous on the objective that the rebellion in Rhodesia must be brought to an end speedily. In order to achieve this objective, most of the Heads of Government of the Commonwealth expressed their firm opinion that force was the only sure means of bringing down the illegal regime in Rhodesia. Others, however, shared the British Government's objections to the use of force to impose a constitutional settlement, while agreeing that it was not ruled out where necessary to restore law and order.

Most of the Heads of Government urged that Britain should make a categorical declaration that independence would not be granted before majority rule is established on the basis of universal adult franchise and that this declaration should not be conditional on whether the illegal regime agreed to surrender or not. They further urged that Britain should refuse to resume discussions or to negotiate with the illegal regime.

The British Prime Minister stated that the British Government would not recommend to the British Parliament any constitutional settlement which did not conform with the "six principles": that they attached particular importance to the fifth principle, namely that any settlement must be, and be seen to be, acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole; that they regarded it as implicit in this fifth principle that the test of acceptability must enable the people of Rhodesia as a whole to indicate whether or not they were prepared to accept any settlement which provided for the grant of independence before majority rule was achieved; and that there would be no independence before majority rule if the people of Rhodesia as a whole were shown to be opposed to it.

The conference noted the following decisions of the British Government:

(a) After the illegal regime is ended, a legal Government will be appointed by the Governor and will constitute a broadly-based representative administration. During this interim period the armed forces and police will be responsible to

217

the Governor. Those individuals who are detained or restricted on political grounds will be released and normal political activities will be permitted provided that they are conducted peacefully and democratically without intimidation from any quarter,

(b) The British Government will negotiate, with this interim administration, a constitutional settlement directed to achieving the objective of majority rule, on the basis of the six principles.

(c) This constitutional settlement will be submitted for acceptance to the people of Rhodesia as a whole by appropriate democratic means.

(d) The British Parliament and Government must be satisfied that this test of opinion is fair and free and would be acceptable to the general world community,

(e) The British Government will not consent to independence before majority rule unless the people of Rhodesia as a whole are shown to be in favour of it.

Most Heads of Government made it clear that in their view political leaders and others detained should be immediately and unconditionally released before an interim representative Government was formed, in which they should be adequately represented. They further expressed the view that any ascertainment of the wishes of the people of Rhodesia as a whole should be by a referendum based on universal adult suffrage, i.e., one man, one vote.

The Heads of Government also noted that the British Government proposed immediately to communicate the British intentions as indicated above through the Governor to all sections of opinion in Rhodesia and to inform the illegal regime there that if they are not prepared to take the initial and indispensable steps whereby the rebellion is brought to an end and executive authority is vested in the Governor, the following related consequences will ensue:

- (a) The British Government will withdraw all previous proposals for a constitutional settlement which have been made; in particular, they will not thereafter be prepared to submit to the British Parliament any settlement which involves independence before majority rule.
- (b) Given the full support of Commonwealth representatives at the United Nations, the British Government will be prepared to join in sponsoring in the Security Council of the United Nations before the end of this year a resolution

providing for effective, and selective mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

The conference had before it an analysis of the working of economic sanctions prepared by the Sanctions Committee set up in Lagos. It was agreed that, though sanctions had undoubtedly depressed the Rhodesian economy, they were unlikely at their present level to achieve the desired political objectives within an acceptable period of time, Accordingly, the Heads of Government were generally agreed on the need for stronger and mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Most of them were convinced that mandatory sanctions of a general and comprehensive character should be applied under Chapter VII, Articles 41 and 42 of the UN Charter, and should cover both exports and imports. Others favoured sanctions on selected individual commodities important to the economy of Rhodesia. The Heads of Government recorded their appreciation of the work of the Sanctions Committee and requested it to continue its work.

There was unanimity of view that Commonwealth countries should continue to co-operate to the fullest extent possible in the pursuit of these objectives for Rhodesia, notwithstanding some differences of opinion as to the most effective means of achieving them.

It was also agreed unanimously that assistance should be given to Zambia to produce a more complete cut-off of trade with Rhodesia and to assist her to withstand any serious effect on her economy resulting therefrom. To this end, they requested that the Zambian subcommittee of the Sanctions Committee should continue its efforts in coordinating further Commonwealth assistance. Continuing consideration should also be given to the problems of Malawi.

The Heads of Government agreed that the problem of Rhodesia should be kept under constant review, and that they would meet again soon if the illegal regime were not brought to an end speedily.

The Heads of Government have had one overriding purpose in their consideration of the Rhodesian situation--a consideration which has now extended over four meetings of Commonwealth Prime Ministers. That purpose is to end the perpetuation of power in that country in the hands of a minority, with only ineffective and inadequate guarantees of the political rights of the majority. Such a situation must be replaced by an arrangement based on a multiracial society in which human and political rights will be vested in all the people without discrimination and in accordance with the true principles of democracy.

218

UNITED KINGDOM USA ZAMBIA MALAWI **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS CONFERENCE

Final Communique

The following is the text of the final communique issued in London on September 15, 1966 at the end of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference :

The meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers which began on September 6 ended today (Sept. 25). Cyprus, Malawi and Uganda were represented by their Presidents, and Kenya by its Vice-President. Australia, Britain, Canada, The Gambia, Guyana, Malaysia, Malta, New Zealand, Sierra Leone and Singapore were represented by their Prime Ministers, and Jamaica by its acting Prime Minister. Ghana was represented by the Deputy Chairman of the National Liberation Council, Trinidad & Tobago by its Deputy Prime Minister, India by its Minister of External Affairs, and Pakistan and Zambia by their Foreign Ministers. Ceylon was represented by its Minister of Justice and Nigeria by Brigadier Ogundipe. The Prime Minister of Britain was in the chair

This was the first meeting at which Guyana was represented as a member of the Common-

wealth and the other Heads of Government welcomed its Prime Minister. They agreed that Commonwealth countries would collectively sponsor Guyana's application for United Nations membership.

They noted with pleasure that the Bechuanaland Protectorate would become independent on September 30 as Botswana, Basutoland as Lesotho on October 4, and Barbados on November 30, and that all three countries had expressed the wish to become members of the Commonwealth. All member-Governments agreed to accept them as members of the Commonwealth, upon completion of the necessary legislative and constitutional processes, and looked forward to welcoming them to the Commonwealth association and to sponsoring their application for membership of the United Nations.

FAITH IN UN

In the course of a comprehensive review, the Prime Ministers discussed the major issues arising from the international situation. They considered that it had never been more important that the United Nations should be as strong and effective a spokesman of the world community as possible and they pledged themselves to continue efforts to place the organization's finances on a sound footing and to strengthen the organization in all its aspects, including its ability to discharge its peace-keeping role. They were unanimous in expressing their deep appreciation of U Thant's efforts on behalf of peace and international cooperation and expressed their hope that he would reconsider his decision not to offer himself for a second term.

The Prime Ministers greeted with pleasure the announcement made to the meeting that Pakistan and Malaysia had resumed diplomatic relations.

The Prime Ministers recognized the dangers of a narrowing of horizons and a failure to view the great human problems of racial injustice, poverty and war in the universal terms which alone offer hope of relief to this and succeeding generations. The Prime Ministers affirmed their conviction that the greater the international stresses proved to be, the greater the need for bridgebuilding associations to try to resolve them. They recorded their view of the continuing and vital importance of such broad groupings as the United Nations and the Commonwealth itself, comprising representatives of so many races, continents and cultural traditions.

(Here the final communique records the interim communique on Rhodesia issued on September 14).

VIETNAM

The Prime Ministers discussed the situation in Vietnam. They noted with particular concern that since they had last met the conflict had intensified. They expressed deep anxiety at the tragic and mounting loss of life and devastation in Vietnam, and were conscious of the danger that the conflict might spread and develop into a major international conflict.

They reviewed recent developments, including the many efforts, representing a wide range of international opinion, which had been made since their last meeting to end the conflict and achieve a negotiated settlement. They reaffirmed their continuing belief in the urgent need to establish conditions in which the people of Vietnam might be able to live in peace and be free from outside pressures in order to be able to work out their own destiny within the broad framework of the Geneva agreements of 1954.

They regretted that the Mission which they had appointed at their 1965 meeting had not been able to undertake its task. None the less, they believed that the Commonwealth should continue its efforts to promote peace in Vietnam.

DISARMAMENT

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed their support for the aim of general and complete disarmament subject to effective international inspection and control. They expressed regret that, since the conclusion of the partial nuclear test-ban treaty in 1963, the 18-nation Disarmament Conference had not reached agreement either on general and complete disarmament or on more limited measures; but they expressed the view that this conference had performed thorough and useful work

219

in defining the areas of disagreement on specific measures. They agreed that-this conference is a

useful forum for detailed disarmament negotiations. and they expressed the hope that, when it reconvened after the conclusion of the 21st United Nations General Assembly, it would be able to agree on a solution of the most urgent problems.

The Prime Ministers recorded their view that events were throwing into ever sharper relief the need for firm and far-reaching agreements on disarmanent. They were convinced that the persistence of political tensions gave a reason not to relax but to redouble efforts to this end.

They expressed their concern at the growing danger of nuclear proliferation. The meeting deplored recent nuclear weapons tests conducted in the atmosphere by two major Powers. The Commonwealth Governments recorded their hope that all steps would be taken to bring about a universally binding nuclear test-ban treaty and to Persuade those nuclear States concerned to participate in discussions on disarmament.

Nevertheless, the Prime Ministers were of the opinion that useful progress could be made in the control of nuclear arms and that such progress would increase the momentum towards worldwide agreements on disarmament. To this end, they reaffirmed the principles set out in Resolution 2028 (XX) on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on November 19, 1965.

The Prime Ministers emphasized in particular that while there was still time it was imperative to halt the spread of nuclear weapons by the signature of a non-proliferation treaty. They urged all countries, nuclear as well as non-nuclear weapon Powers, to agree to measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Prime Ministers regarded it as no less important to complete the test-ban treaty by agreement to stop underground tests. They welcomed the fact that initiatives had been taken by some non-nuclear weapon countries both in suggesting procedures for bridging the differences among the major nuclear weapon Powers as well as in setting in motion arrangements for international seismological co-operation. They trust that these initiatives, along with the rapid developments, which are taking place in the-field of detection and identification of seismological events, could help to lead towards an early extension of the present partial test-ban treaty to include an agreement to ban underground tests.

The Commonwealth Heads of Government Pledged themselves to work for these ends both within and outside the United Nations, and appealed to all Governments, to do likewise.

AFRICA

Apart from Rhodesia itself, the meeting also considered other problems in southern Africa. It expressed its concern at the continuing refusal of Portugal to concede the right of self-determination to its territories. The meeting expressed the hope that the remaining dependent territories in Africa would soon be granted the right of selfdetermination.

The meeting also expressed concern at the denial by South Africa of its international obligations in respect of the mandated territory of South West Africa. There was some discussion of the recent decision on this territory by the International Court of Justice. The Prime Ministers drew attention, with regret, to the fact that the Court had not pronounced on the merits of the issue.

While the meeting noted that it was still open to the United Nations to raise collectively with the Court the question of South Africa's discharge of its responsibilities under the mandate, most members thought it necessary that the United Nations should now revoke the mandate of South Africa in respect of South-West Africa and take over responsibility for its administration until such time as it achieves independence. They noted that this matter would be considered at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The Prime Ministers noted that there was danger of an escalation of conflict arising from territorial claims in Africa, particularly in the Horn of Africa, and they expressed the hope that disputes on changes in international boundaries would be settled by peaceful means and outside Powers would refrain from taking steps which could aggravate the situation in that area. The Heads of Government condemned the continued practice of apartheid by the Government of South Africa and the adoption of oppressive and discriminatory measures against the non-white population of that country.

CYPRUS

The Prime Ministers noted the developments with regard to Cyprus since their last meeting, including the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on December 18, 1965, and reaffirmed their view that the Cyprus problem should be solved within the framework of the United Nations and its Charter and in accordance with the principles of democracy and justice and in conformity with the wishes of the people of Cyprus.

DEPENDENT TERRITORIES

Britain made a statement to the meeting about the progress of the remaining British dependencies towards self-government or independence.

220

In the last year there have been nine constitutional conferences involving 12 territories agreement on the final status of 11 had be reached. These included Guyana, the Bechuanaland Protectorate (Botswana), Basutoland (Lesotho), Barbados, Mauritius, and Antigua, St. Kitts/Nevis/Anguilla, Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenada.

When all these agreements have been put into effect over the next few months, 22 dependencies will remain, many of them with very small populations. A new constitution is about to be introduced in Fiji. The British Government is engaged in working out new constitutional arrangements with Swaziland and is planning conferences to work out further constitutional arrangements in the near future for a number of other territories, including Bermuda and the Virgin Islands. They are also engaged in discussions about the special positions of British Honduras, Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands. The British Government stands ready to give independence to territories that want it and can sustain it. For the others, Britain is willing to work out arrangements appropriate to each territory that will enable them, if they wish,

to continue in some form of association with Britain.

The Prime Ministers noted with approval the report of the New Zealand Prime Minister on the progress being made by the independent State of Western Samoa and the fact that the Cook Islands had become a fully self-governing State freely associated with New Zealand.

They noted with approval the progress that had been made and was in train to bring British territories towards independence or some other solution of their choice. They welcomed the assurance of the continuing object of British policy in this regard.

The Prime Ministers were informed about the association arrangements being made with Antigua, St. Kitts/Nevis/Anguilla, Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenada. They noted that while these include provision for Britain to be responsible for the external affairs and defence of these territories in consultation with their Governments it had been agreed that a substantial measure of authority in the conduct of their external relations should be delegated to the associated States. The Prime Ministers agreed that consultations should be held about the question of representation of the associated States of the Eastern Caribbean at Commonwealth meetings.

In relation to British Honduras, some concern was expressed about the current mediation between Britain and Guatemala, and the hope was expressed that particular care would be taken to ensure that the people of British Honduras are given the fullest opportunity to express their views freely about any proposed arrangements affecting their future. Britain gave a firm assurance that no settlement would be reached that was not in accordance with the wishes of the people of British Honduras.

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

The Prime Ministers held a general discussion on the world economic situation. They noted that Commonwealth Trade Ministers, at their meeting in June 1966, had had extensive and valuable consultations on world trade. It was recognized that, while Commonwealth trade must be seen in the larger context of international trade of which it was a vital part, there was continuing scope for expansion of Commonwealth trade and the need to strengthen to this end the well-established links among Commonwealth members. In this context, the value of the Commonwealth preference system was recognized. The Heads of Government endorsed the continuing need for close consultation and co-operation among Commonwealth countries in international forums, particularly with the view to improving conditions for international commodity trade, including question of better access and more stable prices for primary products remunerative to producers and fair to consumers, and to increasing the openings in international markets for exports of manufactured and semi-manufactured goods from developing countries so essential in the development of their economies.

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed the hope that the Kennedy round of trade negotiations would lead to a substantial growth in international trade. Failure of the negotiations could lead to the further development of trade blocs and intensified trade restrictions. Such growth was of vital concern for the economic progress of Commonwealth countries. Despite the slow progress of the negotiations, the Heads of Government attached importance to achieving an early settlement covering both industrial and agricultural products and resulting in increased benefits for all concerned, including the developing countries.

They observed that the British Government had indicated at the Trade Ministers' meeting its readiness to seek membership in the European Economic Community provided that the essential interests of Britain and other Commonwealth countries were safeguarded. The British Government stated that they would make available the maximum information possible to other Commonwealth Governments on the progress of exploratory discussions and would, at all stages of any negotiations, consult closely with other Commonwealth Governments. The other Heads of Government noted this assurance and stressed the importance of consultations at all stages of exploratory talks, discussions and negotiations. The hope was expressed that the interests of developing countries would receive special attention during these talks.

The Heads of Government also noted the statement by the representative of Nigeria that his country had recently signed an agreement of association with the European Economic Community,

They noted with approval that, in accordance with their decision in 1965, which had been carried further by the Commonwealth Trade Ministers at their meeting in June 1966, a preliminary conference of officials engaged in economic planning was to be convened to consider the various methods adopted in Commonwealth countries and to see whether a mutual exchange of current plans could be used to improve them and thus promote trade and economic progress within the Commonwealth.

The Heads of Government recognized the importance of the strength of sterling and the need for additional liquidity for international payments and they expressed the hope that substantial progress in this direction would be made at the forthcoming meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Washington. They attached particular importance to this matter since they recognized that the maintenance of economic expansion in the fully industrialized countries as well as in less-developed countries was a basic requirement for the steady increase in world trade and development that is so vital to all countries of the Commonwealth. They noted that Commonwealth Finance Ministers proposed to discuss these and allied matters in Montreal later this month

The Prime Ministers noted with concern the deteriorating position with regard to the world's food supply and stressed the urgent need for a massive increase in food production, particularly in the developing countries, to meet the needs of the world's growing population, and the desirability for continuing assistance towards this end.

In the course of discussion of the problems of aid and development, the Prime Ministers were concerned that the economic progress in the developing countries had fallen short of the minimum average targets of the United Nations Development Decade. They also noted that, notwithstanding the increased efforts of certain countries, the flow of resources from the developed to the developing countries was inadequate. They recognized that the growing economic imbalance between rich and poor countries called for a continued and concerted effort to provide development assistance. In this connection, they noted the growing difficulties arising from maturing debt obligations. They agreed that the Commonwealth, which was a representative group covering all levels of economic development problems, could continue to provide useful initiatives in international co-operation as it had in the establishment of the Colombo Plan for economic and technical co-operation in South and South-East Asia and the Special Commonwealth African Assistance Plan.

The Prime Ministers had before them a number of suggestions submitted to them by the Secretary-General on possible ways to implement their wish, as set out in the 1964 and 1965 communiques, that the Commonwealth can make a further distinctive contribution of its own to increase the economic strength and material well-being of Commonwealth countries. They considered that one of the most promising avenues of Commonwealth co-operation lay in the opportunity to play a creative role in the future strategy of economic development.

The Prime Ministers agreed that the suggestion, made by the Secretary-General in his paper on Commonwealth assistance programmes should be further examined at a meeting of senior officials of Commonwealth countries concerned with aid administration and that this meeting might usefully be combined with the meeting of senior planning officials which the Trade Ministers had earlier, on the suggestion of the Prime Ministers, asked the Secretary-General to convene on planning techniques, regional co-operation in planning and trade promotion.

COMMONWEALTH MEDICAL CONFERENCE

The Heads of Government were happy to accept the invitation of the President of Uganda that the Commonwealth Medical Conference in 1968 be held in Kampala.

COMMONWEALTH SECRETARIAT

Following the decision at their 1965 meeting, the Heads of Government considered the report of the review committee on intra-Commonwealth organizations concerned with economic and related affairs. They expressed appreciation of the work of the committee and accepted the major recommendations, including the integration of the executive secretariat of the Commonwealth Economic Committee and the Commonwealth Education Liaison Unit with the Commonwealth Secretariat, noting that this would produce economy in expenditure.

The Heads of Government took note of the annual report of the Secretary-General and authorized its publication.

The Heads of Government expressed their high appreciation of the work of the Secretary-General and his colleagues in the Commonwealth Secretariat.

222

UNITED KINGDOM CYPRUS MALAWI UGANDA USA KENYA AUSTRALIA CANADA GUYANA MALAYSIA MALTA NEW ZEALAND SIERRA LEONE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE JAMAICA GHANA INDIA PAKISTAN ZAMBIA LATVIA NIGER NIGERIA BOTSWANA LESOTHO VIETNAM SWITZERLAND PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA MAURITIUS ANGUILLA DOMINICA GRENADA FIJI SWAZILAND BERMUDA GIBRALTAR HONDURAS FALKLAND ISLANDS WESTERN SAMOA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GUATEMALA RUSSIA SRI LANKA

Date : Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swam Singh's Statement in the General Assembly on South West Africa

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, delivered the following speech in the General Assembly on September 26, 1966 on South West Africa:

Mr. President, it is a great honour and pleasure for me to offer you on behalf of the Government of India and my own behalf our warm and sincere congratulations on the well-earned distinction conferred on you by this world Assembly in choosing you to direct its work as President of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly of our Organization. It adds to our pleasure to felicitate you on your success not only because you are a fellow Asian, but also because you are an eminent representative of a neighbouring country with whom we have close, vibrant and constructive understanding and relations. As a matter of fact, there is a sense of participation for us in your election to this high office because of the close and brotherly ties extending over centuries which bind India and Afghanistan. I offer you, Mr. President, our wholehearted co-operation in the tasks that lie ahead.

There is no graver issue before the United Nations today than the future of the mandated territory of South West Africa, with the serious threat it poses to international peace and security. The recent verdict of the International Court of Justice lays on the world body an even greater responsibility to act in the interests of freedom and justice. The people, of South West Africa have been deeply injured and sorely neglected for many decades; and it behoves the United Nations to take swift and effective action to bring to an end their subjugation and oppression.

My delegation, like most others, closely followed the proceedings before the International Court instituted by Ethiopia and Liberia. We had hoped that the Court would hand down a learned judgement on the substance of the complaint, after a thorough examination of all the issues involved, and keeping in mind the basic principles of international law and morality. The earlier Advisory Opinions of the Court as well as its Judgement of 1962 led many of us to believe that the final verdict of the Court would uphold those principles of international law which govern the conduct and the relations among civilized nations. It was with deep regret and disappointment, therefore, that my country received the Judgement of the International Court of 18 July 1966. The Court chose a most doubtful and controversial technical ground to dispose of the case without dealing with the substantive questions before it. What is worse, the Court took six long years to come to the conclusion that it did in the end. It is deplorable that the Court has now reversed its earlier Judgement of 1962, wherein it clearly recognized the applicants' standing to take the matter to the Court. The latter

Judgement has disturbing implications for the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs and the role of the Court in the settlement of disputes. The Judgement is unlikely to inspire confidence in the International Court. There is a growing feeling in the world that the International Court as it is constituted today is outmoded in its concepts and is incapable of responding to the needs of modern times. My delegation does not wish to enter into a detailed discussion of the Court's decision. It is interesting to note, however, that the ground on which the Court has now denied the right to an answer to Ethiopia and Liberia is one which even the Government of South Africa itself did not put forward in its final submission.

Mr. President, it is useful to recall that when the League of Nations established the mandates system to make arrangements for the administration of the territories ceded by Germany to the Principal Allied Powers at the end of the First World War, it was guided by the following main principles :

- (1) The aim of the institution of mandates was to ensure the well-being and development of the peoples inhabiting the territories in question.
- (2) The method of attaining this aim was to entrust the tutelage of these peoples to certain advanced nations, which would administer it as a "sacred trust'.
- (3) The acceptance by a nation of this mission carried with it certain obligations and responsibilities established by law-

223

Like guardians in civil law they were expected to exercise their authority in the sole interest of their wards and to maintain an entirely selfless attitude in their dealings with them.

(4) The territories under their administration were not to be exploited by the mandatory Powers for their own profit A mandatory mission was not, by its very nature, intended to be prolonged indefinitely, but only until such time as the peoples under tutelage were capable of managing their own affairs. Furthermore, the mandatory Power was to be responsible for preparing the people for eventual self-government.

It was with these lofty principles in mind that the administration of South West Africa was entrusted to South Africa as a mandatory Power on 17 December 1920. It is a well-established fact that the administration of this mandated territory has been in utter and callous disregard of these principles. South Africa even claims that its obligations as a mandatory Power under the League of Nations came to an end with the dissolution of the League in 1946.

Indeed, as early as April 1945 at San Francisco, about a year before the dissolution of the League when the Charter of the United Nations was still being drafted, South Africa announced its intention to incorporate South West Africa as part of the Union of South Africa. In the first General Assembly of the United Nations in 1946, it submitted a formal proposal of incorporation on the ground that South West Africa was sparsely populated and unable to support itself and that a majority of the inhabitants desired its incorporation into the Union. This was a clear and formal indication of South Africa's true intentions in respect of South West Africa.

The General Assembly, rejecting the preposterous demand of South Africa in its resolution 65 (1) of 1946, declared that it was unable to accede to the incorporation of the Territory of South West Africa in the Union of South Africa. South Africa was invited to submit an agreement for the purpose of placing the Territory under the Trusteeship System. But the Government of South Africa had no intention of doing so and, predictably, refused to accept the invitation. It informed the United Nations of its decision not to proceed with the incorporation of the Territory and to continue to administer it in the Spirit of the Mandate. South Africa also agreed to submit reports on its administration of South West Africa. Subsequently, after submitting only one report. South Africa decided not to furnish any further reports, in clear violation of its solemn undertakings and obligations.

South Africa then tried to annex a part of the Territory by proposing to the Good Offices Com-

mittee, set up by the General Assembly at its twelfth session, that if the General Assembly were willing to consider a solution based an the partition of the Territory with the northern portion, which contained a majority of the Dative population, to be placed under Trusteeship and the rest containing the Territory's diamond deposits and other major resources to be annexed to the Union of South Africa, the latter would be willing to investigate the practicability of such a scheme. The designs of South Africa to annex the Mandated Territory were thus further exposed. The proposal for partition met with the opposition of the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly and was rightly rejected.

Undeterred by these setbacks, South Africa resorted to various underhand methods of jutegrating South West Africa with its own territory. It started extending to the Mandated Territory its own hideous policies of apartheid which had already been universally condemned as constituting a crime against humanity. It placed serious restrictions on travel abroad by South West Africans. All political activity by the people of the Territory was suppressed. Legislation, regulations and administrative decrees detrimental to human dignity and violating the fundamental rights and liberties of the African people were adopted. The policy of Bantustans was gradually applied to the Territory. As a climax, the South African Government appointed a temporary committee in June 1964 to ensure the smooth functioning of the interim arrangements in connexion with the recommendations of the notorious Odendaal Commission. The implementation of these recommendations by creating separate homelands for the Africans would undoubtedly result in annexation and absorption.

It is thus clear that South Africa has only one aim in view, namely, to annex South West Africa despite its solemn obligations under international agreements. In the words of the International Court of Justice :

"The Mandate Was created, in the interest of the inhabitants of the territory, and all humanity in general, as an international institution with an international object-a sacred trust of civilization."

Article 22 of the Covenant of the League pro-

claimed "the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in the Covenant". South Africa's administration of the territory during the past forty-six years has made a mockery of this sacred trust. Its actions have proved that it is no longer qualified to merit the trust of the international community. It has

224

flouted even the most fundamental principle of civilized behaviour which requires it to fulfil the obligations inherent in the trust. In view of South Africa's intransigence and callous disregard for world opinion, the removal of its authority over South West Africa and the assumption of its administration by the United Nations are the only means of fulfilling what the League of Nations had recognized as obligations owed by the more developed nations to help dependent peoples take their rightful place in the world community.

Mr. President. the International Court of Justice has categorically rejected South Africa's contention that its Mandate had lapsed with the dissolution of the League. In its Advisory Opinion delivered on 11 July 1950, the Court unanimously declared that South West Africa was a Territory under the international Mandate assumed by the Union of South Africa on 17 December 1920 and that the Union was not competent to modify its status except with the consent of the United Nations. In its Advisory opinion of I June 1956, the Court itself interpreted the general purport and meaning of its 1950 Opinion as follows :

"The general purport and the meaning of the opinion of the Court of 11 July 1950 is that the paramount purpose underlying the taking over by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the supervisory functions in respect of the Mandate for South West Africa, formerly exercised by the Council of League of Nations, was to safeguard the sacred trust of civilization through the maintenance of effective international supervision of the administration of the mandated territory."

Again, in its Judgement of 21 December 1962,

the International Court repeated the conclusion it had reached in 1950 that "to retain the rights derived from the Mandate and to deny the obligations thereunder could not be justified."

The 1966 Judgement, despite its grave and disturbing political consequences for the Territory has left unimpaired the validity of the Court's Previous decisions. Those decisions remain the basic and authoritative statements of the International Court of Justice on important substantive legal questions, including the existence and scope of South Africa's obligations and the rights of the inhabitants of South West Africa.

The most important lesson to be learnt from the long exercise of proceedings before the International Court is that there is not, and cannot be, in effective substitute for the willingness of the members of the international community to enforce. with vigour and conscience, the principles of their own Charter, the dictates of their own decrees and the plain terms of their own undertakings. In other words, the only course of action left to the world community is to terminate South Africa's Mandate and to take upon itself the responsibility of administering the territory until such time as arrangements can be made for the people of South West Africa to assume the reins of the government themselves.

Mr. President, that the Mandate is a trust and the abuse of the trust entitles the United Nations to revoke the mandate is indisputable. As early as 1922, the Indian representative to the Third Assembly of the League of Nations had declared :

"A mandate is, in theory and essence, revocable. These 'C' class territories are a separate legal entity and all possessed the indestructible potentialities of independent existence."

The absence of any clause for the revocation in the mandate agreement does not imply that it cannot be revoked. The International Court has also affirmed, in its opinion of 1950, that from the dissolution of the League of Nations one cannot conclude that no proper procedure exists for modifying the international status of South West Africa. Under the general principles of international law, breach of agreement by one party justified denunciation by the other. To grant that the misdeeds of the mandatory Powers could never, in any conceivable circumstances, lead to revocation would merely encourage governments like that of South Africa in their evil intentions. In the words of Judge Padilla Nervo, and here I quote from his dissenting Opinion on the 1966 Judgement:

"The sacred trust is not only a moral idea, it also has a legal character and significance; it is in fact a legal principle. This concept was incorporated into the Covenant after long and difficult negotiations between the parties over the settlement of the colonial issue."

If I may quote from another dissenting Opinion, Judge Jessup, in discussing the competence of the United Nations to grant a request for the termination of the Mandate said: "Such competence is one of the highest manifestations of supervisory power".

The intention and purpose was to internationalize instead of annex, to make the principle of self-determination applicable, to keep in view the goal of self-government and, in case of abuse of the trust to appeal for redress, to exercise international authority to the full, even to the extent of revoking the Mandate. Surely, Mr. President, what was given by the international community to a member nation as a mandate to be administered according to certain conditions can also be taken back, if those conditions are grossly violated.

225

The competence of the United Nations to supervise the administration of the territory and to determine the international status of South West Africa is based on very sound grounds. First of all, it is derived from the resolution of the League of Nations of 18 April 1946, which recognized that, on termination of the League's existence, its functions with respect to the mandated territories would come to an end, but noted that Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter of the United Nations "embody principles corresponding to those declared in Article 22 of the Covenant of the League". The resolution of 18 April 1946 of the League pre-supposes that the supervisory functions exercised by the League would be taken over by the United Nations. The United Nations is the successor of the League of Nations. In the words of Judge Sir Arnold McNair.

"The policy and principles of the new institution, namely, the mandates system, have survived the impact of the events of 1939-1946, and have indeed been reincarnated by the Charter under the name of the 'International Trusteeship System' with a new lease of life."

Secondly, the competence of the General Assembly in the matter has been recognized by the International Court, which declared in its Advisory Opinion of 1950 that the General Assembly derived its competence from the provisions of Article 10 of the Charter which authorises it to discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the Charter and to make recommendations on these questions or matters to the members of the United Nations. It is in the exercise of this competence that the General Assembly through its various resolutions had adjudged that the official policy of racial discrimination practised in the mandated territory was in clear violation of the obligations of South Africa under the mandate.

Thirdly, the International Court, in its Judgement of December 1962, ruled that South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa was in law an international undertaking with the character of a treaty or a convention. Regarding South Africa's-objection that the Mandate had not been officially registered by the League of Nations, the Court said that if that was the case South Africa had never had any juridical right at all to administer South West Africa. The Court had already recognized the competence of the United Nations to exercise supervisory powers over the territory, to receive reports from the mandatory Power and to bear petitioners from the territory. Furthermore, it may interest the representatives to know that Judges Spender and Fitzmaurice, in their 1962 joint dissenting Opinion, stated : "The real dispute over South West Africa is between the Respondent State and the United Nations Assembly"-thus underlining the primary and the sole responsibility of the General Assembly to deal with the problem.

The ordinary circumstances in which a man date would be terminated would be the recognition by the world Organization of the fact that the inhabitants of the territory are able to manage their affairs and that they need not any longer be denied their separate existence as an independent State. But, since South Africa seeks to annex the territory in direct contravention of the spirit of the Covenant and the fundamental principles on which the mandate system is based, and is further determined not to develop the territory to stand by itself but to keep it backward and nonself-governing, there is no possibility to terminate the Mandate in that way. The revocation of the Mandate, therefore, is the only step left to the world community. It would be worth recalling here the words of General Smuts who was himself one of the principal architects of the mandates system. General Smuts stated in 1918 :

"The mandatory state should look upon its position as a great trust and honour, not as an office of profit or a position of private advantage for it or its nationals. And in the case of any flagrant and prolonged abuse of this trust, the population concerned should be able to appeal for redress to the League, which should, in a proper case, assert its authority to the full, even to the extent of removing the Mandate and entrusting it to some other state, if necessary."

Thus there are ample justifications, both by way of provisions in the Charter and through various pronouncements of the International Court of Justice, to put an end to the hideous control of South Africa over South West Africa and thus to assume direct administrative control over it and to take other necessary steps for the promotion of the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Territory. The United Nations, acting under the Charter and in its capacity as the representative of the international community and guarantor of the new world order, has the power to decide on the reversion of a mandated territory to the international community. This was recognized even by General Smuts, who stated: "Reversion to the League of Nations should be the substitute for any policy of national annexation". The revocation of the Mandate is now the first necessary step to enable the inhabitants of the Territory to exercise their fundamental right to self-determination, which has been guaranteed to them under the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 of the General

Assembly.

226

The position of my country on this question well known. India's attitude has been through out strongly to support the African peoples their legitimate demand for the grant of independence. At the very first session of the Assembly, in 1946, the Government of India focused attention on this issue and expressed its opposition to what amounted to annexation of South West Africa by South Africa. The fate of the people of South West Africa has always been a matter of great concern to us. The inhuman and criminal policies of the racist rulers of South Africa have been condemned by my delegation and by my country on innumerable occasions. It has been our view that the problem of South West Africa is basically a political and colonial problem and that it must be dealt with as such. We fully and unreservedly support the right of the people of South West Africa to become masters of their own destiny by exercising their right of self-determination which has been guaranteed to all colonial countries and peoples by the General Assembly in its resolution 1514 (XV).

The time has now come for the United Nations to take firm and decisive action in support of the people of South West Africa to thwart the aggressive plans of the South African Government. Its administration of the mandated Territory has been a blatant violation of the explicit requirements and implicit principles contained in' the Mandate, in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Members of this body assembled here today are only too well acquainted with the number of General Assembly resolutions against racial discrimination that have been ignored by South Africa. The world community has tried everything possible with a view to persuading the racists of South Africa to mend their ways and to discharge their obligations in fulfilment of the sacred trust, and has totally failed in this vital responsibility. The only response of South Africa has been to extend, with increasing severity, its abominable policies of racial discrimination to South West Africa and to strengthen its grip on the Territory. This has been made evident by the various committees of the United Nations that have examined in detail the nature of the administration of the mandated territory.

The fact that South West Africa is a political problem and that it has to be dealt, with accordingly has been demonstrated forcefully by the recent verdict of the International Court of Justice, which has caused a further deterioration in the situation prevailing in the Territory. My Government believes, as I am sure most of the Members assembled here do, that the United Nations, as the inheritor of the obligation that the League of Nations took upon itself to help the much-wronged peoples of South West Africa to progress towards self-government, cannot now shirk its responsibility. This obligation has recently assumed added significance in view of the disturbing situation obtaining in the adjacent High Commission Territories due to the aggressive policies of South Africa. We are also firmly convinced, as I mentioned earlier, that the United Nations has the right to terminate the Mandate and to assume direct administration of the Territory. I would like to reiterate that our primary concern is to save the indigenous people of South West Africa from being totally subjugated by the white rulers of South Africa. Unless this is done, there is a great danger that the present situation may lead to a most serious racial conflict throughout Africa, endangering international peace and security.

Mr. President and Distinguished Delegates, my delegation, in common with other like-minded delegations, and conscious of its moral responsibility as a Member of the United Nations will lend its full and unreserved support to such action as the General Assembly at its current session must and will take to being justice to the longsuffering people of South West Africa. Any prolongation of the existing state of affairs which permits the pathologically racist rulers of South Africa to continue their criminal policies of apartheid and racial discrimination in the Territory, policies which have been repeatedly condemned by the world community as constituting a crime against humanity, must not be allowed. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that all the Members of this august Assembly, leaving aside considerations of narrow parochial interests, will rise to the occasion and join forces in taking effective action to end the evil and barbarous rule of South Africa in the mandated territory of South West Africa.

INDIA USA AFGHANISTAN ETHIOPIA LIBERIA SOUTH AFRICA GERMANY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU

Date : Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the General Assembly in reply to Pakistan Foreign Minister

The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following statement in the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 29, 1966 in reply to the Pakistan Foreign Minister :

Mr. President. I am conscious that the hour is late and we all have other pressing engagements. I should, therefore, be as brief as possible.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has today referred to India in abusive but familiar terms.

227

Like other representatives of Pakistan who have exploited, indeed misused, this august forum, he has offered to the distinguished delegates assembled here a mixture of half truths and fantasies. What is painful is that in the process of hurling abuse against India, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has completely ignored that provision of the Tashkent Declaration which stated the specific agreement of the two sides that they will "discourage any propaganda directed against the other country and will encourage propaganda which promotes the development of friendly relations between the two countries." Among other things, India has been branded an aggressor and India has been compared to South Africa. The fact of India's defensive action in September last year has been presented by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to this Assembly as aggression. The fact of Pakistan's aggression on toe Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir twice within the last 19

years has been conveniently ignored and kept back from this Assembly. Now, Mr. President, I prefer to be constructive; I prefer not to violate the Tashkent Declaration. As far as the record is concerned, the same charges had been made time and again and refuted by the delegation of India on every occasion. I am not going to take the time of this Assembly by once again covering the whole ground. There are two points, however, which need to be brought to the attention of this Assembly.

First, it is amazing that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has taken exception to reiteration by the leaders of India of the Indian stand that the State of Jammu and Kashmir is a constituent State of India. This position of India has been stated by the Indian delegation on innumerable occasions both in this Assembly as well as in the Security Council. While participating in the general debate last year I myself stated and I quote "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 a people". The fact that India is prepared to discuss all differences with Pakistan in accordance with the letter and spirit of Tashkent Declaration and to settle those differences by peaceful means in a spirit of good-neighbourly relations does not mean and cannot mean that India must give up its stand in regard to the status of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. If each side were to insist on preconditions, would we not be entitled to say to Pakistan that it must first not only give up its point of view on Kashmir but also, as a prior condition for talks, vacate two fifths of Indian territory in Jammu and Kashmir that it illegally occupied and still occupies ? Mr. President, in our reading of the letter of the Tashkent Declaration and in our appreciation of its spirit, what is required to be done by the leaders of the two countries is that they must

sit down and settle all their differences without conditioning the settlement of one dispute on the settlement of another. It is necessary to recall that at the time of signing the Tashkent Declaration, "cacti of the sides set forth its respective position" on Jammu and Kashmir and this tact is mentioned in article I of the Declaration. Recognizing this absence of reconciliation of the respective view points on Jammu and Kashmir, India and Pakistan agreed to take several steps mentioned in article II to IX of the Tashkent Declaration. Article IX has special significance in the present context. It states : "The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the sides will continue meetings both at the highest and at other levels, on matters of direct concern to both countries. Both sides have recognized the need to set up joint Indian-Pakistani bodies which will report to their Governments in order to decide what further steps should be taken". The present effort of Pakistan to refuse to implement this article and to make it contingent on what Pakistan chooses to describe as "meaningful talks" on Jammu and Kashmir is contrary to the provisions of the Tashkent Declaration.

The second point which I wish to clarify, Mr. President, relates to the ministerial meeting between India and Pakistan in March of this year. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has made reference to the communique issued after that meeting. The operative part of the communique is that the two parties will meet again and discuss all their differences. In spite of India's best efforts to start these talks, the intransigence of Pakistan has not made it possible for a further meeting as contemplated in the communique issued after the Rawalpindi talks in March this year. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan did not, perhaps he could not, refer to the substance of the discussion held in March. This is so perhaps because be was not present at the talks. Since I led the delegation of India to that ministerial meeting, I can speak with some authority and assurance in regard to the attitude taken by India then an attitude which remains the same today. it is that regardless of differences between the two countries, indeed because of those very differences, the most important provision of the Tashkent Declaration, that is restoration of normal relations between the two countries, must be brought about by all possible meats. As we

228

in India see it, Mr. President, the way to the settlement of all differences is not to put conditions towards the conclusion of agreement on all problems at one and the same time. What Pakistan desired in March this year was that even though the two countries might arrive at an agreement on a specific issue between the two countries that agreement could not be implemented as long as there was no settlement of the question or Kashmir. Now, Mr. President, the Tashkent Declaration has been registered with the United Nations. Its copies are available to all delegations, and I invite all those who are interested, to study the document. There is no basis in that Declaration to support the thesis of Pakistan that restoration of normal relations between the two countries, in other words, settlement of differences between the two countries could not come about unless there was first an agreement on the question of Kashimir.

Mr. President, as recently as last month, we have offered to Pakistan to hold discussion on all outstanding issues between the two countries without any preconditions. To our deep regret, and I believe to the deep regret of this Assembly, Pakistan has once again rejected our offer. Today, We Foreign Minister of Pakistan has come to this Assembly and complained that India is not prepared to implement the Tashkent Declaration. Mr. President, on behalf of India. I would like to reiterate that India continues to adhere to the Tashkent Declaration in letter and in spirit and is ever ready to start talks for settling all the differences between India and Pakistan by peaceful means in a spirit of good neighbourly relations and with a view to reverse the deteriorating trend of the relationship between the two countries. I make this offer here and now to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Let us sit down and discuss ways and means of implementing all the provisions of the Tashkent Declaration.

Mr. President, before I conclude I would like to quote from a statement made by the Prime Minister of India, to the Afro-Asian group here on April 1, 1966. She said and I quote "it is not enough that there should be peaceful coexistence among the great powers of the world, we should also set an example and co-exist peacefully among ourselves. The essentials for peaceful co-existence are the determination not to use force and not to intervene in each other's affairs and the desire to settle all disputes by peaceful means, It is in this spirit that India,' less than three months ago, signed the Tashkent Declaration with Pakistan in which the two countries reaffirmed their obligations under the Charter, not to use force but to settle their disputes through peaceful means. The Tashkent Declaration provides India and Pakistan with a new framework in which to restore normal and peaceful relations between the two countries and to promote understanding, and friendly relations between the two peoples. The underlying concept of the Declaration was the deep conviction that peaceful relations between India and Pakistan are vital for the maintenance of their political independence and the achievement of their economic and social development. If all the provisions of the Declaration are implemented faithfully in letter and spirit, an atmosphere will be created in which all differences between the two countries can be settled peacefully. Political problems with emotional overtones--and there are strong emotions on both sides in this problemcannot be solved unless the peoples of both countries appreciate the vital necessity of peaceful and friendly relations between them".

After the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, had replied to the Pakistan Foreign Minister's earlier statement in the General Assembly on September 29, the Pakistan Foreign Minister again took the floor to make a brief statement. Replying to this statement, Sardar Swaran Singh said:

I must apologise for asking for the floor. I thought that I had said in very categorical terms that India is prepared to enter into discussions without any preconditions and that in such discussion each side will be fully justified in raising any point. I said also that India would be prepared to discuss any matter raised by the Pakistan delegation, just as the latter should be prepared to discuss any matter raised by India.

The fact that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan could anticipate what I would say and, therefore, came with a prepared text to reply to it only show that we are going through this exercise, knowing each other's point of view and trying to meet it by statements and counter statements. I do not wish to delay the Assembly by taking any more time. I make this appeal to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Let us begin talks in right earnest, and not just continue to exchange diplomatic notes or statements and counterstatements on the floor of the General Assembly. There is no substitute for direct talks and no substitute for trying to understand each other's point of view. Let us devote ourselves to improving the relations between our two countries. It is only by adopting that attitude that the people of India and the people of Pakistan can live in peace and friendship and goodneighbourly relations, an objective which is very dear to us and, I hope, dear also to Pakistan.

229

INDIA PAKISTAN USA UZBEKISTAN SOUTH AFRICA **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly on the Admission of Guyana to the U.N.

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on September 20, 1966, welcoming the admission of Guyana to the United Nations :

Mr. President, before I make a few remarks on the happy occasion of the admission of Guyana as a Member State of the United Nations, I should like to take this opportunity of expressing the profound satisfaction of my delegation at your almost unanimous election to the exalted position of the President of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly. Your election is a matter of immense gratification for my delegation. We are happy and proud that the President of this session of the General Assembly, which may turn out to be one of the most important sessions in the history of the United Nations, comes from a close neighbour with whom my country enjoys the most friendly and brotherly relations. Afghanistan and India are bound together by age-old ties of common culture and neighbourly intercourse in commerce and other fields from which both the nations derived mutual benefits. These ancient ties between our two peoples have been further strengthened in modern times as a result of sharing common aspirations in nation building and close identity of outlook on world affairs. The recent high level exchange of visits between our two countries brought out further the spirit of co-operation and friendliness which prevails in the relations between Afghanistan and India. Moreover, it is a matter for satisfaction to us that the great nation, Afghanistan, is represented in this high office of President of the General Assembly by a person of your eminence who is well-known and respected in international circles for his outstanding qualities of wisdom and knowledge.

As the Permanent Representative of your country to the United Nations for the past several years you have made a most significant contribution to the work of the Organization in all its fields. We have greatly admired your tact, your patience and your perseverance in dealing with most difficult and intricate issues. If I might add a personal note, it has been my proud privilege to have been associated with you ever since my arrival in New York and I have greatly benefited from this association. My delegation- has no doubt that under your wise and enlightened guidance the General Assembly will be able to proceed with its work smoothly and bring it to a successful conclusion. In this difficult task, let me assure you of the whole-hearted support of my delegation.

May I also take this opportunity to pay my delegation's tribute to the retiring President, Mr. Fanfani, who guided our deliberations with such distinction and outstanding success last year.

The independence of Guyana is a matter of particular satisfaction for the United Nations since it had been the subject of its consideration for many years. We in India have had close links with the leaders and people of Guyana for a considerable length of time. Not only did we follow Guyana's fight for freedom with deep interest and admiration, but we also actively sought her independence through the appropriate organs of the United Nations. We considered it our great privileged to join in the effort to help accelerate the liberation of a country for whose leaders and people we entertain feelings. of the highest respect and affection. It was, therefore, with great joy that we welcomed the emergence of Guyana as an independent State on 26 May 1966.

Guyana, with her vast and rich potentials for economic and social growth is at the threshold of the exciting process of development which all nations of the world are experiencing in varying degrees today. The motto of "One people, one nation, one destiny" inscribed in the national coat-of-arms of Guyana is an inspiring one. Initially, Guyana's problems might seem enormous, due to her long history of colonial exploitation and her multi-racial population, but her soil, rich in natural resources, her people, full of courage and determination to progress, and her dynamic leadership, ensure a glorious future.

In this most challenging task of development that faces the people of Guyana, the international community will, we are sure, offer its sincere cooperation and assistance so that they may enjoy the fruits of their fertile land in peace and harmony.

Guyana's membership of this world body is its due and will bring a step nearer the realization of the dream of universality in the United Nations. We have no doubt that. despite the problems and pressures that inevitably absorb the attention of an emerging nation, Guyana's contribution to the outside world, and especially to the ideals espoused by the United Nations, will be important and significant. My delegation warmly welcomes the admission of Guyana to the United Nations, an admission which has been unanimously endorsed by this Assembly. We offer our warmest congratulations and good wishes to the Prime Minister of Guyana on this happy occasion.

230

INDIA GUYANA USA AFGHANISTAN **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Joint Communique on Indonesian Foreign Minister's Visit

The following is the text of a joint communique issued in New Delhi on September 7, 1966 at the end of the visit of the Indonesian Foreign Minister, His Excellency Mr. Adam Malik

With the desire to strengthen the friendly and cordal relations between India and Indonesia, the Presidium Minister for Political Affairs/ Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, His Excellency Mr. Adam Malik, paid a visit to India at the invitation of the Government of India from September 3rd to 7th. He was accompanied by Rear Admiral Mursalin, Deputy Speaker of the Gotong-Royong House of Representatives; Mr. Ch. Anwar Sani, Director General for Political Affairs of the Department of Foreign Affairs; Mr. Djamaluddin Malik, Member of the Gotong-Royong House of Representatives; Mr. Elkana Tobing, Adviser to the Foreign Minister/Member of the Provisional People's Consultative Assembly; Air Vice Marshal I.S. Wirjosaputro, Deputy Chief of Staff for Administration of the Defence and Security Staff; Police Inspector-General M. Hasan. Deputy Chief of Staff for Special Affairs of the Defence and Security Staff and other senior Indonesian Government officials.

During his visit the Foreign Minister of Indonesia had talks with the Prime Minister of India, Smt. Indira Gandhi; the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh; the Minister of Education, Shri M. C. Chagla; the Minister of Commerce, Shri Manubhai Shah and the Minister of State for External Affairs, Shri Dinesh Singh. He also called on the President and the Vice-President of India. During these meetings, the Indonesian Minister for Foreign Affairs was assisted by His Excellency, Mr. Suska, Ambassador of Indonesia to India, and senior members of his party.

The talks were held in an atmosphere of great cordiality and mutual understanding and dealt with a wide range of topics of common interest. Special emphasis was laid on the further development of relations between India and Indonesia, and mutually beneficial cooperation in all fields.

In reviewing the bilateral relations between India and Indonesia, the two Foreign Ministers recognised the close cultural and historical affinity of the peoples of the two countries. They affirmed their desire for taking concerted steps in furtherig and strengthening their relations in the economic, technical and cultural fields.

In the economic field both sides recognised the need for formulating and adopting practical measures with a view to enhancing economic and technical cooperation and promoting trade relations to their mutual benefit. In this context the Indonesian Foreign Minister expressed his appreciation and confirmed his Government's acceptance of the offer of credit facilities to the amount of one hundred million Rupees extended by the Government of India. A high level Indonesian economic mission will arrive in New Delhi shortly to hold further discussions on this matter.

The two Ministers agreed to reactivate the existing Cultural Agreement concluded in 1955 between India and Indonesia. They felt that exchanges of visits and cultural delegations would help to enlarge the scope of cooperation between the two countries.

Both Ministers reviewed the international situation, in particular the developments in South and South East Asia and reiterated their continued adherence to the Bandung principles. They expressed their firm belief that an independent and active foreign policy in consonance with the Bandung principles is of the utmost importance in preserving the political and economic independence and national integrity of developing countries, in their common fight against imperialism and colonialism and in raising their standard of living. They reaffirmed their faith in the principles of non-alignment as an instrument for the prevention of war and consolidation of peace. for alleviating international tensions and developing international cooperation. They deplored all attempts at subversion and interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and the use and the threat of use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

231

They also discussed the problem of Vietnam and in the light of the rapid deterioration of the situation they were of the opinion that all efforts should be, continued to bring about a peaceful solution through negotiations within the shortest possible time in accordance with the Geneva Agreement of 1954. They affirmed that a military settlement of the conflict would be neither possible nor desirable. They further agreed that as one of the pre-requisites to such a solution the bombings of North Vietnam should cease immediately. They expressed the belief that the conflict in Vietnam is a matter of special concern to Asian countries and requires their earnest efforts in helping to restore peace to the area

Both Ministers recognised the urgency and importance of developing close economic and cultural cooperation among the countries of the region.

The Minister of External Affairs of India welcomed Indonesia's intention to reparticipate in the activities of the United Nations. He also welcomed the normalisation of relations between Indonesia and Malavsia and agreed that this step was a positive contribution towards peace and stability in the region. The Foreign Minister of Indonesia expressed the hope that the outstanding problems between India and Pakistan would be solved through peaceful negotiations for which the Tashkent Declaration provided a basis.

The Indonesia Minister for Foreign Affairs expressed his sincere appreciation and gratitude for the warm welcome and generous hospitality accorded to him and his party during their visit. He extended an invitation to the Minister of External Affairs of India to visit Indonesia which invitation was accepted with pleasure.

INDONESIA INDIA MALI USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND PAKISTAN **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Joint Communique on the Visit of Indonesian Trade Delegation

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on September 22, 1966 on the visit to India of the Indonesian Delegation led by His Excellency Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX :

A Delegation from Indonesia led by His Excellency Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX, Presidium Minister of Economic and Financial Affairs of Indonesia, arrived in New Delhi on September 20, for further talks on economic cooperation with an Indian Delegation led by Shri Manubhai Shah, Commerce Minister of India. These talks have been held in an atmosphere of extreme cordiality and in a spirit of mutual cooperation.

As a result of these talks, an Agreement has been reached to facilitate purchases from India of several commodities urgently required by Indonesia. India has agreed to make a line of credit of Rs. 100 million available to Indonesia for this purpose. The credit provides for the purchase of jute manufactures, cotton textiles, dyestuffs, pharmaceuticals, chemicals, insecticides paper, iron and steel products, aluminium sheets, irrigation pumps, spare parts for oil mill machinery, spare parts of bicycles and components and spares for truck and buses.

Broad agreement was also reached on the provisions of a new trade agreement proposed to be signed shortly. The draft agreement envisages the promotion of closer economic and commercial relations between the two countries and the expansion and diversification of trade between them. It would also specify the commodities available for export from either country to the other. The Leader of the Indonesian delegation extended an invitation to the Leader of the Indian Delegation to visit Djakarta for finalising the Trade Agreement.

The talks and the agreements reached herald the beginning of a new chapter of fruitful economic cooperation between the two countries and ensure that the economic cooperation between them would be extended to other fields in the near future.

It was further agreed that there was considerable scope for technical cooperation between the two countries. It was felt that there was a wide field in which the two countries could fruitfully cooperate to mutual benefit, thus helping to raise the standards of living and bringing about greater economic prosperity to the peoples of the two countries. As a first step, it has been agreed that the Reserve Bank of India will provide training facilities to a certain number of officials from the State Bank of Indonesia. The scope for the extension of technical cooperation between the two countries is proposed to be explored in greater detail.

The conclusions reached during these talks constitute positive steps to strengthen traditional hands of friendship and to build up economic cooperation between the two countries for mutual benefit. The leaders of the two Delegations viewed the understandings reached between them as a significant contribution in promoting economic cooperation amongst the developing countries.

232

They fully subscribe to the ideas and proposals currently under discussion in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the GATT for the expansion of trade among developing countries. They feel that while aid from developed countries is crucial for stimulating the economic growth of the under-privileged nations of the world, there is nevertheless, a large and hitherto fairly unexplored area in which exchange of goods on mutually satisfactory terms can take place between developing countries contributing significantly to their economic growth.

INDONESIA INDIA RUSSIA LATVIA USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL ROUND TABLE ON NEHRU

President's Inaugural Address

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, inaugurated in New Delhi on September 26 1966 the International Round Table on Jawaharlal Nehru's Role in the Modern World, organised jointly by UNESCO and the Government of India.

The following is the full text of the President's inaugural address Friends,

May I offer to the distinguished guests from abroad and home, who have come here to participate in this Round Table, a most cordial welcome on behalf of the people and the Government of India. You have come to pay your homage to a great servant of peace and of humanity. It is a pleasure for me to be here and inaugurate this Conference.

Jawaharlal Nehru spent his whole life in promoting international understanding, would unity and freedom of subject nations. That is what he lived and died for. It is essential for us, therefore, to remember his great achievements. He was essentially a democrat. I think democracy all that we can say-is the least unsatisfactory of all systems and no where has it succeeded to the extent which we desire.

In our country many people thought that it would not be able to function at all: poverty, general illiteracy, disease, divisions of caste, community languages and people of different stages of social and economic development. All these will make democracy a hard thing to succeed. If in spite of all these deficiencies it is working, more or less, satisfactorily, it is entirely due to the work of Jawaharlal Nehru. He was a man who had implicit faith in democracy and endowed his countrymen with faith in the same ideal and he tried to make us people with a democratic outlook, took hold of all these differences and difficulties, mobilized them all to the success of democracy and tried to build up a structure which we today possess.

He was a man, from the beginning. even when this country was a subject nation, had an international outlook. He revealed to us the realities of the world situation. In a speech which he gave a year before we got our Independence, he said, we should not align ourselves with any military powers. We should work for the United Nations Charter and we should work against any kind of racial discrimination and work for the attainment of the freedom of all subject peoples. He put these principles in an emphatic way in a speech which he gave in 1946, the year before we achieved our Independence.

The principle of non-alignment, to which he paid great attention, stems from the very genius of this country. This country does not believe in the philosophy of 'either this or that', but always believed in the philosophy of 'this and that'. They are distincts not opposites. They are contraries, but not contradictories, and we have to work together to build out of these differences a world of harmony. That is the world which he tried to achieve. That is the world which UNESCO is interested to foster.

Just as in our country we have Hindus, Muslims, Jews, Christians, Sikhs, etc., and all of them have a sense of belonging to one whole in spite of a few occasional set-backs, in spite of all those things, they have that great sense. So also, the countries of the world should have a sense of belonging to one world. There may be differences but those differences will have to be adjusted to the end of the great human dignity.

UNESCO has been interested in inviting the scientists, the thinkers, the artists of the world and are attempting to build a world of spiritual

233

community, a world of truth, beauty and human brotherhood. it pointed out to us the high destiny which beckons humanity. The world today is just a raw material of the world which is yetto-be and we have to use all the differences which we have in this world for the purpose of building up a high destiny for humanity. That is what we are expected to do. UNESCO has been instrumental in bringing different cultures together. It is there that we are learning the lesson of the Greek thinkers and the dramatists and Roman Law which brought together the whole Mediterranian. The whole world today aspires to get under the dominion of law. Israel and its neigbbourhood have developed the three great prophetic religions and in the east we have religions which emphasise the spiritual transformation of man as the essential aim of any kind of true religion. All these are brought together in the East-West Conferences which UNESCO, now and then, holds.

We have been there attempting at a closer understanding between the cultures of the world and it is on that human solidarity that the world today can easily be built. In spite of all these difficulties, as both the preceding speakers have stressed, we have violence and conflicts, we seem to have, so many difficulties in this world. It seems to be a source of perpetual conflict.

Wars have become more grim and more lethal after the discovery of nuclear weapons. once upon a time the victor and the vanquished could both survive any kind of war. Today, if there is a real nuclear war, there is no salvation for humanity. But are we far away from that. Only the other day in Cuba the patience of President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev helped us out. The other day we were startled to read a disclosure by President Eisenhower who says in the Korean war, we were about to launch nuclear weapons.' Why? The reason he assigned is that '135,000 people were casualties and we cannot look on and do nothing; we must do something!

Is not the position more or less similar in Vietnam today? There are many people who apprehend great danger there. It is reported that Chinese are moving their people to the central plateau because of the apprehension of a war. U Thant says, it may enlarge into a bigger conflict and bring about a nuclear catastrophe and His Holiness the Pope warned us that the danger to the whole human family is much more imminent today than before. But is it necessary for us to conclude any kind of peace to wait for all these developments? Is it not the part of wisdom to anticipate events and overcome them ? Is it not right for us to ward off these catastrophies as much as possible ? It is my earnest hope that peace-loving nations who are interested in bringing them to a conference table will succeed. That is where lies sanity. And I hope we will become sane enough to adopt that kind of attitude.

White our whole interest is that we have to change ourselves, the real problem facing the world today is the problem to which Gandhi gave utterance both by precept and practice. Courage, confidence, self-denial are as vital to international life as in other matters. For this we have to struggle hard at the souls of men. We have tried to change the nature of human beings. That is what is necessary. If we are not able to do that, we will have to drag on like this. Has the world become jaded, tired, bereft of recuperative power and. is incapable of making a new start. Can't it begin a new creative faith of living where all people recognise that they are world citizens, that the world is a primary loyalty and our nation is an administrative convenience which we have adopted, however beautiful it may be.

We have to preserve a world in which nationalities may be retained but the international idea becomes the most important thing. The only way in which we can do honour to this great statesman is to try our utmost to rededicate our efforts to rid the world of fear and hate which breed conflicts and cause wars. I wish your deliberations to be of benefit to us all.

INDIA USA OMAN ISRAEL CUBA KOREA VIETNAM **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

SINGAPORE

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in honour of the Prime Minister of Singapore

His Excellency Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore, arrived in New Delhi on September 1, 1966 on a five-day State visit to India. On September 2, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, gave a dinner in honour of the Singapore Prime Minister.

234

Speaking on the, occasion, Shrimati Indira Gandhi said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have great pleasure in welcoming you to New Delhi and I should like to assure you that for us it is a very great pleasure to have you with us. The name Singapore evokes friendly sentiments in the Indian people. It is only a little more than a year ago that Singapore became an independent State. It is one of the youngest States in the world but it is a dynamic young State and it is blessed with the dynamic leadership of the distinguished statesman whom we are welcoming today.

Earlier in the evening, you, Sir, were talking about the antiquity of India and how it gave us roots and a balanced outlook for the future; and this is true. At the same time, it is a burden also, and a burden which holds you down. Today it is one of our tasks-not to do away with our old traditions for we value much of it and we feel it gives us strength-but to be able to free ourselves from some of it so as to be able to move ahead. In that sense you are fortunate, in that you start with nothing to hold you back and only a bright future to beckon you forward.

You, Sir, are no stranger to India; but this time you are here as the first Prime Minister of the Sovereign Republic of Singapore. Under your leadership, Sinagpore is building a multi-racial, multi-lingual society, governed by parliamentary institutions and dedicated to the welfare of the people and to socialism. Situated at the cross-roads of culture and the migration routes, at the meeting place of the seaways and skyways of the world, this city has naturally attracted people from various lands. You have moulded them into one people. Your ideas and vision are those which we also value, the vision of a composite society of many races and languages committed to the ideals of democracy and peace. Like you, we cherish the exercise of independence in international affairs.

You have seen in this brief Period that you have been with us that we are facing tremendous problems but I hope that you have also seen that we are facing them with confidence and with courage and with the feeling that these difficulties are of a temporary and of a passing nature and that soon. we shall be on our way forward again.

We have found we started our independence with not only the tremendous burden of history, the tremendous burden of a colonial past but the tremendous burden of deep-rooted poverty. As we started on this onward journey, we found that each problem has its solution and also that each solution has its problems. This I think is the way of life and it is a way which none of us can escape. I think not only can we not escape it, but I think it is something which we must accept as a challenge and meet, as my father used to say, as a great adventure.

We, in India, recall with gratitude, the understanding and support we have had from Singapore during our difficulties last year. This has further strengthened the relations between our peoples. Already, there has been fruitful co-operation in the cultural and economic fields between our two countries. These exchanges, along with visits of political delegations from the two countries, has further stimulated the climate of better understanding and widened the area of friendship and co-operation.

We rejoice in the efforts of the Government of Singapore under Your Excellency's inspiring leadership for the economic uplift of your people through planned industrial development towards the goal of a Welfare State. Endowed with rich natural resources, you have made spectacular advance in budding a healthy and prosperous community. Singapore has the reputation of having the best health-which, you, Sir, have told us can sometimes be a handicap also--housing, educational services in that part of the world.

I have referred to Singapore as a young State. But it is young in a very special sense, that not only are your leaders very young but I learn that half of its population is below 20. How I wish that these young people, like young people everywhere, could inherit a world without want or a world without war.

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, may I request you to join me in a toast to the personal happiness and success of His Excellency Mr. Lee Kuan Yew and to the progress and prosperity of the people of Singapore.

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE INDIA USA PERU **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

SINGAPORE

Singapore Prime Minister's Reply

Replying to the toast, His Excellency Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore, said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies and ladies and gentlemen, first I would like to thank you for your warm words of welcome and the generous words of praise and encouragement with which you have accompanied that warm welcome.

India is a very special friend of Singapore. We borrowed our name from one of the ancient languages of India and we have borrowed many things

235

besides-the secular State, multi-language society, multi-racial community bound together in pursuit of equal or just society. Our leadership shares some special characteristics in that behalf-socialist by conviction and pragmatic in practice and that they both operate the system of rule which requires a great deal of tolerance, patience and effort in political affairs.

To India who pioneered the struggle of freedom of the subject peoples of Asia and later of Africa,

many of us owe a great debt in the work of the leaders of the freedom movement and the writings of leaders, not least of whom was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, which spread a message that sought justice and fight all injustice and inequality.

I would like to believe that, like, India Singapore which is a microcosm of so many different peoples and cultures and languages brought together by the accident of history and geography and modern science, as India is a macrocosm of the same. If India can resolve her problem in that magnitude, we must then surely take heart in that our problems which are of a more manageable dimensions must lead to the similar rational solution.

However, in the last 20 years since the first of anti-colonial movements as the present slang goes, has gone through an interesting, significant and subtle change has come about. The assumptions one took for granted; the monolithic structure of the communist world movement making a broad appeal across race, language and religion to poverty and down-trodden masses is no longer quite the same. Polycenterism Revisionism and many other terms have been added to the vocabulary of Marxism-Leninism.

There is another factor which has gravely altered perhaps to the detriment of the Asian people, is the prospect for the future. One of the factors which made Western advanced countries give concessions to former colonial peoples was the terrifymg prospect of solidarity of Afro-Asian peoples seeking to redress ancient wrongs. But we have discovered that independence does not mean the return to some idealistic romantic past of so many brothers living in one great humanity. Ancient feuds are renewed and what is worst, new guarrels are formed and so, the solidarity of Afro-Asia, as the large monolithic structure of the communist world, has also become a myth with grave consequences to the bargaining position of the haves and have-nots of the world.

It is in this context that I would like to believe that when we say, Asia for Asians, Asian co-prosperity, Asian solutions to Asian problems. we should not be unmindful of the fact that often Asian problems first are not just caused by Asians nor can be resolved by Asians alone. Perhaps political and social problems may be resolved by ourselves. But economic and worst problems of security are not within the complete dispensation of the Asian nations. And perhaps if it is just as it were, then I think we would have a dispensation which would be a great deal more disadvantageous to quite a number of us than what it already is.

So you see, Prime Minister, we begin to develop a degree of philosophical, if not somewhat cynical. resignation to the new checks and balances with which we must try and find our way forward to a more peaceful and more constructive world.

I would like to believe that the rallying call should be to bring Asians together, that Asians should put Asian peace and progress first and foremost And if we all try to do that and accommodate each other, to have peace and to enable each other to progress, and if possible to help each other to progress, then we would have a better chance of seeking the kind of life which we envisage we should have as of right.

This is an old and ancient continent with people of many ethnic groups with old and ancient memories. You have spoken, Prime Minister, of the disadvantageous aspects of old memories, the debris of history, of futile anger, bitterness, quarrels which are not productive. But it is when old and ancient groups of peoples discovered their freedom of action, capacity to initiate things for themselves, those things began to happen.

I have been fascinated of late by the problems of the past; I thought to myself that surely human beings who must have a long and varied occupation of this part of the world and many others, must have faced similar problems. And I am terribly disappointed that really no historian, however erudite, however discerning can tell us more than this, that for some reason in some parts of the world, under some circumstances, in certain climate some peoples rise to the occasion, flower and flourish, sometimes to die, sometimes to go on together and all they can tell us is that sometimes a group of people, faced with a challenge, respond and they warn us that if the challenge is too great and the response required is too prolonged, they perish in the end. They point to the monuments all around the world, from the great rocks and carvings of islands in the Pacific which it would be difficult to believe that people who

now reside in those Islands could possibly have created and to the Eskimos who can expend all their energy, fighting nature that they have very little left to live.

In fact they can point to the other great past civilisation, some of the earliest civilisations that took place in the Yellow River basin a very early civilisation took place thousands of years before Europe was stirred. And the lesson they tell us is that where there is no challenge, so they say, when the challenge is not as great as that of the Yangtee, disastrous uncertainties of the Yellow River, then,

236

no civilisation will emerge. But when there was a challenge to man he flourished in greatness and in Delhi, and in many parts of India, there are monuments which bear evidence of this tremendous response which your people made at other times in their long career.

I have no such relic which is a disadvantage, for it gives you confidence to know that in some given place, some given people have responded with vitality and vigour and produced a civilisation which left these great relics.

I should like to believe that what I am doing in Singapore with my colleagues should be the kind of tokens by which they would say, 'once upon a time there was a group of human beings who occupied this little part of South East Asia who responded but only for a short while', and it is with that hope that we what do for ourselves would have a more enduring and secure future for posterity. I believe eventually the qualities and the virtues and the strength and abiding reservoir of courage and vitality created great ancient civilisations that occupied large parts of Asia. They are not bereft of that wisdom we seek and accommodation which would bring an enduring and prosperous future for all.

Prime Minister, there is one other great thing. I have spoken of the similarities between our microcosm and your macrocosm; but there is of course one other treat difference. You carry a great tradition; not we . In your movements and in your forebears and in the history which has impelled this civilisation and made it survive so many ancient conflicts, it must give you comfort to know if it has lasted that long; it is likely to last till eternity. I have no such comfort. Therefore I would like to believe that by some rational process of checks and balances and friendships and associations. we might be able to share some of the security which your history, of course, gives.

Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen, may I ask you to drink to the health and success of our Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi,

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE USA INDIA OMAN PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

SINGAPORE

Joint Communique

The following is the text of the joint Communique issued in New Delhi on September 4, 1966, at the conclusion of the visit to India of His Excellency Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore :

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore, paid a State visit to India from September I to September 4, 1966. The Prime Minister was accompanied by His Excellency Mr. S. Rajaratnam, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. K. R. Chandra, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Law, Mr. Anwar Ibrahim, Chief of Protocol and Mr. Lim Tiong Ann, Private Secretary to the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister of Singapore assisted by the Minister of Foreign Affairs had discussions with the Prime Minister of India, who was assisted by the Minister of External Affairs and the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs. He also had talks with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Planning. He called on the President and the Vice-President of India and on the Speaker of the Lok Sabha.

The two Prime Ministers exchanged views on the Present international situation with special reference to the problems of Asia. They reiterated their faith in the policy of non-alignment and recognised that the world must be made secure for each nation to develop according to its own genius and its own chosen political and economic systems. Both the Prime Ministers reaffirmed their adherence to the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence and the need to abjure subversion and interference in the internal affairs of other states and the use and the threat of use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

Both the Prime Ministers hailed the Taskhent Declaration as an example of rational resolution of international problems. They agreed that the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration would undoubtedly contribute to peace and prosperity and to the happiness of the people of India and Pakistan.

The two Prime Ministers affirmed their faith in the principles of secularism and multi-racial integration as providing a just and harmonious approach to the economic, social and political problems of a pluralistic society.

They considered the Vietnam situation and expressed their great concern over the danger to the world in general and South Fast Asia in particular, arising from a prolongation of the conflict.

The two Prime Ministers agreed that the countries of South and South East Asia, as indeed all countries of Asia and Africa, must increase their economic co-operation in order to raise their living standards and give greater sub. stance to their political independence. They felt satisfied that strong links in the field of science, education, culture and trade were being forged between India and Singapore and expressed their determination to strengthen these relations in every possible way.

237

The Prime Minister of Singapore expressed his deep appreciation to the Prime Minister and to the Government and the people of India for the cordial reception accorded to him and his colleagues.

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE INDIA USA UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN VIETNAM

Date : Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

SWITZERLAND

Indo-Swiss Technical Co-operation Agreement

A general technical co-operation agreement between India and Switzerland was signed in New Delhi on September 27, 1966.

Mr. Etienne Serra, Swiss Charge d' Affaires in New Delhi, and Shri S. G. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, signed the agreement on behalf of their respective governments.

The Government of Switzerland has agreed to provide, on request from the Government of India, the services of technical experts for the various development programmes, training facilities for Indian technicians in Switzerland and such necessary equipment and materials as are not manufactured in India. The Swiss Government will pay the salaries and international travel costs of the Swiss experts and provide one-way passage costs, maintenance allowance, medical expenses etc. to the Indian trainees. The Government of India will meet the rupee cost involved in the various schemes of technical cooperation and give the usual facilities to the Swiss experts. The agreement will be valid for three years.

The Swiss Government has been providing assistance since 1963 for the development of agriculture in Munnar (Kerala) where modern methods of fodder production, soil improvement, cattle breeding and dairy economy are being developed. During the first stage of the first phase of this project, the assistance was of the order of Rs. 18 lakhs. In May last, Switzerland had agreed to provide further assistance of the order of Rs. 23.5 lakhs for the second stage of the agricultural development project in Kerala. The Kerala Government's contribution for the second stage is Rs. 16.65 lakhs.

With the signing of the general technical assistance agreement, it is expected that there will be a larger measure of technical cooperation between Switzerland and India in various fields for the economic development of this country.

SWITZERLAND INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date** : Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Indo-U.A.R. Trade Protocol Signed

Talks between the official trade delegations the United Arab Republic and the Republic of India on issues arising out of devaluation of Indian Rupee concluded in New Delhi on September 5, 1966 with the signing of a protocol.

During the discussions, which were held in a most friendly and cordial atmosphere, both sides reiterated their firm determination not only to maintain the current level of trade between the two countries but continuously to expand it during the coming years.

On questions relating to the problems consequent upon devaluation of the Indian Rupee, both sides agreed to take necessary measures to facilitate a smooth flow of trade during the postdevaluation period, so that there is no reduction in trade between the two countries and a favourable climate is created for future growth of trade.

The two Governments will endeavour to ensure that all existing contracts for exports from the U.A.R. to India and from India to the

238

U.A.R. are treated by the importers in either country as follows :

All the existing but not yet executed contracts or unimplemented portions of such contracts for export of goods from the U.A.R. to India will be immediately revalued in terms of the Rupee by 57.3 per cent in line with the new par value of the Rupee. The values of all the existing but not yet executed contracts or unimplemented portions of such contracts for export of goods from India to the UAR will similarly be increased by 57.5 per cent in terms of the Rupee.

The term "all the existing but not yet executed contracts or unimplemented portions of such contracts" used in this Protocol will apply only to contracts concluded before June 6, 1966, and in respect of which payments are due as described below :-

- (i) Payments due on or after June 6, 1966, on shipments effected on or after June 6, 1966;
- (ii) Payments due on or after June 6, 1966, under terms of deferred payment on earlier shipments; and
- (iii) Payments due in full or in part on June 6, 1966, on earlier shipments for which documents were on that date in the process of negotiation or were sent already on collection basis.

If there are any specific or exceptional cases on either side which cause serious hardship to either party, the representatives of both Governments will jointly examine at the request of either party such cases in order to find equitable solutions,

Every effort will be made by both sides to implement the existing Trade Agreement with the objectives of strengthening the, economic ties between the two countries. Both the Governments are pleased with the smooth conduct of negotiations, which augur well for the future flow of trade between the two countries. It was made clear during the negotiations that even though the existing contracts were being re-valued in this manner, future contracts could be made by both sides at prevailing market prices without reference to the pre-devaluation contracts.

INDIA USA PERU

Date : Sep 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

W.H.O. REGIONAL CONFERENCE

Prime Minister's Inaugural Address

The following is the text of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhis inaugural address at the 19th session of the Regional Committee for South East Asia of the World Health Organisation which opened in New Delhi on September 27, 1966 :

It is indeed both an honour and a pleasure to welcome public health administrators and delegates from nine countries of this part of the world.

The aim of W.H.O. is a healthy world. W.H.O. is a symbol of the growing cooperation among nations in matters of public health and medical research.

We speak of the world being one, but the implications of this idea are not fully appreciated. The unity of the world means that this globe cannot be half poor and half rich, half healthy and half diseased. An epidemic or an endemic disease in any Part of the world should rightly be regarded as a potential danger to all mankind and a challenge to the skill of science.

Most diseases are the Product of poverty. It is only economic development which can create a social administration which is capable of harnessing science to the task of conquering disease. Malnutrition is the mother of much illness. The food battle of India is not only one of quantity but one of quality as well. Our Government attaches the greatest importance to programmes which give protective food to the needy-in particular to children and to mothers. All who are engaged in development planning cannot, therefore, afford to lose sight of investment in health, for it pays dividends both in the greater well-being of man, which is the ultimate aim of all development; and in greater vitality and efficiency, which are, indispensable qualities of human resources in creating a reasonable standard of living for all. Both high dependence rate and short life expectancy militate against economic progress. It has been estimated that during the span of one generation some Asian countries lose no less than 32 per cent of their potential total productive capacity as a result of premature death.

239

Every child has a right to health, to education, to congenial employment. But his share of the sun and air, of water and sustaining food, is limited by the economic status of its parents. We feel that it is the duty of the State to correct this injustice. All children do not come with the same natural endowments, but every government should be able to give to every child the best opportunity to develop its potentialities to the fullest. Among the principles of WHO's Constitution, one seems particularly valuable to me. It says : "Healthy development of the child is of basic importance; the ability to live harmoniously in a changing total environment is essential to such development". How can this ability be inculcated in the young ? A very important task is precisely to induce every young person to go outside the narrow framework of his own personality, to go beyond the present, and to think in terms of the community and of those who will come after him. It is necessary to inculcate a regard for every life, which implies respecting everything which maintains health and life, respecting the vital elements of air water and earth. The more rapidly the world population increases, the more widespread industrialisation becomes and the more towns grow, the more essential it becomes, in this rapidly changing total environment, to do every thing possible to promote the harmonious development of the child in trying to teach a sense of true value.

The Constitution of the World Health Organisation states clearly in its preamble that success does not depend solely on the work of specialists but to a very great extent on informed public opinion. As my father said when be inaugurated this building, people must be convinced of the cause to be furthered. Informed opinion and active cooperation on the part of the public are of the utmost importance in the improvement of their health. This informed public opinion can no longer confine itself to matters concerned merely with individual hygiene. The individual must be taught above all to respect and set true value upon the common good, for which we are accountable not only to ourselves but to the world of tomorrow. International co-operation has a great role to play in enabling developing countries to improve their public health and medical aid programmes. Not all our countries have the means to carry out the basic research from which come life-saving discoveries. Therefore we all owe a lot to the discoverers. But the benefit of these discoveries must be available for all mankind at the lowest possible cost. Modern research needs large investments, but it is well known that, in the name of research. some firms charge exhorbitant prices for drugs. There is urgent need for arousing the conscience of the world in the matter of reducing the prices of the basic tools of birth control and death control

An essential precondition is the provision of health facilities and medical aid today. Even amongst advanced countries not all can provide prompt and adequate medical aid to their people. The public health programme is a programme of saving lives and conquering disease. It means fewer deaths, longer lives. Thus we are confronted with a dilemma: the conflict between the rate at which population is growing and the rate at which food supplies and job opportunities grow. This is why most' nations of Asia and Africa have undertaken programmes of family planning. It forms part of our Indian Fourth Five Year Plan, the most important feature of which is our determination to provide 3 oz. more of food per head and to be relatively independent of foreign imports of food. The family planning programme, we hope, will bring down the birth rate from 40 per 1000 to 25 in the next den years.

This is no small undertaking. It requires a large army of qualified medical people who can provide advice and guidance; it demands efficient organisation of supplies of contraceptive materials; and it depends on the involvement and cooperation of millions of married couples in India's 5,60,000 villages--calling for individual approach and persuasion. I have every confidence that we shall achieve the goal we have set out for ourselves.

Besides the big expansion in medical education, we have also planned for a big expansion of public education in matters of health. Expansion of general education brings about increasing health awareness and by 1971 we shall have nearly 100 million children at school. But we have the large mass of grown-up people, threefourths of them illiterate, in whom we must create a consciousness of environmental hygiene.

I said earlier that malnutrition is the mother of many illnesses. The food battle of India is one of changing diet habits and persuading people to cat not only what they like but what is good for them and for their growing children. Our Government attaches the greatest importance to programmes which give protective food to our poorer people. We had to undertake many such large-scale programmes during the recent food shortage in many States of India. I hope that it will be possible to. continue some of these programmes specially those which relate to schoolgoing children.

I am grateful for the opportunity which W.H.O. has given me to meet so many distinguished representatives of the countries of South-East Asia. I have great pleasure in welcoming you all to India and in inaugurating your conference.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 01, 1966

October

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Vol. XII	Record 1966 OCTOBER	No. 10		
CAMBODIA	CONTENTS	PAGE		
Vicc-President's Speech at a Banquet by Prince Sihanouk241Vice-President's Speech at his Banquet to Prince Sihanouk242				
INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS				
Sardar Swar Shri V. C. T	- -	243 the General Assembly e Political Committee eapons 2		
MALAYSIA				
Vice-President's Speech at a Banquet by the Prime Minister of Malaysia253Vice-President's Speech at his Luncheon to the Prime Minister of Malaysia254				
NEPAL				
Prime Minis Prime Minis Sangh	ster's Speech at King ster's Speech at the Ci ster's Speech at a Rec stering on Prime Mir	vic Reception eption by the Bharat-N 258	255 256 Jepal Maitri 259	

SINGAPORE

Vice-President's Speech at a Banquet by the President of Singapore 260

THAILAND

Vice-President's Speech at a Banquet by the Prime Minister of Thailand 262

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming President				
Nasser 26	53			
President Nasser's Speech at Palam Airport Replying to				
Dr. Radhakrishnan	263			
President's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming President				
Tito 264				
President Titos Speech at Palam Airport Replying to				
Dr. Radhakrishnan	265			
President's Speech at a State Dinner in honour of President				
Nasser				
and President Tito	265			
Reply by President Nasser and President Tito 266				
Prime Minister's Inaugural Speech at the Tripartite Meeting 268				
President Tito's Speech at the Inauguration of the Tripartite				
Meeting 2	69			
President Nasser's Speech at the Inauguration of the Tripartite				
Meeting 2	70			
Joint Communique on the Tripartite Meeting 271				
President Nasser's Speech at his Banquet to President				
Radhakrishnan	274			
Reply by President Radhakrishnan	274			
Press Release on President Nasser's Visit	275			

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CAMBODIA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA MALAYSIA NEPAL REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE THAILAND **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CAMBODIA

Vice-President's Speech at a Banquet by Prince Sihanouk

The Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, paid a goodwill visit to Cambodia from October 11 to October 13, 1966. On October 11, His Royal, Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Head of State of Cambodia, gave a Banquet in honour of the Vice-President.

Replying to the toast by H. R. H. Prince Sihanouk, Dr. Zakir Husain said:

Your Royal Highness, Your Highnesses, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am indeed overwhelmed by the extremely kind and generous remarks made by Your Royal Highness in regard to my country and myself. I would beg Your Royal Highness to accept my sincerest thanks for this magnificent Banquet which you have been good enough to hold in my honour. I am convinced that this warm reception to which I and my entourage have been treated springs from the heart of the great Khmer people whose friendship we in India cherish so much. I consider it a great honour to have been accorded an audience by Her Gracious Majesty the Queen whose serene wisdom and charm shall ever remain a cherished memory With me.

It is only a few hours since I have arrived in your beautiful capital of Phnom-Penh. Even during this short stay, the visit to the permanent exposition of the Sangkum, and the tour of the capital including the most impressive Olympic Stadium Complex has given me an opportunity to understand the immense progress that the people of Cambodia have accomplished under Your Royal Highness's in--iring leadership. Having

spent the best part of my life as an educationist, it has been a great joy for me to discover the remarkable strides that Cambodia has achieved in the field of education. Your Royal Highness has truly laid a fine foundation for the future of Cambodia.

India and Cambodia have centuries of close relations. History, religion, culture, social traditions-all that go to forge the links in the chain of friendship that unite nations and peoples-have held India and Cambodia together through history. We have cherished the-same dreams and hopes, flourished alike in the glory of creative thought and art, suffered alike from the anguish of lost freedom. Today both our countries are again free and united in our common endeavour to protect that freedom and make it a living force for the good of our people and the world at large.

In modern times, these relations have been vitally renewed and thanks to the great friendship, consideration and comprehension shown by Your Royal Highness, especially towards our late venerated leader Jawaharlal Nehru, these bonds have been immeasurably strengthened in the. years following our two countries' emergence to freedom. I should like to express our appreciation for all he eloquent demonstrations of sympathy and understanding for India in a tangible form on the part of Your Royal Highness. Cambodia is an basis of peace in a region so tragically torn by conflict--an achievement only made possible by the far-sighted policies so resolutely pursued by Your Royal Highness despite all pressures. We in India greatly rejoice in the success of these policies and have always strongly supported and will continue to support your desire and determination to maintain the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cambodia.

Your Royal Highness has graciously referred to the modest part played by my country in implementing the decisions of the Geneva Conference of 1954. May I in this regard stress the unfailing and courageous support that the Royal Government of Cambodia' has extended under your wise leadership to the work of the International Commission for Supervision & Control in Cambodia over the years.

Your Royal Highness, Cambodia like India has had an astonishing continuity of culture and civilisation equalled by few other countries in the world. We both prize dearly our precious traditions while endeavouring to transform ourselves into modern societies within the framework of a peaceful democratic structure. It is, therefore, with considerable anticipation that I am looking forward to my journey tomorrow to the very source of Khmer Civilisation, Angkor. Your Royal Highness, your warm hospitality and warm kinship have already made, me feel that I am not in a foreign land as a mere guest but as a member of the family in the home of my own brothers. It is a precious feeling, particularly in the world of today where sincerity is often suspect as a blind for selfishness, where passion and hatred divide men and nations and aggressive postures are accepted as signs of strength. And I shall ever cherish that feeling.

May I, once again, thank You Royal Highness for the very affectionate welcome given to me and my party ? It is with a profound sense of gratitude that-I shall now request Your Highnesses, Your Excellencies, Ladies & Gentlemen, to raise your glasses and drink a toast to Her Gracious Majesty the Queen, to His Royal Highness, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Head of State of Cambodia and to the imperishable friendship between CAMBODIA & INDIA.

CAMBODIA UNITED KINGDOM USA INDIA SWITZERLAND **Date** : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CAMBODIA

Vice-President's Speech at his Banquet to Prince Sihanouk

The following is the text of the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain's speech at a Banquet given by him in honour of His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Head of State of Cambodia, on October 13, 1966 :

Your Royal Highness, Your Highnesses, Excellencies, Ladies & Gentlemen,

Now that I have come to the very end of our brief but unforgettable visit to Your Royal Highness's wonderful country, I find it extremely difficult to express adequately our gratefulness for the warm and generous hospitality and welcome extended to us. During the last 3 days, I have seen a great deal of the magnificent achievements of the great builders of the Khmer nation in the past as well as in the present. One can now understand something, of the fire that bums in the hearts of all these torchbearers of Khmer achievements.

In the case of our two countries, the past two thousand years stand as a living witness to a most satisfying story of mutual relations. We have both been extraordinarily Vital peoples sending out our thought and culture to each other and to neighbouring countries. There is not a trace of any conflict between us and the entire period has been one of peaceful exchange of ideas, religion, art and culture.

I have seen for myself the great strides which modern Cambodia has made under your Royal Highness's remarkable leadership. The supreme adventure of creating a contented, peaceful and democratic State in the short space of a decade will not only inspire your countrymen but all others in Asia. I shall carry back with me from this visit a rich fund of memories and appreciation of the people of this great country.

Cambodia we feel, has to play a distinctive and important role in South-East Asia. It is, therefore, natural for us to think of closer relations with the Cambodian people and Your Royal Highness. Therefore, the question of Cambodia and India understanding each other and developing the closest possible relations is not only important from the point of view of our two countries but has a larger importance and significance of its, own It is in this context that I particularly value the opportunity that this visit has afforded me to discuss with Your Royal Highness many a matter of mutual interest to our two countries. I am greatly strengthened by Your Royal Highness's understanding and friendship for India. At this perilous moment of history, I sincerely hope that our two countries will continue to stand for peace, co-operation and the values which have given strength to our two nations and sustained them through long centuries

Your Royal Highness, Your Highnesses, Your Excellencies. Ladies and Gentlemen, I should

now like to request you to join me in drinking a toast to Her Majesty the Queen, His Royal Highness, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Head of State of Cambodia, to all Cambodian friends present here and for the continued prosperity, happiness and wellbeing of the Cambodian people.

242

CAMBODIA UNITED KINGDOM USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's U. N. Day Message

In a broadcast to the nation on October 23, 1966 on the eve of the U. N. Day (Oct. 24), the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, said

Friends,

Tomorrow is the United Nations Day. The United Nations has become a part of our international political life. It is not a panacea for all our ailments but a safety valve which softens the asperities of the international anarchy which is still the lot of mankind. It is an instrument of international co-operation.

The Charter of the United Nations, approved at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, mentions the following objectives

- (1) to save future generations from the scourge of war,
- (2) to re-establish belief in the fundamental rights of man,
- (3) to create conditions which will help to settle disputes between nations according to law and justice,

(4) to promote higher standards of living and social progress.

The Declaration of the Rights of Man was approved by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The non-observance. of the fundamental rights has been the principal cause of conflicts which. have offended the conscience of man. 'Equal and inalienable rights for all members of the human family should be recognised as the foundation of freedom, peace and justice in the world.

Many of the colonial peoples have been accorded political freedom, though they have yet to achieve economic progress. There are, however, colonies whose rulers do not wish to 'Part with power. We' have 'racial discrimination in some parts of Africa where the people are subjected to very grave humiliation. Fascism was defeated in the last war but the fascism of the mind is not yet defeated. The emotions of bigotry, hatred and violence are still alive in the human heart. The agencies of the United Nations like the UNESCO, WHO and FAO have assisted backward peoples to improve their conditions.

They should bring about an equitable use of the world's resources, economic, scientific and moral, to meet the needs of poor, hungry, illiterate and diseased peoples. As economic disparities within a nation cause unrest, even so the disparities between the rich and the poor nations of the world unsettle the equilibrium of the world. The distance between the rich and the poor should be bridged as speedily as possible.

The United Nations has succeeded to some extent in removing disagreements among nations. Israel, Indonesia, Korea, Suez, Lebanon, Laos, The Congo, West New Guinea, Yemen, Cyprus, stand out as witnesses to the United Nations' spirit of conciliation through peaceful means.

In spite of the achievements of the United Nations, it is still ineffective in vital matters. In the matter of peace-keeping operations, the great powers have not come to any agreement. We have to develop the will to maintain and even improve the United Nations peace-keeping machinery. The International Court of Justice, by refusing to decide on the South West Africa issue has set back the cause of law as a substitute for power politics. We hope that South West Africa may fare better in the United Nations General Assembly than in the International Court. The absence of China not only takes away from the universality of the United Nations but retards any real progress towards disarmament, peace in Vietnam and a stable world.

The trouble spots today are disarmament, apartheid and decolonisation. The dangers of a nuclear conflict are increasing as the number of nations possessing nuclear armoury is increasing. We are aware of the danger of nuclear proliferation but are not nearer a non-proliferation treaty and a comprehensive test ban. Military budgets, in the conventional fields, are steadily increasing. There are countries which, in sheer despair, hope to acquire nuclear weapons as a protection against nuclear attack by hostile neighbours. We all profess that we are pledged to control, reduce and ultimately eliminate nuclear weapons of destruction but mutual suspicion hinders our efforts

243

to prevent nuclear proliferation, halt the nuclear arms race and reduce nuclear stocks. We foresee the tragedy but seem powerless to prevent it. We know the dreadful consequences of a nuclear war but are unable to check the drift to it. We are afraid to face the fact that an old world is disappearing and a new world is emerging. We should recognise that we are members of the human family first and foremost and not Russian or American, French or German primarily. We should develop a strong sense of community. We must find the power to change ourselves and the society so that moral values may have reality in our world.

The United Nations should be allowed to grow into a federal Organisation. There are difficulties in the way but there is no other alternative to the devastation and horror of a modern war. We must strive to strengthen the judicial, executive and police functions of the United Nations.

INDIA USA INDONESIA ISRAEL KOREA LEBANON CONGO GUINEA LAOS YEMEN CYPRUS CHINA VIETNAM RUSSIA

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech in the General Assembly

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, delivered the following speech in the General Debate of the General Assembly on October 7, 1966:

Mr. President,

May I once again offer to you, both on behalf of the Government and people of India and on my own behalf, our most sincere felicitations on your assumption of the high office of the Presidency of the twenty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly. We rejoice in your election for more than one reason. It is, if I may say so, a fitting recognition of your own eminence as a statesman. We rejoice also that the representative of a neighbouring country, Afghanistan, should have been chosen for this high and important office. I do not have to dwell on the nature of the close and intimate ties which bind your country, Mr. President, with my own. Indeed, this traditional friendship between our two countries may well be regarded as an example of good-neighbourliness in our part of the world.

Allow me, Mr. President, to take this opportunity to place on record our deep sense of appreciation of the work done by your distinguished predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Amintore Fanfani, as President of the twentieth session of the General Assembly.

PRESENT SECRETARY-GENERAL'S RE-APPOINT-MENT It will not be out of place if I, at this stage, express our earnest and sincere hope that U Thant, our respected Secretary-General, will not decline reappointment at this particular juncture. We are conscious of the considerations which have prompted U Thant to take his present decision. These very considerations impel us to urge him to reconsider his decision.

We share his disappointment at the lack of "new ideas and fresh initiatives" in the field of disarmament. We share, too, in his concern about the financing of the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations and in the lack of impetus the United Nations Development Decade was expected to give to the urgently required technological breakthrough in the developing countries. We are equally concerned about the deteriorating situation in South-East Asia and, more particularly, in Viet-Nam. For these very reasons. we are convinced that this Organization needs his continued guidance and wisdom. While we welcome the decision of U Thant to be prepared to remain in office at least until the end of the present session, we join with the Members the General Assembly in expressing the earnest hope that he will agree to accept a second term as Secretary-General.

GUYANA

Year after year, we have seen this Organization of ours grow as new States join our ranks. This year we have the pleasure of welcoming in our midst the new State of Guyana. Feelings of brotherliness and cordiality animate the relations between our two countries, and we now look forward to our working together in this Organization.

BOTSWANA AND LESOTHO

I should like to say how happy. we are at the emergence of Botswana and Lesotho as independent, sovereign States. Soon, another State-Barbados-will also attain independence and sovereignty. We look forward to welcoming them here in the near future, and we have no doubt that they will all add to the strength of this Organization.

As one surveys the contemporary political scene across the continents of this world of ours,

one is naturally oppressed by the weight of the

244

many problems which continue to defy solution. The Secretary-General, in his introduction to the Annual Report, has reflected, with remarkable sensitivity, the general climate in which the world finds itself. I shall endeavour to deal with some of these problems which especially touch and concern us all vitally. But before I do this, I should like to mention one or two brighter aspects of the world scene.

We rejoice at the easing of the tensions between Indonesia and Malaysia, and we are happy that Indonesia has decided to resume its rightful place in the United Nations. There is little doubt that Indonesia's return not only demonstrates the loyalty of its Government and its people to the principles and purposes of the Charter, but also reflects the inherent strength of the United Nations.

South-East Asia is in turmoil. Consequently, even a small beginning towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia can have vital beneficial effects in this region. We offer our felicitations to the leaders of these two fraternal countries.

I should also like to say how happy the Government and people of India are at the resumption of normal diplomatic relations between Malaysia and Pakistan.

VIETNAM

In the concluding observations the Secretary-General has made in the Introduction to the Annual Report, he has referred to his endeavours "to help in the efforts which have been made to reduce the escalation of the conflict in Viet-Nam and to move to the conference table the quest for a solution of the problem". The approach he has indicated and the considerations which have weighed with him coincide with our own approach and our purpose. For nearly A quarter of a century now, the people of Viet-Nam have gone through suffering, misery and torture. That is tragedy enough. What is worse is the constant danger that some day the war in Viet-Nam may overflow its own frontiers and engulf us all. Situated as we are as an almost neighbouring country of Viet-Nam, we in India are 'vitally affected by developments in that part of the world. Herein lies our deep interest. We are also concerned as Chairman of the International Control Commission. We also deeply feel that the entire area of the former Indo-China States will remain a source of extreme anxiety and even turbulence unless the situation in Viet-Nam is brought under control. And, above all, we sense in the agony of Viet-Nam a haunting and brooding tragedy of a possible world conflict.

It is well to recall that after a Conference lasting several months, the Geneva Agreement was reached in 1954, by which the war of independence in Viet-Nam was brought to a close. What was stipulated at Geneva was that the cease-fire agreement should be respected and that steps should be taken to bring about a political settlement in Viet-Nam. To this end it was envisaged that consultations' should be held between 'the two sides in Viet-Nam to bold general elections in July 1956 for the reunification of Viet-Nam. It is the tragedy of Viet-Nam that these stipulations regarding the political settlement were not fulfilled in time.

For some time now, there has been recognition on all sides that there can be no lasting military solution to the Viet-Nam problem. If this is true then the only alternative left is the earnet search for it peaceful solution. Moved by this primary consideration, my Prime Minister has been urging the stoppage of bombing of North Viet-Nam, the cessation of hostilities and of all hostile action throughout Viet-Nam, a Geneva-type conference between the parties to the conflict and others vitally concerned so as to eniable the people of Viet-Nam to decide freely their future without any interference or pressure from outside, and within the framework of the Geneva Agreement of 1954.

All of us can derive some encouragement from the fact that, even today, every one directly concerned with the conflict in Viet-Nam subscribes to the continuing validity of the Geneva Agree-

There can be no doubt that the world community is eagerly and anxiously searching for ways and means to bring the conflict in Viet-Nam to an end. We feel confident that, if the bombing of North Viet-Nam is ended, a way out could perhaps be found to move the parties from the battlefield to the conference table. We are equally confident that in the ensuing negotiations modalities could be worked out between all the parties concerned, including the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam, for the full implementation of the Geneva Agreement. It is our earnest hope that the very compulsion of preserving national identity and national interests would make the Viet-Nam of the future selfregarding and independent. In this context, the Secretary-General has made a very wise observation when he states that "the basic problem in Viet-Nam is not one of ideology but one of national identity and survival"

LAOS

The situation in Laos is integrally tied up with the situation in Viet-Nam. There could be no perceptible improvement in one without a corresponding improvement in the other. Should the conflict in Viet-Nam escalate, there is bound to be a corresponding escalation in Laos as well.

245

in such an inherently difficult situation, we appreciate the efforts made by the Prime Minister of the Royal Laotian Government, Prince Souvanna Phouma to steer a middle course.

CAMBODIA

All of us should understand and appreciate the problems faced by Cambodia in the context of the situation in Indo-China. The courageous efforts of His Royal Highness, Prince Sihanouk, to safeguard Cambodia's neutrality and independence evoke in our hearts a sympathetic response. All of us owe it to the world community and to the cause of peace that we should have a clear understanding of the extremely difficult situation in which Cambodia finds itself.

CHINA

May I refer briefly to another sombre aspect of the picture in Asia. In one way or the other, China looms large on our horizon. I do not need to recapitulate all the efforts which we made from' 1949 onwards to build our relations with that country on the basis of friendship. We literally bent backwards in our anxiety to convince the world bow necessary it was that the People's Republic of China did not suffer from a sense of isolation. We do not, for a moment, regret having made a sincere effort in that direction. While we do not wish our vision to be clouded by our pre-occupation and concern we are nevertheless left with a most serious problem on our hands across the entire stretch of our northern and north-eastern borders.

You, Mr. President, and all assembled here are familiar with the macabre drama enacted by China last year in delivering ultimatums to us. We stood our ground, and it is our firm resolve that, whatever sacrifices our people have to make, we shall never falter in the defence of our security and territorial' integrity.

We have no objection-we never had it in the past-to China fashioning its destiny within the social, economic and political framework of its own choice. All that we seek is to reserve to ourselves a similar right. After all, peaceful coexistence would be a mere slogan unless all of us could feet a sense of assurance that we could fashion our respective destinies in the light of our own experience, tradition and circumstances. We therefore view with concern the adventurist postures and policies of China in defiance of the principles of peaceful co-existence.

While we have no illusion that China will change its policy overnight, we nevertheless believe that our attempts towards that end should not be given up. It is for this reason that we have continued to maintain the position that the People's Republic of China should be seated in the United Nations,

RHODESIA

May I now deal with some of the problems which continue to torture the continent of Africa. The United Nations cannot contemplate with equanimity the situation in which it finds itself there.

The problem of Rhodesia is assuming an increasingly disquieting character. Some of us recently had occasion to discuss it elsewhere in great depth and over a long period. We, in India, are amazed at the staggering disproportion between the actual size of the problem and the ineffectiveness on the part of the administering Power, in dealing with it.

Let us measure the dimensions of the problems which Southern Rhodesia presents. The last nineteen years have witnessed the emergence of as many as twenty-seven sovereign independent nations out of what was once the British Empire, Seven hundred million people, after long, bitter and strenuous struggle, attained their freedom. And, in each case, sovereignty was transferred on the basis of majority rule. The question simply is whether this vast historic process of the liberation of peoples is going to be reversed and set at naught by a mere 200,000 people in Rhodesia who are infected with pathological racist doctrines. This staggering fact can-not be hidden by any sophistication of language. This handful of men are defying with impunity the urge for freedom of four million people of Southern Rhodesia who rightly demand independence on the basis of majority rule and one man, one vote.

If this festering sore in Rhodesia is not healed quickly, its poisonous effects will corrode and corrupt the very vitals of the world community. And the price which we shall then pay will be far more terrible and costly than all the calculations that we might make of the cost at present. What could be more tragic than that our hope for the possibility of races living together in peace and co-operation should be shattered? The time has therefore come for immediate and effective action to end the illegal and racist regime in Southern Rhodesia. We earnestly urge the United Kingdom to take the necessary action with a sense of urgency in order to discharge its responsibilities to itself and to the world community.

If the situation in Rhodesia is menacing, no less menacing are the policies and practices of the Government of South Africa and of the Portuguese colonialists.

COLONIALISM

There may appear to the protagonists of Realpolitik an element of unreality in our trying to deal, year after year for nearly twenty years, with the problems of apartheid and the remnants of colonialism. The fact remains, however, that

246

sooner or later these problem will have to be resolved one way or another. We hope that they will be resolved peacefully, reasonably and rationally. It is because we persist in this hope that it is of vital importance that, year after year, this Organization must make its position abundantly clear. There is no government on this earth which can remain immune for ever from the pressures generated by the world community and the conscience which it embodies. It is in that hope and that faith that we have persisted and shall continue to persist in lending our support to the cause of the liberation of the peoples of South West Africa and of Mozambique and Angola.

This great Organization must give hope to all those who are suffering and striving for the liberation of mankind from dehumanizing doctrines of racialism and intolerance, discrimination and oppression of one people by another.

APARTHEID

This brings me to the problem of apartheid. And if I do not speak on this subject at length, it is because my delegation will have the opportunity of expressing its views when this matter comes up for a more detailed consideration in the appropriate Committee. I should, however, like to say with all the emphasis at my command that the pernicious policies of apartheid provide the most explosive material for conflict and undermine the foundations of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights. All this we have said- in the past, and we shall continue to caution the world community against the accumulation of inflammable material to which South Africa is so recklessly contributing.

While we denounce the rulers of South Africa for elevating to the level of State policies doctrines of racial intolerance and persecution, we must at the same time express our abhorrence of the policies of those who aid, assist and comfort South Africa in the name of commerce and trade and for other financial benefits. The many powerful friends by whose grace South Africa is enabled ruthlessy to suppress the indigenous people should really give some thought to trading human rights for commercial profit.

DISARMAMENT

May I now refer briefly to another problem which vitally concerns us all-namely, the problem of disarmament and proliferation of nuclear weapons. At the very outset I should like to say that I do not have to present credentials concerning my country's unswerving loyalty to utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. Our record in this respect is as clean as it is above board.

The very act of living daily with the everincreasing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and delivery systems tends to make us insestitive to the menace which all this represents. In order to combat this insensitiveness and in order that the peoples of the world may understand what all this really involves, the Secretary-General has made an interesting suggestion, He has observed that :

"no organ of the United Nations has ever carried out a comprehensive study of the consequences of the invention of nuclear weapons". (A/6301/Add.1, p. 3).

He has suggested that the time has now come for an appropriate body of the United Nations

"to explore and weigh the impact and implications of all aspects of nuclear weapons, including problems of a military, political, economic and social nature relating to the manufacture, acquisition, deployment and development of these weapons and their possible use". (ibid., p. 4).

We would heartily support such a study. Indeed, under the inspiration of Jawaharlal Nehru, our scientists had engaged, some ten years ago, in a preliminary study of the consequences of atomic explosions. The results of that study were published in the form of a book, but quite clearly we need to deepen the study.

There can be no doubt that the most serious menace which the world faces today rises from the feverish arms race that is going on among the nuclear weapon Powers. The arsenals of these nations are more than large enough to destroy the entire world several times over. And yet these nuclear weapon Powers are now going in for what they call a new generation of nuclear weapons and planning to add a new dimension to the arms race by embarking upon antiballistic missiles. In the context of this grave situation, it is mere diversionary tactics to talk about a sixth or seventh or eighth nuclear Power. The net effect of this is to give sanctity to the existing nuclear weapon Powers, to their weapons and their proliferation. Indeed, it provides a justification for defiance of the will of the comity of nations as expressed in the test-ban Treaty. Fortunately for most of us, the international community does not look at the problem in that manner. It does not give its scal of approval to four or five countries and accord to them permission to proliferate. In so serious a matter one would not wish to engage in making debating points. But, quite seriously, we believe that proliferation whether vertical or horizontal is equally serious.

The United Nations adopted a resolution at the last session of the General Assembly on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in which it stated categorically that a treaty on the subject must be

247

based on certain principles, one of which is that it should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of nuclear weapon Powers and non-nuclear weapon Powers.

It is to us axiomatic that all countries, namely, those which possess nuclear weapons as well as those which do not, must assume similar obligations in respect of non-proliferation, and that there should be some progress on nuclear disarmanent as a whole. We shall therefore continue to press for measures which could act as a genuine deterrent against nuclear proliferation and, at the same time, check the nuclear arms race among the nuclear weapon Powers.

I should now like to touch on the fringes of a problem which, in many ways, bedevils the developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. All of us are, in one way or another, involved in processes of transformation of our respective societies. The essence and substance of this process is that in this latter half of the twentieth century we are trying to do what Europe achieved over a period of three to four centuries. We are trying to transform subsistence economies and archaic societies into modern societies with modern industry and modern agriculture. We are in the process of setting up modern nation-States. All the great tensions and conflict stem from these efforts. In the measure we sympathetically understand these processes, that measure, we might guide these vast changes into creative channels. And yet one cannot help expressing disappointment at the lack of under standing shown.

DEVELOPMENT DECADE

Since the adoption of its resolution on the Development Decade, this Assembly has increasingly turned its attention to the grave problem of disparity between the standards of living of the developed and the developing countries. The turning point came in 1964 when, at the first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the international community took a pledge to tackle this problem in a systematic and concerted manner and give to itself the machinery and the framework of a dynamic international policy for achieving this purpose.

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development has completed two years of existence. The progress in the implementation of the recommendations adopted at the first session of the Conference has been disappointing. The annual report of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to the Trade and Development Board, which has just concluded its session in Geneva, shows that the developed countries lack the will to implement the recommendations of the first Conference. Unless bold and imaginative steps are taken to implement the recommendations of the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the crisis of rising expectations in the face of diminishing fulfilment will get further aggravated and may lead to such deep frustration that it may shake the very foundations on which the international community is trying to build a new world order and lasting peace. The second session of the Conference, which is scheduled to be held next year, will provide an opportunity to devise ways and means to translate into concrete action the noble objectives embodied in the Final Act of the first Conference. We welcome the unanimous decision of the Board to recommend to this Assembly that the Conference be held in New Delhi, and we are happy indeed to have this opportunity to make our modest contribution to the success of the Conference.

Reports on world economic trends submitted by our distinguished Secretary-General, the World Bank report, the reports of the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization and, most recently, the report on implementation submitted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, present a picture of an all-round deterioration in the economic situation of the developing countries. Poverty and stagnation in the developing countries have become more vicious. Those countries face the problem of the food gap, the problem of debt explosion and the problem of not being able to maintain the momentum of economic growth achieved so far. Under these pressures, many governments in the developing countries are finding it difficult to maintain the socio-economic structure for the evolution of which they have made great sacrifices and which they cherish as one of their most important national achievements and objectives.

The rate of growth in the developing countries during the first half of the Development Decade not only fell short of the target of 5 per cent but was lower even than the rate of growth during the fifties. Taking into account the increase in population in developing countries, the increases in per capita income in these countries have been only nominal. This leads our world to a situation where the gap in the standards of living between the developed and the developing countries has widened further instead of narrowing. We gather from the report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development Secretary-General on implementation that whereas the increase in per capita income in the developed countries during the first half of the Development Decade was \$60 per annum, that in the developing countries was only \$2 per annum. Our attention has also been repeatedly drawn recently to the stagnation in the out-flow of financial assistance to the developing countries during the first

248

half of the Development Decade. During that period, the gross national product of the developed Countries as a group has increased substantially per year, which has resulted in a fall in the ratio of capital outflow of gross national product of the developed countries assigned for aid to developing countries. The latest figures in the total debt burdens of the developing countries and their payment liabilities on this account show that the repayments of debts by developing countries now absorb more than half of the total inflow of financial assistance to these countries. if that trend is allowed to continue, in fifteen years time the devoloping countries will be in the peculiar situation of earning only to pay their past debt.

NON-ALIGNMENT

In conclusion. may I make one or two observations of a general character.

Those of us, who have endeavoured in our own imperfect way to pursue the policy which has conic to he known as one of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence have always tried to ensure that our minds remain ever free from the passions and prejudices which may sway us from time to time.

If the world today at least the European part of it, feels a little relaxed and talks with a certain amount of detachment about the emerging polycenterism it is, in no small measure, due to the fact that a very large number of emerging countries refused to be drawn into military alliances of one sort or another and thus freed their minds from the conditioned reflexes created by such alliances.

The de'tente in Europe, which we devoutly hope will persist, cannot, however, have durability and stability unless policies triumph in Asia and Africa which consciously avoid interference of one sort or another in the affairs of other countries and consistently show respect for human rights.

In India, we strongly feel that the future of a peaceful world depends, in a decisive way, on the growth and consolidation of those tendencies which would scrupulously respect differences in political and social systems prevailing in the world. It is our firm belief that countries such as ours-newly emergent and trying to give bread and liberty to their people-can best serve the cause of peace in the world through consistent adherence to the principles of non-alignment. In the measure this is recognized by the great and small Powers, in that measure we will generate the confidence that nations can develop, give a better way of life to their peoples and maintain liberty and national dignity in freedom and diversity.

INDIA AFGHANISTAN USA GUYANA BOTSWANA LESOTHO PERU INDONESIA MALAYSIA PAKISTAN VIETNAM CHINA SWITZERLAND LAOS CAMBODIA UNITED KINGDOM SOUTH AFRICA MOZAMBIQUE ANGOLA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Speech in the Political Committee on Non- proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Shri V. C. Trivedi, Indian Ambassador in Switzerland and Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following speech in the First (Political) Committee of the General Assembly on October 31, 1966 on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons :

As this is the first time that I am speaking in the Committee, it is my privilege, on behalf of the Indian delegation, to offer you, Mr. Chairman, its warm congratulations on your election to the distinguished office of Chairman of the First Committee; to Mr. Fahmy on his election to the Vice-Chairmanship, and to Mr. Tchernouchtchenko on his election as Rapporteur. During the past sessions we have come to know and admire you and your colleagues, and we are looking forward to our work in the Committee under the wise guidance of the Bureau.

The discussion on problems concerning nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is taking place in our Committee this session in a constructive atmosphere and under a hopeful prospect. Two factors are mainly responsible for this welcome development. Firstly, all throughout this year, negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament were devoted principally to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. As the Indian delegation said in that Committee,

"... if we compare many of the statements being made in the Committee these days with those being made a few months ago, we shall find unmistakably that we have defined the issues dividing the different approaches fairly distinctly and that we know which are the few specific points which need to be settled in order to reach an agreement acceptable to all concerned." (ENDC/PV. 269, p. 4).

The Secretary-General of the United Nations has emphasized this point in the introduction to his annual report.

Towards the end of the current year's sessions of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, the eight non-aligned delegations submitted a memorandum analysing the problems involved in a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear

249

weapons. They reiterated their conviction that a treaty which is acceptable to all concerned and satisfactory to the international community should reflect the mandate given by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 2028 (XX) and should pay full attention to the principles laid down in that resolution. It is heartening to note that these detailed and specific principles are subscribed to generally by the international community.

The second welcome factor in the current scene is the determination and the sincerity of the United States of America and the Soviet Union to strive for mutual understanding and accommodation in respect of one of the two important aspects of proliferation of nuclear weapons, namely, that of dissemination of weapons. The eight non-aligned delegations have referred to it in their memorandum of 19 August 1966. They said :

"The eight delegations are aware that main obstacle to an agreement has so far been constituted by differences concerning nuclear armaments within alliances, a problem mainly discussed between the major Powers and their allies". (ENDC/178, p. 2).

Later, in giving an analysis of the principles set out in resolution 2028 (XX), the memorandum went on to say :

"They wish to draw attention to the usefulness of clearly defined terms in order to prevent any misunderstanding or contradictory interpretation now or in the future." ([bid.).

The Indian delegation is happy that this attempt is now being made earnestly and, along with the rest of the international community, it hopes that at least one of the problems concerning proliferation of nuclear weapons, that of dissemination of weapons, will be solved satisfactorily in the near future. It was in this spirit that the Indian delegation offered, along with other delegations, some constructive comments on the draft resolution on "Renunciation by States of actions hampering the conclusion of an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", originally sponsored by the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and others, and co-sponsored the draft as revised with these amendments.

For the purpose of clarity, I have adopted the practice followed by many distinguished experts and scholars in defining the action of giving or receipt of weapon technology as "dissemination", or the dissemninatory aspect of the general problem of proliferation. Proliferation takes place when a country disseminates nuclear weapons to another country or, conversely, when a country receives these weapons from another country. An adequate treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should prevent such transfers in any form or manner and without any loophole.

In addition to the question of such dissemination, there is also the question of manufacture of nuclear weapons or proliferation in the classical sense of the term. A comprehensive treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should deal with this aspect of the problem as well. Resolution 2028 (XX) clearly stipulates in principle (b) that the treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear weapon Powers. Thus, on the aspect of dissemination as well as on that of proliferation of nuclear weapons, an acceptable treaty should embody the responsibilities as well as the obligations both of the nuclear weapon Powers and the non-nuclear weapon Powers. These responsibilities and obligations. not to disseminate and not to proliferate nuclear weapons, should be mutual and balanced as between the nuclear and non-nuclear weapon Powers. And, above all, these balanced and mutual obligations should be embodied in the treaty itself.

The principles set out in resolution 2028 (XX) represent in a precise manner the basic and inescapable elements of a genuine and acceptable treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The International community has been defining for a long time with progressive precision what constitutes proliferation of nuclear weapons and what measures are necessary to prevent it. Many proposals were made in the fifties in this context for the freezing of nuclear stocks with a view to their eventual elimination. In recent years the non-aligned countries have advocated the same approach. In October 1964, the Heads of State and Government declared in Cairo their readiness not to produce, acquire or test any nuclear weapons as part of the efforts of 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. In June 1965, the United Nations Disarmament Commission said that agreement on non-proliferation would be facilitated by adopting a programme of related measures. In September 1965, eight non-aligned delegation presented a memorandum, which was overwhelmingly supported in this Committee and which found its eloquent expression in the historic resolution 2028 (XX).

When we talk of proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is essential to remember that the problem is a single and organic problem, a problem which concerns existing proliferation as well as future proliferation, present proliferation as well as further proliferation. The Oxford English Dictionary defines the verb "to proliferate" to mean

250

"to reproduce itself, grow by multiplication of

elementary parts, increase rapidly". Proliferation, in the dictionary sense of the word, therefore, refers to the production of nuclear weapons principally by a country which already possesses nuclear weapons.

It is not, however, a question only of a dictio nary definition although that helps in clarification of thinking. When one talks of proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is necessary to bear in mind that the problem is not merely that of dissemination of nuclear weapons by or from one country to another, although that is included; that it is not merely the problem of the independent manufacture of nuclear weapons by a hitherto non-nuclear weapon State, although that is included as well; but also that of the continued manufacture of nuclear weapons by the existing nuclear weapon Powers.

All these aspects of proliferation contribute to the ever-increasing nuclear menace threatening mankind. The nuclear arms race widens its geography when dissemination takes place, when nuclear weapons are passed on by one country to another. This leads to serious consequences as the ability to wage or trigger a nuclear war extends to additional countries and leads to an increase in international instability.

There is a similar increase in international instability when a new nation embarks on an independent nuclear weapons programme as it happened during the last few years in the case of powerful countries belonging to military alliances. The proliferation of nuclear weapons which took place in the past was not a healthy phenomenon, and a continuation of that trend is certainly not healthy. India, which has declared itself unequivocally and repeatedly against manufacture of nuclear weapons, believes passionately in this 'policy.

But these dangers of dissemination and independent manufacture pale into background when one views the calamitous dangers of the arms race which is developing today as a result of the proliferation of nuclear weapons by the nuclear weapon Powers themselves, large and small. For many years now, the super-Powers have possessed an over-kill or multiple-destruction capacity and even their second-strike capabilities are sufficient to destroy the entire world. They have hundreds of missiles of varying range which are capable of devastating the surface of the earth. They are continuing to test underground, miniaturizing warheads, improving penetration capabilities and sophisticating their weapons and missiles. The other nuclear weapon Powers are also following the same menacing path, conducting atmospheric weapon tests, proceeding from manned-bomber delivery systems to missile systems and submarines. Only four days ago, the People's Republic of China conducted yet another Weapons test, firing an intermediate-range guided missile with a nuclear warhead.

When we talk of the dangers of the arms race, therefore, here we face the dangers of the most titanic proportions. It is here that the proliferation of nuclear weapons has its most catastrophic consequences.

It is necessary, therefore to deal with the problem comprehensively and correctly. It is necessary to remember that proliferation of nuclear weapons took place in the past. and is continuing to take place at present, only among the members of military alliances and that the reasons they gave, and are still giving, are of prestige and security, indicating quite clearly that future proliferation is only Me consequence of present proliferation. If one wishes to deal with the consequence, the only effective method is to deal with the cause.

General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) has accordingly stipulated that the treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of nuclear and non-nuclear weapon Powers.

In this context, it is necessary to remove one misunderstanding which still seems to persist in some minds. It is stated that in asking for such balance of obligation some delegations insist that measures of actual disarmament must necessarily be embodied in the treaty. Proceeding from that premise, it is then argued that this demand is unreasonable, or that, if it is reasonable, it is impracticable, or that, in any case, it complicates the problem. But then the premise is wrong. As far as the Indian delegation is concerned, it considers that principles (b) and (c) of resolution 2028 (XX) must not be mixed up. All five principles are, of course, connected with each other, but they deal with different facets of the problem. As far as principle (c) is concerned, the Indian delegation agrees with the approach set out in the non-aligned memoranda of 1965 and 1966 that a treaty of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is not an end in itself but a means to an end, namely, the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, more particularly, nuclear disarmament. It also believes that measures to prohibit the spread of nuclear weapons should be co led with, or followed by, tangible steps to halt the nuclear arms race and to limit, reduce or eliminate the stocks of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery.

Like most of the delegations, therefore, the Indian delegation urges the nuclear weapon Powers to take meaningful steps to reduce and eliminate the stocks of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery. India would applaud if these steps could be coupled with measures. to prohibit the spread of nuclear weapons. At the

251

same time, India agrees with other non-aligned delegations of the Eighteen-Nation Committee when they say in their memorandum that various steps of disarmament, that is, of reduction and elimination of nuclear armaments, "could be embodied in a treaty as part of its provisions or as declaration of intention". (ENDC/178. p. 3).

As I said earlier, however, the contusion arises because attempts are being made to confuse the issues and the principles. The. Indian position is clear and unambiguous and there can be no room for any confusion. The Indian delegation has maintained in Geneva and in this Committee that as, far as the question of proliferation of nuclear weapons is concerned, that is, the question of manufacture and dissemination of nuclear weapons is concerned, the treaty must embody balanced provisions which would impose mutual obligations and responsibilities on both the nuclear as well as the non-nuclear weapon Powers not to proliferate. Therefore, on dissemination of nucclear weapons, a balanced provision will require that no country will give nuclear weapons, to another country and that no country will receive nuclear weapons from another country. Similarly, on the question of production, a balanced provision will require that no country will produce nuclear weapons. The non-nuclear weapon

countries will not produce them and the nuclear weapon countries will also not produce any more weapons. In an acceptable treaty, a treaty which is to fulfil its purposes, these obligations have to be assumed not only by non-nuclear weapon Powers but also by all nuclear weapon Powers.

At the same time, India agrees with the vast majority of delegations that, as far as actual measures of disarmament are concerned-that is, as far as measures of reduction and elimination of nuclear weapon stockpiles and their means of delivery are concerned-these measures could be coupled with or follow the measures to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The relevant phrase in the memorandum of the eight nonaligned delegations of 19 August, 1966, needs to be quoted again. It says that these steps "could be emboied in a treaty as part quoted again. It says that these steps "could 'be embodied in a treaty as part of its provisions or as declaration of intention". (Ibid.).

Certain delegations have also raised some perirheral issues in the context of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. For example, there have been references to control. India has always believed that control and disarmament must go together. We said so from the early days of the Baruch Plan and Gromyko Plan for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and of the comprehensive ideas which this august Organization has been putting forward since it passed its very first resolution, resolution 1 (I).

India recalls with pride the part it played in the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency and in the institution of its System of safeguards. In regard to the problem of disarmament and arms control in general and a treaty on non-proliferation in particular, it is imperative that we view the question of control in an objective and non-discriminatory framework. Thus, if any control is to be exercised, it should be exercised universally and on all aspects of proliferation. More specifically, it should be exercised not only on the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy, but also on the war-like utilization of nuclear energy; not only on the manufacture of radio-isotopes, but also on the manufacture of nuclear weapons. As the Indian delegation said once before:

"Institution of international controls on peaceful reactors and power stations is like an 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 keeping the peace; but surely it is more rational to keep the lawbreaking elements under restraint rather than the law-abiding citizens." (ENDC/PV. 223, pp. 19-20).

References have also been made to peaceful nuclear explosions and it has been suggested that these should be denied to the developing nations and that if the latter need them for digging canals or for their harbour projects, they should get such explosions done for them, on payment, by the nuclear weapon Powers. A discussion of this matter for the present is, of course, only theoretical as even the super-weapon Powers are still engaged in completing their researches in controlled fusion experiments. The non-nuclear weapon Powers, and particularly the developing countries, are nowhere near the nuclear fusion stage, not to talk of conducting controlled fusion explosions for building dams or canals or harbours. The question at present is., therefore, one of principle and not of practice.

The Indian delegation would like to say at the outset that it is convinced of the sincerity of the suggestion first made in Geneva and then referred to here. At the same time, it feels that the proposition is somewhat strange. There is full justification for preventing proliferation in weapons, but this is the first time it is suggested that there should be non-proliferation in science and technology. It is true, of course, that science and technology can be used for destructive purposes, but that has never been seriously used as an argument to deny the benefit of science and technology to the developing nations of the world. If that argument were valid, no developing nation would have got steel technology or aircraft technology or even have learnt nuclear

252

physics for such technology could also be sued for weapons. Technology in itself is not evil, it is the will of the nation which Possesses the technology that decides how it will use the knowledge. And if I may add, we in India, have illustrated this truth by our own practice, by devoting our nuclear technology exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Knowledge and learning, science and technology are meant to be disseminated and must be disseminated. The United Nations held three international conferences on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, attended by thousands of scientists and specialists. The first conference was held in August 1955 and was presided over by Dr. Bhabha of India. In his inaugural. address, be predicted that a method would be found for liberating fusion energy within the next two decades and added that when that happened, the energy problems of the world would have been truly solved for ever. At the second conference, which was held in 1958, the question of controlled fusion, which is now being sought to be denied to the developing nations, was, in fact, the principal theme of discussion. The last conference was held in 1964. Resolution 1770 (XVII) calling for the convening of that conference recalled the benefits which flowed from the earlier two conferences and recognized that these international meetings provided effective opportunities, for the dissemination of scientific information on the application of atomic energy to peaceful purposes.

The present age is the age of technology. The future of the world, particularly of the developing world, will be decided on the extent the emerging nations are able to absorb modern technological developments and use them in their societies. These nations cannot afford to remain mere producers of raw material which could be exported to industrialized nations which would process it and sell the finished article to the raw material producers. One of the momentous achievements of the United Nations has been the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas held in Geneva in February 1963 under the presidentship of a distinguished Indian scintist, Prof. Thacker. We want more such conferences and increasing dissemination of technology' As President Truman said as early as October 1945 in his famous Navy Day address, which enunciated for the first time the basic concepts of the United States atomic policy, "No nation could long maintain or morally defend a monopoly of the peaceful benefits of atomic energy."

The Indian delegation agrees unreservedly that nuclear energy must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. That has been the philosophy that India has adopted and the practice it has followed all throughout the years. India has, therefore, welcomed all measures designed to ensure that nuclear energy is used only for pursuits of peace and not for manufacture of weapons. Any arrangement for control of production of fissile material in an objective, comprehensive and nondiscriminatory manner has, therefore, the full support of the Indian delegation,

India has long been in the forefront of nations urging a speedy conclusion of an adequate treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and it agrees with the conclusion reached fin the memorandum of 19 August 1966: of the eight nonaligned delegations of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee that it is :

".... urgent to negotiate a treaty which reflects the mandate given by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2028 (XX) and which is acceptable to all concerned and satisfactory to the international community" (ENDC/178, p. 4).

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA RUSSIA EGYPT CHINA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

MALAYSIA

Vice-President's Speech at a Banquet by the Prime Minister of Malaysia

The Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, paid a goodwill visit to Malaysia from October 17 to 21, 1966. On October 19, His Excellency the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tunku Abdul Rahman, gave a Banquet in honour of the Vice-President. Speaking an the occasion, Dr. Zakir Husain said :

Hon'ble Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I thank you for your kind words of welcome. it gives me great pleasure to be in Malaysia bringing fraternal greetings and good wishes from the people and government of India to the friendly people and Government of Malaysia.

Mr. Prime Minister, we have so many things in common; our common colonial past and the urge of our people for freedom which has culminated in free India and free Malaysia, our faith in the people and their innate wisdom, our belief in democracy and the sanctity of the free vote, our dedication to the cause of our people's welfare at home and goodwill towards all nations of the world, our faithful adherence to the high principles of (he U.N. Charterthese are but a few of the many things that India and Malaysia share and cherish.

We in India know that we have a long way to travel before we get the full results and benefits of the independence that the sacrifice of our leaders and millions of our people achieved for us. The problems are great and the challenge serious. And we are fully conscious that even though we have fared well in many fields much more remains to be done.

Here in Malaysia the spectacular results achieved in national reconstruction within such a short time since Independence is something of which your Government and your people can justifiably be proud. If I may be permitted to say so, it is a monument to your wise and dedicated leadership.

In the International field also Malaysia has made important contributions in the cause of peace and we are happy to realise the similarity of our approach with yours on most international issues. Malaysia's unshaken faith in peaceful methods of settling international issues has been amply vindicated by the recent accord with Indonesia, which has been greeted by all peace loving countries of the world. I wish to express our felicitations and happiness at this welcome reestablishment of friendly relations between Malaysia and Indonesia. We earnestly hope that it will strengthen peace and stability in this important region. Indeed, most of the world problems can be solved peacefully if more and more countries were to decide to adopt the method of negotiations in the spirit of mutual goodwill instead of resorting to aggressive postures and threats. Let us hope that patience and goodwill, strength without aggressiveness, and a willingness to accommodate without surrendering national dignity and basic interests will inspire the nations of the world in their dealings with one another.

Mr. Prime Minister, it gives me great pleasure to recollect that not only have our two countries been knit in friendly relations during centuries of history but that this relationship has grown in strength after we, have become free. There are many fields in which we are already collaborating. I have no doubt that these fields will expand in future and that our two peoples will gather richer harvests from their mutual efforts and common endeavour.

You have stood by us in our hour of need and we shall ever cherish that knowledge. The strong support given by you during our difficulties in 1962 and last year and the deep understanding of our problems shown by your Government have carved out a permanent place for Malaysia in the hearts of the people of India.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, May I request you to join me in a toast to the health of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, to the health of His Excellency Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, Prime Minister of Malaysia, to the prosperity of the people of Malaysia, to the everlasting friendship between India and Malaysia and

to goodwil and peace among mankind.

MALAYSIA USA INDIA INDONESIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

MALAYSIA

Vice-President's Speech at his Lunch to the Prime Minister of Malaysia

The following is the text of the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husains speech at a Luncheon given by him in honour of H.E. the Prime Minister of Malaysia on October 20, 1966 : Hon'ble Mr. Prime Minister and all my distinguished guests,

I am grateful to you, Mr. Prime Minister, and to everyone of you, Gentlemen, for accepting my invitation to this lunch.

I recall with much pleasure those days in 1962 when you Mr. Prime Minister, were our guest in India. Your name has become a household word in my country, as that of a true friend of the people of India.

254

Much has happened in India since you were last there. We have had to resist aggression twice from across our borders. Our beloved Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, is no longer with us. His successor, Lal Bahadur Shastri, who strove so hard to establish peace between India and Pakistan, has also passed away.

Though sonic of our leaders whom you met in India at the time of your visit are no more, India continues to maintain and stand by the same ideals and values which you had noticed. We continue to seek peace and progress within our frontiers, peace with our neighbours and peace in the world.

India is on the verge of a General Election which will be held next February. There is much political activity in the country at present. Sonic of it may even appear to be disturbing to many outside the country. But, Mr. Prime Minister, we are as dedicated to the preservation of the democratic spirit, as you are. For, we believe that only in that way can the nation grow up strong, nurtured in the best traditions of democracy. It may be that other forms of Government can show quicker results. But, like you in Malaysia, we have chosen to follow the surer path of patience, prefering to build our nation on the firm foundations of democracy and freedom.

At the time of independence in 1947 India was ushered into the nuclear age equipped with few modern skills and means. Through three Five Year Plans we have been able to establish an industrial base broad enough for future development. There were disappointments and disasters caused by natural calamities and external aggression, shortcomings arising from our own mistakes and insufficient experience. But the country has moved forward and kept progressing. And we expect that the present Fourth Plan will bring a self-generating vigour to our industry and production.

I had heard,, much about your country's phenomenal economic development, Mr. Prime Minister. My visit has enabled me to see and understand some of this development. My visit to the Operations Room gave me an overall picture of your plans which impressed me very much.

There is much in the field of economic development which we can learn from each other. There is also much scope for bilateral and regional co-operation in economic matters among the nations of Asia.

Our two countries are already co-operating closely in many fields of trade and industry. This will no doubt expand in the years to come to our mutual benefit.

Mr. Prime Minister and Gentlemen, once again I thank you all for taking the trouble of coming here today to be my guest.

Mr. Prime Minister, I wish you and your people continued progress and prosperity. And may I wish you also many, many happy returns of our common birthday. May you continue to be as vigorous and wise as you have always been.

Excellencies and Gentlemen, I request you to join me in a toast-to the health and happiness of H.E. the Prime Minister of Malaysia and the people of Malaysia.

MALAYSIA USA INDIA PAKISTAN

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Prime Minister's Speech at King Mahendra's Banquet

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid a goodwill visit to Nepal from October 4 to October 7, 1966. On October 4, His Majesty the King of Nepal gave a Banquet in honour of the Prime Minister.

Replying to the toast by King Mahendra, Shrimati Indira Gandhi said :

Maharajadhiraj, Maharani, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

255

I am grateful to Your Majesty for your kind words of welcome and for your gracious invitation to me and my colleagues to visit Nepal. I have been overwhelmed by your hospitality and the warmth of affection that has surrounded us in Kathmandu.

I have come here not for reasons for protocol nor on account of any particular problems between our two countries. I have come here because of the age-old friendship between Nepal and India.

We are not strangers to one another. The eternal peaks of the Himalayas have given us spiritual sustenance since time immemorial. They are the scene of our epics and our folklore. They also nourish the great rivers which water our fields. Ours is a common heritage.

I greatly look forward to my talks with Your

Majesty and Chairman Thapa and his colleagues. There is much to discuss with regard to matters of mutual concern and interest and the fast changing international scene. The newspapers sometimes refer to "problems" between Nepal and India. Of course, there are problems. It would be surprising if there were not any between such close neighbours. But I venture to suggest that these problems are basically small and incidental to the much larger fact of Indo-Nepalese friendship.

I am convinced that the friendship between Nepal and India is firm and unshakable. Our people wish it. Our Governments are working for it. History, geography and our common interests demand it.

We agree that every nation has the right to lead its own life and shape its own destiny in accordance with its need and circumstance and the genius of its people. Our common heritage and our common interests and outlook on so many matters is, therefore, fully compatible with diversity in other areas. We do not regard this as strange. On a larger plane, this belief is translated into our common dedication to the right of every nation to preserve its own identity and personality. This is the basis of our commitment to peaceful coexistence.

Nepal has chosen its own path. Under the wise guidance of Your Majesty, a new, modern Nepal is in the making. You have adopted planning as an instrument of orderly development and have completed plans. Apart from the material progress this has brought, it has set in motion a process of social change.

We are greatly privileged to have been able to assist your plans of development in the same spirit of international economic co-operation in which we have ourselves received assistance from others. Economic and cultural co-operation between Nepal and India constitute yet another symbol of friendship based on the principles of equality and mutual benefit. These principles of peaceful co-existence are universal principles. They offer the only sane and safe road along which the nations of the world can travel today.

This is an age of science and technology. Science, however, can be both a blessing and a curse of mankind. We are heirs to an ancient culture. We must combine the best of the old with the best of what is new. As my father said :

"It is essential that science and spirituality should combine if the modern world should survive and progress. Without science you perish; without spirituality you perish".

Man's knowledge has increased greatly, but do we have the wisdom and the maturity to use this knowledge wisely ? We cannot determine events, but we can influence reactions to events and thus shape history and our environment

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I request you to join me in a toast to the good health and welfare of Their Majesties, to the progress and prosperity of Nepal and to the unbreakable bonds of Indo-Nepalese friendship.

NEPAL USA INDIA **Date** : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Prime Minister's Speech at the Civic Reception

The following is the text of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi's speech at a Civic Reception held in her honour in Kathmandu on October 5, 1966:

I am grateful to you for your very warm and gracious words of welcome. It is a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to meet the citizens of Kathmandu. I bring to you the greetings and good wishes of the people of India.

I first visited Kathmandu 13 years ago. All around me I see a great many changes since my last visit to Kathmandu. Your country is blessed with great natural beauty. The fascination of Kathmandu lies in its wonderful temples, monuments and wood-carving, its rich heritage of arts and crafts as much as in its lovely setting. I hope progress will preserve and enhance their

256

aesthetic value and that the growth of the new Kathmandu will blend and harmonise with the old city.

Friendship and cooperation between Nepal and India is not only based on cultural affinities and sentiment but on present-day realities. The trade and commerce between our countries is of benefit to both. There is a growing cultural exchange and we are jointly exploiting some of our shared natural resources. This is only a beginning.

Both countries face immense problems of development and change. So much has to be done to give our people a better life and many programmes can be undertaken together in friendly cooperation to our mutual benefit

Nepal has just launched its Third Five year Plan and is engaged in the task of national reconstruction. Considerable progress has been made. We are following your efforts with sympathy and admiration.

We are glad to be able to assist Nepal in some measure in the execution of its development plans. India is also a recipient of foreign assistance which we regard as a necessary and useful form of international economic cooperation. We finance the major part of our development programmes from out of our own resources --by the sweat and toil, the saving and investment of our people. During the past decade the very process of development has served to widen the pool of resources and open up new possibilities for advance. This is the law of growth. I know this is equally true of Nepal. The building of the Tribhuvan Rajpath, the Sonauli-Pokhare road and the yet more ambitious East-West Highway, in all of which India is proud to be associated, provides a net-work of communications which will hasten the tempo of progress and development. We shall also be assisting you suitably in the realisation of your next Five Year Plan.

The doors of our universities and technical institutes have long been open to students from Nepal. Many of our universities are indeed proud to claim distinguished Nepalese citizens, including His Royal Highness the Crown Prince and Chairman Shri Surya Bahadur Thapa, among their alumni. It is a matter of particular happiness that he was a student in my home town Allahabad. I hope this flow of scholars and intellectuals and other human and cultural contacts will increase.

It is for each country and each people to choose their own path in accordance with their circumstances, aspirations and genius. Nepal has chosen the path of panchayat democracy under the leadership of the Maharajadhiraj. We are watching the evolution of the panchayati system in your country with deep interest. We hope you will make progress.

Both Nepal and India need peace in order to devote attention to the crying needs of development. I am glad that our countries share a common outlook in international relations. We both believe in nonalignment and peaceful coexistence. There is no alternative to these policies if the world is to be made safe from the madness of another war which could lead to nuclear destruction. Our two countries have cooperated to this end in the United Nations and in the councils of the non-aligned nations and the Afro-Asian group.

Unfortunately some countries do not accept peaceful co-existence. They see the world as a stereotype moulded in their own image. This is a false and dangerous doctrine which we repudiate. Countries with differing social and economic systems can and should be able to live side by side in peace and friendship. We have abjured the use of force in the settlement of international differences. But we will resist force.

India does not covet others territory. Nor does it seek to impose its ways or will on any nation. We accept the freedom of nations to choose their own destiny and do not seek to interfere in the affairs of others. Our belief in peaceful co-existence is not a matter of expediency. It is rooted in our tradition and way of life. It is among the gifts of Buddha, Asoka, Gandhiji and Nehru.

We in India are, like you, striving to build a new society. We have launched on our Fourth five year plan and early next-year some 250 million men and women will cast their votes in our fourth General Elections. We are confident that these elections and the implementation of the Fourth Plan will help strengthen the foundation of the "new India" that we are engaged in building.

Despite a series of bad seasons, culminating in a drought of unprecedented severity last year, and external provocations along our borders from different quarters necessitating an unforeseen diversion of resources to defence, the Indian economy has made tremendous progress over the past 15 years : in education and health, in the development of communications and power, in irrigation and agricultural production, and in the quality and diversity of industrial production.

We have 70 million students in schools and colleges,. Malaria has been practically eradicated and the average life expectation has risen from under 30 years to over 50 years. We are building three large nuclear power stations and have

257

set up almost nine million tons of ingot steel capacity. We are now in a position to produce a wide range of heavy electrical, transport, metallurgical and other machinery and equipment. We are building ships, aircraft, automobiles, tractors and other sophisticated equipment. All this is transforming India We are giving special attend on to our agriculture. We hope to eliminate food imports within five years and to eliminate dependence on foreign credits within a decade. We have a long way to go; we have a difficult task. Ahead of us we have many problems. But these are largely problems of growth. Progress means change and change gives rise, to social tensions. Every step forward helps solve some problems but gives rise to others. New opportunities create new wants. This is the revolution of rising expectations. We have to make greater efforts to meet this challenge.

We are determined to succeed. For only development and the creation of a self-reliant. economy will enable us to ensure our people a better life and give real and abiding content to our ideals of democracy and socialism.

Nepal too, I know, will succeed in its endeavours to banish poverty, ignorance and diseasethose common enemies of developing nations.

It has been a privilege and pleasure to return to Napal, to have enjoyed the unbounded hospitality of Their Majesties the King and Queen and the people of Nepal and to have seen something of the many-sided progress that you have made. I wish you well and every success.

May cooperation between Nepal and India grow and prosper

May friendship between the people of Nepal and people of India grow ever stronger

NEPAL USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Prime Minister's Speech at. a Reception by the Bharat-Nepal Maitri Sangh

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following speech at a reception organised by the Bharat-Nepal Maitri Sangh in Kathmandu on October 6, 1966:

It is a great pleasure for me to be here today. The friendship between Nepal and India is as old and as firm as the Himalayas. Historically and geographically our common interests demand strengthening the continued friendship. Nepal has given India a great Son and a great Daughter-Gautam Buddha and Sita. They are priceless gifts. The bonds that unite us are truly deep and strong, timeless and indestructible. Our two countries have drawn spiritual inspiration from the same source and our cultural history has blended and mixed through the ages. The influence of Lord Buddha pervaded not only India and Nepal, but all of Asia. Influenced by his teachings, Emperor Asoka gave a new direction to our policy and history. Gandhiji and Nepal is in the mainstream of international sources in shaping our national policies.

Until some years ago, Nepal was shut off from the world. Now the door is wide open and Nepal is in the mainstream of international life. Communications have improved with roads, air services, telephone and wireless. There is more travel, commerce and student exchanges. Increasing contact and cooperation can and, I believe, has strengthened Indo-Nepal friendship. When there are closer contacts, however, there can also be minor misunderstandings. The very process of development and change must result in new ideas, new aspirations and social tensions. This is a universal phenomenon and we have experience of this in India too. Nothing can come in the way of the steadily-growing friendship between our two countries. The Bharat-Nepal Maitri Sangh can render great service by protecting and promoting good neighbourly relations, not merely between our two Governments but between our two peoples. It is this latter aspect that is most important. Our ancient cultural links have survived the centuries because they have become part of the life of our people. The friendship between Nepal and India is enduring and incorruptible precisely

because it is a friendship between the peoples. In recent times, our friendship has found new expression in various forms of economic and political cooperation.

I should like here to pay a tribute to the indomitable courage of the Gorkhas whom we are most proud to have in our Army. The story of their valour fills many glorious pages of history.

The mighty Himalaya has been the mountaineering's greatest challenge. A long succession of expeditions to your great peaks has made famous that extraordinarily tough and cheerful people, the Sherpas. It was entirely fitting that a Sherpa-Tenzing Norgay-should have been

258

among the first two men to set foot on the untrodden summit of the Sagarmatha. We are very proud that last year the third Indian Everest Expedition not only climbed Sagarmatha but succeeded in establishing a record by putting nine men in four teams on the summit. Among these were three Sherpas. One of them Nawang Gombu has the distinction of being the only man to have twice stood atop Sagarmatha. There are many Indians living in Nepal and many Nepalese settled in India. This is another bona between our countries.

The friendship between Nepal and India is it friendship between equals.

Nepal has chosen its own path of development and in these few days, I have been able to see and learn about the many aspects of your progress.

It is for a body like the Bharat-Nepal Maitri Sangh to interpret each country to the other, to encourage people-to-people contact and exchange, to strengthen and revive our cultural ties and to proclaim our common ideals and our belief in peaceful co-existence.

I wish this society every success in its activities. May friendship between Nepal and India grow stronger and richer.

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date** : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Joint Communique on Prime Minister's visit

The following is the text of the Joint Communique issued on October 7, 1966 at the, conclusion of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's visit to Nepal :

On the invitation of His Majesty the King of Nepal, the Prime Minister of India, Her Excellency Shrimati Indira Gandhi paid a goodwill visit to Nepal from October 4 to October 7, 1966. The Prime Minister was accompanied by Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary to the Prime Minister, Shri T. N. Kaul, Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs and other high ranking officials of the Government of India.

His Majesty and the Prime Minister welcomed this opportunity to renew personal contacts, and expressed the hope that the visit would further strengthen the bonds of friendship between Nepal and India. His Majesty's Government and the Government of India regard the Prime Minister's visit as an important milestone in the further development of friendly relations between the two countries.

During the visit, the Prime Minister visited centres of economic development and places of historical and cultural interests in the Valley of Kathmandu. The Prime Minister was accorded a warm civic reception by the citizens of Kathmandu and conveyed the friendly greetings and sincere good wishes of the people of India to the people of Nepal. The Prime Minister was also honoured by the Nepal-Bharat Maitri Sangh and the Nepal Women's Organization and was glad to meet the leaders of these two societies. She was deeply moved by the warm welcome accorded to her by His Majesty's Government and people of Nepal.

Matters of bilateral interest to the two countries were also discussed between His Majesty the King and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and the Prime Minister. Both sides reaffirmed a vital interest in each other's territorial integrity, prosperity and general wellbeing. They reaffirmed their faith in further strengthening the traditional kinship, and common ties of history, geography and culture, binding the two countries and peoples.

During her stay the Prime Minister held frank and friendly talks with His Majesty the King, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and other Ministers of His Majesty's Government. These talks were marked by a spirit of cordiality, mutual trust and sympathetic understanding of each other's problems. His Majesty, the Chairman and the Prime Minister reviewed the general inter-national situation with particular reference to the developments in Asia. They expressed their grave concern over recent developments in Viet Nam. They reaffirmed their belief that there should be immediate cessation of bombing of North Viet Nam, as an essential first step to peace talks for a political settlement of the Viet Nam problem. They expressed their hope that all parties concerned would work for a political settlement of the Viet Nam problem through peaceful negotiations in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the Vietnamese people in full conformity with the spirit and within the broad framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. These talks underlined the similarity of approach to international issues based on the principles of nonaligment and peaceful co-existence and reaffirmed the unanimity of views on major international issues discussed by the two sides, particularly on the need for strengthening peace,

259

relieving tensions, and settlement of all international problems through peaceful negotiations on the basis of respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs. The two sides expressed their wholehearted support to (he struggle against colonialiam, racialism and neocolonialism. The Prime Minister also briefly acquainted the Chairman with the nature of her forthcoming meeting with the Presidents of the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia.

The Chairman and the Prime Minister reiterated their willingness to work closely together, along with other developing countries, in order to secure effective implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. They further expressed their view that economic cooperation among developing countries at various stages of development is necessary for a more purposeful implementation of the concept of international cooperation among states.

The Chairman explained to the Prime Minister that Nepal was vitally interested in the full exercise of her transit rights under the Treaty of Trade and Transit, 1960, between His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the Government of India. The Chairman and the Prime Minister agreed that the Treaty of Trade and Transit, 1960, was of great benefit to both countries and should continue to be fully implemented in letter and spirit by both the sides.

The Prime Minister was impressed by the economic progress made by Nepal under the, leadership of His Majesty the King. She assured His Majesty's Government of India's desire to assist in the economic development of Nepal. To this end, India will continue to make increased assistance available for the successful implementation of Nepal's Third Plan. His Majesty and the Chairman thanked the Prime Minister. His Majesty and the Chairman, along with the Prime Minister, participated in the inauguration of the Sundarijal Water Supply Project--which is a symbol of the interflow of friendship between the two countries. The two sides agreed that the work on the Western Koshi Canal and on the East-West Highway should start without delay.

Tho two sides reviewed with satisfaction the progressive and fruitful development of relations between Nepal and India. The Chairman expressed the gratitude of His Majesty's Government for the assistance and cooperation extended by the Government of India for Nepal's economic and social development in the last decade. He expressed satisfaction over the speedy progress achieved in the implementation of India-aided projects in Nepal in recent years.

The Prime Minister extended a personal invitation to Their Majesties the King and Queen to visit India whenever convenient. Their Majesties thankfully accepted the invitation.

NEPAL USA INDIA ANGUILLA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND YUGOSLAVIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

SINGAPORE

Vice-president's Speech at a Banquet by the President of Singapore

The Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, paid a goodwill visit to Singapore from October 14 to 16, 1966. On October 15, the President of Singapore gave a Banquet in honour of the! Vice-President.

Speaking on the occasion, Dr. Zakir Husain said :

Your Excellency, Excellencies, and Gentlemen,

I thank Your Excellency for your kind words and for the sentiments of friendship you have so beautifully expressed. I am happy to be here and have an opportunity of meeting you and the members of your Government. We recollect with great pleasure the meeting we recently had with your dynamic Prime Minister when he visited India.

I have come to this great city bringing the greetings and good wishes of the Government and people of India to the Government and people of Singapore. India and Singapore have had very old ties of trade and culture. Today those ties have been strengthened by our similarity of approach to the big issues that face us

260

both, namely the promotion of our people's welfare and the maintenance of peace in Asia and the world.

Singapore provides a great example of how a society made up of different religions, races and languages can be united into one great community. While it has never been more necessary than it is today for the world to have and cherish the concept, of a common human community, the sad fact is that the world continues to divided not only on political lines but also on ethnical and racial lines. Even religion which should teach man to grasp the infinite and discover the essential similarity of all of God's creation is too often used as a means to keep man apart from man. These divisions and these man-made distinctions and barriers have made the world a seething arena of mean contests, jealousies and strife. Therefore it is, Your Excellency, that the success of your experiment, though conducted in a small area, assumes wider implications and influence.

To us in India this has intimate values. Throughout history India from the Himalayas to the Sea has presented the picture of unity without uniformity. All the great religions of the world continue to flourish in India and many trends of human culture have found a healthy atmosphere to flower in our soil. So when India became free her decision to establish a secular democracy with full freedom for all religions, languages. and cultures was no accident; it was only a continuation and a formalisation of what had always been the basic character of Indian life.

I have seen with admiration, even in this short time that I have been here, your industrial and socioeconomic projects, your great achievements in housing, public health, education and other nation-building activities. I am glad that the people of Indian origin who have made Singapore their permanent home are contributing their share to these achievements.

Your Excellency, we have witnessed many great changes in the world in the last few decades. Colonialism has disappeared from most parts of the world. The remnants of colonialism in Africa and Asia have to go. Their days are numbered. The sooner the Colonial powers realise it the better for them.' While we have solved the political problem of independence the solution has itself given rise to many more problems. Political independence is incomplete unless it is given economic and social content. Today the large part of the world that is generally made up of countries with developing economics is experiencing newer and greater difficulties in evolving their economic plans and implementing them. It is a tragedy that while a section of the world has been flourishing with greater economic expansion than ever before, not much is being accomplished to bring the benefits of this to the rest of the world. I feel that this growing chasm between the richer nations and the others is a much greater source of danger than even the political cleavage that exists between different countries. There can be no co-existence between affluence and poverty. There has to be an intimate coordination between the developed and developing countries if mankind is not to be doomed to continuous strife and bitterness.

And so it is the first duty of all of us, nations newly emerged from foreign domination, to take counsel together as well as with the developed countries of the world how we can strive to avert this tragedy. It is a great challenge and to the extent that we can rise to meet it with stout hearts and good intentions shall we justify the trust that our people have placed in us. This is not a task for any one of us; it is our common task and responsibility.

Your Excellency, I am very happy to come to Singapore bringing to you the goodwill of India and wishing you all success in your efforts and offering you our fullest cooperation.

Your Excellencies, and Gentlemen, may I request to joint me in a toast-

to the health of His Excellency the President of Singapore, to the prosperity of the people of Singapore, to the everlasting friendship between India and Singapore, and to goodwill and peace among mankind.

261

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE USA INDIA MALI **Date** : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

THAILAND

Vice-President's Speech at a Banquet by the Prime Minister of Thailand

The Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, paid a goodwill visit to Thailand from October 8 to 10, 1966. On October 8, His Excellency Field Marshal Thanom Kittikachorn, Prime Minister of Thailand, gave a Banquet in honour of the Vice-President.

Replying to the toast by the Thai Prime Minister, Dr. Zakir Husain said:

Your Excellency the Prime Minister, Your Royal Highness, Your Highness, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I am grateful to Your Excellency for your warm welcome and for the friendly sentiments you have expressed. My visit to this beautiful city is something that I had looked forward to for a long time. I am happy that I am now able to have this opportunity of fulfilling a long felt desire. I have come bearing the abiding goodwill and sincere friendship of the Government and the people of India for the Government and the people of Thailand.

Though this is my first visit to Bangkok, many distinguished Indians have had occasion to pay brief visits to your beautiful country. My predecessor in office, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, now the President of India. was here on an official visit. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, former President of India, and Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, had also had brief sojourns in Bangkok. Similarly, we had the pleasure of welcoming distinguished Thai personalities in India from time to time.

Excellency, your country and mine have been closely knit for centuries by many ties of religion, culture and common endeavour. We have walked together through the avenues of history sharing common dreams and thoughts. The message of the enlightened one continues to illuminate the lives of millions of our people. Your country remained true to its name-The Land of the Free. We had to undergo the bitterness of foreign rule for nearly a century and a half before the innate strength of India roused itself again and we became free.

Excellency, just as in olden days we were knit

by ties of culture and religion, today we are together again in tackling our common problem-, through co-operative effort. Both our countries are co-operating in many fields of useful endeavour. I have no doubt that this will increase in the years to come to our mutual benefit. As far as India is concerned we shall be extremely happy to welcome your students and scientists, your technicians, your philosophers and artists to come and share with us all they wish. And I have no doubt that Thailand will welcome with open arms and warm hearts our scholars and students coming here in search of knowledge and wisdom.

This is nothing new, for this has been the tradition of our two countries from the very early days when our men of learning went forth not for conquest or imperial glory but as messengers of goodwill spreading and at the same time seeking knowledge.

It is also a matter of gratification to me to take note of the closer economic tics and commercial development between our two countries. As part of the Asian continent and as part of a common developing region, it has been the constant purpose of the Government of India to forge closer economic links with other Asian countries. The commercial intercourse between our countries now covers a wide variety of products ranging from manufactured goods to primary agricultural products. I have little doubt that the participation of my country in the first Asian Trade-Fair, which is being organised by your Government in cooperation with ECAFE at the end of this year, will result in a strong impetus to a greater flow of trade.

I have come to your country as my country's messenger of goodwill. You and your people have overwhelmed me by your characteristic hospitality and warm friendship. The little that I have seen of your capital city has greatly impressed me. In the next two days I hope. Excellency, to see more of this modern metropolis, its centres of culture, its renowned religious shrines, its famous seats of learning. But above all I look forward to meeting and making friends with the Thai people and their leaders and to convey to them as I have conveyed to Your Excellency the warm sentiments of friendship of the people of India.

Once again I wish you all happiness and success.

May I now request your Royal Highness. Your

Highness, Excellencie Ladies and Gentlemen to join me in a toast to the health and happiness of Ms Excellency the Prime Minister and to the prosperity of the people of Thailand !

THAILAND USA INDIA RUSSIA **Date** : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President's Speech at the Palam Airport Welcoming President Nasser

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, made the following speech at the Palam Airport on October 20, 1966, welcoming His Excellency Mr. Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, who arrived in New Delhi to attend the Tripartite Meeting which was held from October 21 to 24, 1966 :

President Nasser and Friends

We welcome you to our country as a good and steadfast friend of ours. We have had Indo-Arab relations for centuries.

In the middle, they were somewhat interrupted on account of political subjection of both our countries; but, after we attained our freedom we are once again close friends.

I know during the period of our struggle, you had also your struggle. I remember a deputation from Egypt which waited on Mahatma Gandhi in 1931 in the steamship "Rajputana",

262

when he was going to England for the Round Table Conference.

You are a servant of Arab unity and nationalism. You have done your utmost to improve the general conditions of the people of the United Arab Republic. Aswan Dam is itself an illustration of your interest in trying to improve the conditions of the common people there.

In international relations, we have been working together. In the Palestinian crisis, we tried to find a solution acceptable to the Arabs. In the Suez crisis we stood by you and you were able to nationalise it.

We know also you prevented a Portuguese ship to come to our country in our trouble. In all these matters, you have been a tested and trusted friend of ours.

We therefore welcome you not merely as a servant of Arab unity and nationalism but as a great friend of our own country. We want to see the United Arab Republic grow more prosperous, much stronger and your influence pervade to a larger extent. We wish you therefore a very successful, pleasant and happy sojourn in our country.

INDIA EGYPT USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President Nasser's Speech at the Palam Airport Replying to Dr. Radhakrishnan

His excellency Mr. Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, made the following speech at the Palam Airport on October 20, 1966 in reply to President Radhakrishnan Brethren and friends, It is with deep pleasure indeed that I return once again to the great land of India, to give further depth to the historic bonds that have united our two peoples from time immemorial, ties which have enriched the civilisation of man with eternal and creative values. Mine is a visit which consolidates the relations with brothers in struggle and joint endeavour-brothers who have contributed immensely to the service of our contemporary world and to the solution of its problems and issues. My visit revives personal and dear friendships which bind me to many people in this great and glorious country. Foremost among those people is the wise President, Radhakrishnan, the President of the Republic of India.

263

As I come back to India for the first time without meeting with my dear friend-indeed the friend of humanity as a whole--Jawaharlal Nehru, I can but pay a warm tribute to his memory, fully confident that his great spirit remains in India as a constant inspiration and an everburning incandescent torch.

Brethern, indeed I am deeply satisfied that the first object of my visit to your country today should be to participate in the tripartite meeting with President Josep Broz Tito, President of the Union of the Yugoslav Socialist Republics and Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, with the aim of endeavouring once again, to serve our causes, and die causes of other peoples and those of our Universe, in the light of die noble principles to which our peoples adhere, in faith and struggle.

The principles we proclaimed in the conferences of Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo, can still serve as our guide in the present circumstances, fraught with danger, whether the source of peril is the traditional Imperialism, Neo-Colonialism or Racial Discrimination, or whether the danger emanates from the adoption of the policy of military force or economic, political and psychological pressure.

This apart, it is those principles and those alone that can afford all our peoples the possibility of facing the greatest of all dangers confronting mankind to-day, namely the danger of underdevelopment and the widening gap between the standards of peoples in an age where distance between countries counts no more. The danger of underdevelopment mounts as a result of die obstacles and pressures facing peoples seeking progress and working devotedly to achieve it. Such a state of affairs piles up explosive energies much more dangerous than the stockpiles of nuclear weapons.

"Peace" is the nearest word to all peoples, but genuine peace--unfortunately--is still remote from our world.

Peace is not established by mere hopes, it is established with political, economic and social right and justice. There is no doubt, brethren and friends, that the land of this people, famous for their deep wisdom and noble principles, is the most appropriate site for our scheduled tripartite conference, the outcome of which, we hope, would sincerely serve all that you and we believe in, a belief shared by the masses aspiring for freedom, progress and peace.

INDIA USA EGYPT INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President's Speech at the Palam Airport Welcoming President Tito

The following is the text of the President Dr. Radhakrishnan's speech at the Palam Airport on October 20, 1966, welcoming the President of Yugoslavia, His Excellency Mr. Josip Broz Tito and Madam Broz:

President Tito, Madam Broz:

We are extremely delighted to have you with us once again on a visit to our country after a

lapse of some years. We welcome you as the liberator of your country and the builder thereof.

In the course of your visit, you will miss a familiar figure-Jawaharlal Nehru-but, his daughter is here, who has inherited many of his qualities and is dedicated to the same ideals of social justice, international cooperation and world harmony.

The way to world harmony lies in peaceful co-existence of many countries. Your own country has different languages, different religions and different scripts, but you have been able to integrate the varieties of the Balkan people into a single State of Yugoslavia.

We are also proceeding on, more or less, the same lines with a multi-lingual, multi-racial and multi-religious State. We are trying to harmonise these differences and build up a single Republic of India.

The world is full of problems; so many things are happening about which we are not happy, but we are reminded of the Greek Chorus which could foresee the tragedy but was powerless to prevent it. We also seem to be in a similar position.

During the deliberations these days, I have no doubt, you will be able to build up a singleness of purpose and a sense of unity that will have an impact on the world situation itself.

My dear President, you have been very good to us in our industrial development. You have helped us in many ways and we are thankful to you.

I feel sure that this cooperation between our two countries, cultural, economic and industrial, will grow from stage to stage, with the result that we will be able to weld our relations in perfect harmony.

We wish you and the members of your party a very happy stage and a profitable and useful time.

264

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President Tito's Speech at the Palam Airport Replying to Dr. Radhakrishnan

His Excellency Mr. Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, made the following speech at the Palam Airport on October 20, 1966, in reply to President Radhakrishnan :

Mr. President : First of all, I wish to thank you Mr. President, Madame Indira Gandhi and the Indian people and Government for the very warm. and cordial welcome which has been extended to us today. At the same time, I wish to convey to you all the best greetings and good wishes of the people of Yugoslavia.

We have come to this great country in order to. meet you. Madame. Gandhi and President Nasser and to exchange views on the problems which are plaguing the world today. We are indeed very much interested in safeguarding the peace and in contributing towards the maintenance of peace as much as we can. I am convinced that this meeting of ours will be very useful and fruitful.

We are going to exchange views on the present situation in the world. This situation is not a good one. It is causing concern to the people of the world and we, the developing countries, are interested in being able to build our countries in peace and to ensure a better future for our people. We can, of course, contribute towards that end by our wish and firm will in promoting better understanding in the world and the acceptance of die principles of peaceful coexistence, because it is only in peace that we can build our future, Today, we are facing a very dangerous situation in some regions of the world which, if it were to last, could engulf the whole world and plunge it into a great conflagration, perhaps even much worse than the last world war. Therefore, I think that all those who are concerned about the uncertainties of the future, and not only We who are meeting here, should exert maximum efforts in order to make the people understand that war would be a catastrophe, not only for the individual nations, but also for the whole world.

It was my great desire to see your country again. Unfortunately, this time my stay would be rather short. But I shall gladly avail myself of the kind invitation that you, Mr. President, and your Government has extended to me to visit your country. I hope that this will take place in the near future, because I would like to see what you have achieved since my last visit to India.

I have very vivid memories of my meetings, on that occasion, with your great leader Shri Jawaharlal Nehru who talked to me about India's aspirations and the endeavours of the Indian people to build in peace a better and happier life. Nehru was, indeed, a great son of India, who had laid the foundations conducive to better and happier life for the people of India.

Once again I wish to thank you warmly for the friendly and cordial welcome extended to us.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President's Speech at a State Dinner in honour of President Nasser and President Tito

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, delivered the following speech proposing a toast to the

health of President Tito and President Nasser at the State Dinner held in their honour at Rashtrapati Bhawan, New Delhi, on October 21, 1966 :

Your Excellencies, Distinguished Guests and Friends :

The two Presidents whom we are welcoming here today must have felt a little of the warmth and enthusiasm from the affectionate welcome which our people gave them yesterday when they arrived here.

We welcomed them as friends of this country, as friends who have conic here to cooperate in the task of securing peace. It is a quest for peace that brought them here. And they are trying to the best of their ability to find out how best it could be reached.

Non-alignment is a thing which we have been hearing for a number of years. Our great departed leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, made it popular throughout the world and he made it clear that nonalignment may be negative in appearance but it is positive in content. It does not mean neutrality or indifference to right and wrong.

It means that we should not join any particular military group, that we should have the independence to decide every issue on its merits and not be led by any other interests.

Non-alignment is really the commitment to the work of peace, consolidation, goodwill and friendship among nations. That is what it is an instrument of.

War today has become brutal and inhuman. Our intellects and imaginations are dulled by cold statistics which hide from our vision the bruised

265

body, the broken hearts and the carnage of the innocents. At the present rate, if we are not able to avert a catastrophe, the whole world might be engulfed in a huge holocaust. That is why President Tito yesterday morning said that the thing which is likely to occur may be much more catastrophic than even the Second World War.

So it must be the interest of every individual to work for the reduction of tensions to the best of his ability and bring down conflicts in the world and promote! a climate of peace. That is why we are here. That is why these three leaders. who are opposite to me and by my side, are working day and night. Not only that, but our three countries are trying to build up a new kind of society based on pragmatic, undogmatic and democratic lines. However much we may say that we are a democratic State,--Fascism may have been defeated in the world war-but it is still alive in the hearts of many men. I do not say all men. You have hatred, bitterness, violence, exploitation, racial arrogance-all these things are to be found in the minds of men. we must eliminate these things from our mind if we are to call ourselves truly democratic.

In all our three countries we art trying to bring about a new society, It is that also that binds us together. I have no doubt that President Tito is working out political and economic reforms and tempering Communism with democracy. My friend President Nasser would like to see the divisions in the Arab world healed but these are things which we can attempt to achieve with patience and hope. Nothing in this world is irreversible. just as nothing is inevitable.

I am very glad that we have the plea-sure of meeting our old friends here and telling them how much we appreciate their endeavours for peace.

May I ask you now to drink to the health of President Tito, Madam Tito and President Nasser.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

Reply by President Nasser

Replying to President Radhakrishnan, the U.A.R. President said Dear friend, Brethren

Since our arrival in this great and ancient country we have felt the warm feelings of friendship and cordiality and the hearty welcome and hospitality extended to us.

This moment, dear friend, with the kind And expressive words we have just heard from you, highlights everything we cherished of the warmth extended to us since our arrival in India. I cannot stand in line with your power of expression and will not even try to. We have all known you and admired your rare mind with its ability of piercing depth and driving power.

What commands our admiration most is your ability to blend past heritage with future aspirations and with both enrich the potentialities of the present and that form a creative, positive and harmonious entity.

Indeed your thoughts were not isolated from life. Rather they accepted its challenges, coped with it, took from it and contributed to it. Your thoughts are of particular interest to us because we are people of an ancient and glorious civilisation. We always feared that past history might become a set-back, remote from the present and escape from the future pulling back instead of driving ahead. The biggest challenge of all which faced us and no doubt faced India as well, was how to Absorb the past into the present and for the benefit of the future while not allowing that past to dominate both; and then how to keep the link between our present and deeply rooted past and at the same time retain the power of development and expansion.

We felt, dear friends, one with you and when listening to you, that this harmony and unity and consistency are all potentials for the free and genuine wills of our people.

Dear friend, I thank you wholeheartedly and wish you constant health and happiness. I warmly greet the great people of India, the people with a glorious history with great ambitions, famous for deep wisdom and builders of the new life.

Friends, I invite you to join me in a toast in

honour of President Radhakrishnan, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, President Tito and his distinguished Lady.

USA INDIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

Reply by President Tito

Replying to President Radhakrishnan, the Yugoslav President said :

Esteemed Mr. President, Dear Madame Gandhi, Dear President Nasser, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I wish to express our warmest thanks-on behalf of my wife, my associates and in my own

266

name-for the kindness and friendship with which we have been received at every step during our stay in this beautiful historical city. May I specially thank you, Mr. President, for your kind words which reflect the sincere friendship existing between our two countries and, in particular, your aympathies towards the people of Yugoslavia who had the opportunity to know you not only as a distinguished statesman of friendly India, but also as a philosopher and humanist.

It is with great satisfaction that I share your opinion, Mr. President, concerning the constant and all-round development of cooperation between the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of India. Close friendship and profound mutual understanding have always characterised our relations and this has found expression in our highly developed bilateral cooperation and in our common aspirations on the international plane, in the efforts to consolidate peace and to promote international cooperation. I am firmly convinced that there exist all preconditions for the further successful development and expansion of friendly ties between our two countries in many fields to the mutual benefit. Our traditional friendship is based on the common strivings of our peoples to build a better and happier future in peace and freedom.

From our own experience we know that the process of socioeconomic development is a very complex one and requires great efforts and sacrifices. That is why we all the more appreciate the successes that India has achieved in industrial development, in the fields of science and culture as well as in other spheres. The, people of Yugoslavia have always followed and are following with particular sympathies the efforts that the people and Government of India are exerting in that direction. I avail myself of this opportunity to convey the best wishes of the people of Yugoslavia, and of all of us present here, for the further successes of your great country and for the prosperity of the people of India.

Mr. President,

I am gratified that this time we are meeting in your hospitable country together with our dear friend Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic. Ten years have elapsed since the first Tripartite Meeting. Our present encounter in New Delhi is a concrete example of the continuity of successful cooperation among our three countries. As on earlier occasions, we are meeting in order to enrich our experiencesin an open exchange of views-to strengthen our mutual cooperation and to examine in common the possibilities of constructive actions on the international plane.

It is well known that our three countries, together with other non-aligned and all peace-loving countries, are exerting consistent efforts for the implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations, principles which were unanimously adopted at the Conference of Non-aligned Countries in Belgrade and Cairo. Although many changes have taken place in the world in the meantime, the basic guidelines adopted then are still valid at present. More-, over, it is even more apparent today that the policy of peace and cooperation based on equality is the only alternative to a new catastrophe which could engulf the whole world. We believe that there exist even more favourable opportunities today for the activity of the peace-loving forces. Because, despite a serious aggravation of tension in some regions of the world, where extremely dangerous hotbeds of conflict have been created, positive processes, in which an ever growing number of countries is acquiring better conditions for an independent policy, have also been developing. I have in mind the weakening of the cohesion of military-political groupings and the objective strivings of numerous countries to Make their own contribution towards the settlement of inter'national problems and the strengthening of peace.

On the other hand, however, we are witnessing gross interference in the internal affairs of independent countries, neo-colonialist pressures and plots, an alarming growth of differences in levels of development between individual countries and re-ions of the world as well as the ruthless use of force and aggression. We cannot remain indifferent and passive with regard to all this, since the vital interests of our countries and peoples are involved. In such a polarisation between the forces of war, domination and hegemony, on the one hand, and the forces of peace, freedom and progress, on the other, we wish, on our part, to do all that can be done and can usefully serve the objectives we have been endeavouring to achieve for a number of years.

Mr. President,

I am convinced that I am expressing the thoughts and feelings of my esteemed friend, President Nasser, when I say that, particularly at this moment, we cherish vivid memories of the man who, with all his being and his untiring statemanship, had made such a great-contribution towards peace and understanding among peoples, Jawaharlal Nehru, the great architect of modern India who is no longer with us. However, we are continuing the work we had started together, as this great country is following the road marked out by him. Today this great responsibility has fallen on Madame Indira Gandhi, a personality whom we have known for a long time and whom we respect and in whom the noble characteristics her late father are so well personified.

I am very happy that our meeting has started

in such an open and friendly atmosphere and that our first talks have already evinced a great

267

closeness of our opinions and aspirations Therefore, I am convinced that our broad exchanges of views will he successful and fruitful.

In conclusion, I should like to express, our happiness to be once again in the capital of India to which I am bound with the pleasant memories of my earlier visits.

May I propose this toast to your health, Mr. President, to the health of Madame Indira Gandhi, to the health of President Nasser, to the happiness and wellbeing of the Indian people and to peace in the world.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA EGYPT **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

Prime Minister's Inaugural Speech at the Tripartite Meeting

The following is the text of the prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi's speech at the inauguration of the Tripartite Meeting held in the Asoka Hall of Rashtrapati Bhavan New Delhi on October 21, 1966 :

Your Excellencies, distinguished guests, in welcoming you today, my Government and the people of India are conscious of a sense of historic fulfilment. You have both been with us before. But this is the first time we meet together in Delhi to give new meaning and purpose to our friendship and cooperation which has helped to sustain the dialogue of peace in a sharply divided world, Tito and Nasser are names of world statesmen and respected leaders of dynamic nations. More than that, they are symbols and represent landmarks in modern history. Your Excellencies, you are path-finders and innovators who have inspired revolutionary transformations in your own countries and given expression to wide urges and aspirations. You have led great liberation movements with courage and daring, and have, each in your own way and in accordance with the needs and circumstances of your country, pioneered new paths of socialist development. We are privileged to welcome you here today as partisans of peace and architects of a new and hater world.

This is the third such tripartite meeting between three friendly countries. It reflects the desires, the interests. the common aspirations of our peoples. It is the continuation of a tradition. Not only similarity of approach to international events brines our three nations together. What binds us is our vision of the kind of society we wish to create, a society in which old injustices are eradicated and a new socialist order is established, in which there is opportunity for the full unfolding of the human personality.

We belong to three different continents and have different systems of government and different historical backgrounds. Yet our three countries have drawn close to one another and our friendship has stood the test of time. This proclaims and bears witness to the continuing validity of the concept of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. Non-alignment has raised a voice of reconciliation and human conscience above the harsh din of armaments, cold war polemics and angry clash of alliances. It is a means towards the larger end of peaceful coexistence.

The world has changed a great deal since the last tripartite meeting in 1961 and even more since the first meeting in 1956. New trends, new forces and new problems are emerging. They demand continuing assessment.

In 1956, colonialism and racialism and the intensity of the cold war were explosive factors in the international situation, There have been some positive developments since that time. Colonialism has receded. There were signs of thaw in the cold war, though lately these have dimmed again. Racialism persists and, in alliance with the remnants of entrenched colonialism, notably in the southern part of Africa, is hurling defiance in flagrant violation of world opinion and human rights.

A brutal and tragic conflict is raging in vietnam. It must be ended before it destroys the entire country and spreads and engulfs the world. It has revived cold war postures and tensions. There is only one real solution: a peaceful political settlement in keeping with the wishes of the people of Vietnam and free from all outside interference, as envisaged under the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

The peace around us, if it can be called peace, is an embattled one. We are confronted with the competitive build-up of nuclear armaments which threaten human survival. We hope that our dedication to tangible and realistic steps towards general and complete disarmament will help to create conditions for a lasting peace. This then is not a moment when we can confine ourselves to narrow national grooves. Indeed, we must raise the voice of humanity to assert that war is not inevitable, that there is no alternative to peaceful co-existence which can gain added meaning through active international cooperation.

The threats to newly independent nations are subtle and varied. There are economic and political pressures. There is a combination of social

268

conservatism and revivalism which, with external encouragement, strains to preserve an unreal status quo. There, are overt and covert efforts to undermine the integrity of composite societies. There is, above all, the stark fact of poverty and hunger, aggravated by the population explosion. In a shrinking world, prosperity and progress, like peace and freedom, are indivisible. It is in the interest of all nations that these threats be met,

It is incumbent on industrially advanced nations to help correct the imbalance created by the wide disparity between rich and poor countries. and to implement the many suggestions made to prevent this gap from growing. On our part, the non-aligned nations, the developing nations must make a tremendous effort to become self-reliant in order to give fuller meaning and content to our independence. Only by mutual cooperation in the economic, political and cultural spheres can this objective be furthered.

The United Nations is the hope of the world, more especially of the smaller powers and developing nations, for it is the symbol of world community. We shall do everything in our power to strengthen the United Nations and to make it an effective instrument for international peace and cooperation.

We have gathered here not to speak to others or for others, nor indeed to forge a new alliance, but to exchange views and to share our grave concern over common problems. Our attempt is not to shut others out but rather to find ways to bring them in. The purpose of non-alignment is not to build new barriers but to weaken existing ones. So accustomed is the world to think-' ing in terms of compartments that this new concept has often been misunderstood and erroneously described as a third bloc.

Man today has the power not only to destroy the world but to build it anew. He has the tools of science and technology. He is reaching out to the stars. So I do not despair. For peace and justice cannot elude the collective will of ordinary people the world over. By some strange coincidence we meet here at a time when in India we are celebrating the eternal festival of Dussehra which symbolises the ultimate triumph of good.

President Nasser and President Tito, I offer to you and the members of your delegations and, through you, to the people of the UAR and Yugoslavia, the salutations and the good wishes of my Government and of the Indian people. I am confident that our meeting will bring us even closer, in friendship and understanding, to promote the ideas we share. May they endure.

INDIA USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President Tito's Speech at the Inauguration of the Tripartite Meeting

The following is the text of the speech of President Tito of Yugoslavia at the inauguration of the Tripartite Meeting:

Madame Indira Gandhi, Ladies and Gentlemen.

May I, first of all, thank you most warmly for the cordial welcome which has been extended to us and for the excellent organisation of the Meeting.

I have listened with great attention to the speeches of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and President Nasser and I fully agree with what they have said here.

This is our third Tripartite Meeting which marks the continuity of the efforts we have been exerting for peace and better understanding among peoples over a number of years. The present meeting, in the same, way as the previous ones, is not the result of an intention on our part to speak in the name of others. We have met to talk about relations between our countries and the international situation, that is to say, to discuss all issues of interest to our three countries. It goes without saying that the international problems on which we are going to exchange views do not concern our countries only, but the whole mankind as well. Even more so as the present situation in the world is worse than, say, one or two years ago.

When speaking of the aggravation of the situation in the world, we should not fail to mention that certain positive trends have also manifested themselves in recent years. Let us take, as a case in point, the process of disintegration of military pacts. The Atlantic Pact, for instance, is not what it used to be a few years ago, because France is acting today towards the maintenance of peace and against war. Many

other countries ape adhering to an increasing extent to the principles which were adopted at the Bandung Conference and at the Conference of Non-aligned Countries in Belgrade and Cairo.

Therefore, it is wrong to say, as we hear from certain quarters today, that the policy of nonalignment has failed. On the contrary, the policy of non-aligned countries, i.e. the principles which were fixed in the Declarations of the

269

Belgrade and Cairo Conferences, as well as at the Bandung Conference, are today being accepted to an Increasing extent. For, the vast majority of mankind has realised that peace can be preserved and a new catastrophe averted only if the principles of peaceful coexistence are endorsed and applied in international relations and cooperation.

It is also contended that a certain disintegration of non-aligned countries has taken place, particularly in Africa. It is not explained, however, what are the reasons for this deterioration of conditions in Africa-that it is the result of imperialist pressure on individual countries which find themselves in a difficult economic

At our meeting, of course, most attention will be devoted to the international problems which are causing concern to the world and constitute a threat to peace. One of the most important issues today is, no doubt, the problem of assistance to developing countries and that of the way in which this assistance should be extended. The question arises whether the situation of the developing countries has been improved or has deteriorated since the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in Geneva. In our view, the situation is worse than it was at that time.

The question is also posed as to the possible effect of a meeting such as our Triparute encounter here. I am profoundly convinced that our meeting will make a significant contribution towards the positive solving of current international problems. There is no doubt that all the non-aligned countries can play an important, role in this respect. I am confident that our meeting and our views on the current problems which are plaguing mankind will be welcomed by the vast majority of non-aligned countries and by all the peaceloving peoples in the world. Because the world is indivisible today. A new world catastrophe would equally affect all peoples.

Consequently, I feel that our task here is to direct our talks in a sense that will enable us to make a maximum contribution towards the solution of international problems by peaceful means and towards preventing the use of force, as is today the case.

Finally, I wish to reiterate that we have not established any monopoly and that it is not our intention to speack on behalf of all the non-aligned countries. On the contrary, we shall very gladly give suport to every initiative coming from any or several non-aligned countries, because it is in the interest of all, in the, interest of peace and international cooperation, in the interest of a better future of mankind.

YUGOSLAVIA USA FRANCE INDONESIA EGYPT SWITZERLAND

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President Nasser's Speech at the Inauguration of the Tripartite Meeting

The following is the text of President Nasser's speech at the inauguration of the Tripartite Meeting:

Brethren and Friends,

It is probably still too early to speak of our present meeting which brings together Yugoslavia, India and the United Arab Republic to the glorious city of New Delhi. It is not my intention to go ahead of our discussions and their outcome, but I ask you to allow me to make some quick observations.

In the first place, permit me to express warm and special thanks to the great Indian people, who, by playing hosts to this meeting held in their capital, reaffirm once again India's pioneering role in the national revolutionary movement for independence And the struggle for economic and social progress, the ultimate aim of political independence in its full meaning.

We India, Yugoslavia and the United Arab Republic-meet here, first and foremost, as old friends united by a historic tradition of common endeavour, established and consolidated by unity of principles and ideals, and given depth by previous meetings held in Brioni and Cairo, to be resumed in New Delhi today.

As friends we do not meet here to furnish solutions to all problems or prescribe a medicine for every ailment; but, basically, we meet to exchange thoughts and experience in struggle, and to place the outcome of such exchange at the service of the principles to which our peoples have always adhered and served loyally. We do hope that our endeavours would-just as they have in, the past--contribute, positively to the causes and aspirations of nations sharing our peoples' aspirations to freedom, progress and peace.

The policy to which our peoples have always adhered and served loyally-namely the policy of non-alignment-is sound in essence despite successive developments. Moreover, the genuine principles of this policy, and here I refer to the principles of peaceful coexistence as outlined at the conferences of Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo, are still true.

270

Experience reaffirms this belief every day and, strengthens our faith in it.

World changes in recent years may call for new efforts, but these do not touch on the policy as such on its genuine principles.

Today, our world differs from that world of strife between the two blocs of East and West we had to face in or after 1955. Yet, our world is still governed by strife with numerous centres

of conflict.

The contradictions which served as part of the motive behind the old strife, still remain: imperialism still tries to subdue peoples on a number of continents; racial discrimination is still practised with the same immoral madness; force is still used in the most brutal ways to terrorise and dominate; the cause of peace and war-irrespective of the balance of nuclear terror-remain, exposed to greed and adventure,

There is no doubt that the struggle of peoples against that all, has achieved sweeping victories, but we cannot deceive ourselves and claim that danger exists no more.

This apart, new contradictions have emerged, the most serious of which, to our mind, is the disparity between poverty and wealth, and between progress and underdevelopment.

Despite the fact that our peoples' efforts today surpass any they ever exerted in their contemporary struggle, yet, their material, scientific and technological means run short of their ambition. Moreover, in their strenuous and valiant efforts, the peoples are exposed to obstacles and impediments placed by the Powers seeking domination; I would even declare that they are exposed to violent pressures which almost go as, far as economic and Psychological war.

It is imperative--and this is dictated by the very dignity of oar endeavour--to reject the attitude of hesitation for which attempts are made to involve us in. The attitude of begging is a prelude to that of retreat. It is, therefore, vital that we stand firmly together and prove to those who fail to perceive the truth, that world prosperity is indivisible, world peace is indivisible, and that progress is for mankind as a whole.

Our firm stand can have its impact only through close cooperation among us in all political, economic and cultural fields. Not only does this hasten our steps forward, but it also affords, us and others possibilities without limitations, to face the raids of neocolonialism and its ally reaction. Here it is important that our straggle be closely linked to liquidate the imperialist pockets. We are aware of some in our areathe Middle East and Africa. Such pockets can serve as a springboard from where to pounce on us through the alliance of imperialism and reaction, with the aim of dominating once again our struggling peoples and frustrating their endeavours for economic and social progress,

The policy of non-alignment is actually, in essence an alignment with the principles of freedom, an alignment with peace aspirations, an alignment with the potentialities of sweeping progress, and an alignment with the ability of the human mind to forge ahead.

The peoples adhering to this policy do not aim at isolating themselves from their world, rather, their aim is to react with it and face its problems. They wage their daily struggle guided by a concept of national interest which considers world peace based on justice, an indivisible part of the world feelings and conscience. I thank you friends. May God Almighty guide us to our objectives.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA EGYPT INDONESIA

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

Joint Communique on the Tripartite Meeting

The following is the text of the Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on October 24, 1966 at the conclusion of the Tripartite Meeting between President Tito, President Nasser, and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi :

The President of the Socialist Federal, Republic of Yugoslavia. His Excellency Mr. Josip Broz Tito, the President of the United Arab Republic. His Excellency Mr. Gamal Abdel Nasser and the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, met in New Delhi from October 21 to 24, 1966.

The two Presidents recalled their 1956 and 1961 meetings with Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in Brioni and Cairo. They paid their tribute to his great contribution to the cause of world peace and justice as well as to the formulation of the principles of non-alignment.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister examined the present world situation and exchange ed views on international problems as well as on the further strengthening of co-operation in all fields of interest to their respective countries. These talks were held in an atmosphere of complete frankness mutual understanding and cordiality and confirmed the concordance of views characteristic of the close friendship between the Governments and the people of the three countries.

271

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister "pressed their deep concern at the increasing threat to world peace due to the violation of the principles of peaceful co-existence and the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. They noted in particular the increasing interference, intensified use of force, and the exercise of pressures on the part of sonic Powers against the newly independent and other developing countries. They believe that the main source of persisting difficulties is the opposition of imperialist and neo-colonialist forces to the aspirations and the struggle of many peoples and countries towards achievement of complete political and economic emancipation.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister noted with satisfaction that there is a strong determination among the peoples of the world to safeguard peace and intensify their struggle for political and economic independence. They welcomed the encouraging trend' of an increasing number of countries taking an independent and active, stand with regard to world problems, thus contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security. Further, they noted favourable developments in Europe and expressed the hope that these would have a beneficial effect on international relations as a whole. The two Presidents and the Prime Minister consider that recent trends and developments which have taken place in the world in general confirm the validity of the policy of non-alignment. They note with satisfaction that the principles of nonalignment as formulated at Belgrade and Cairo are gaining more and more ground among independent countries which are exerting efforts towards the achievement of peace and progress in the world.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister form of imperialism, hegemony or monopoly of power and military alliances. The aim of nonalignment is to strengthen international peace, not through division of the world but through the expansion of areas of freedom, independence and co-operation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister remain resolutely opposed to colonialism and neo-colonialism in all their forms and manifestations, which seek to curb the freedom of action of newly independent countries, distorting their national goals, and to exploit their natural and human resources. They deprecate the use of economic and financial assistance as an instrument of pressure, and noted with satisfaction that many developing countries have resisted such pressures. Furthermore, they believe that as problems of growth and development multiply and become more difficult, ways and means should be devised to initiate and further expand areas of co-operation among the developing countries in the fields of trade and development.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister reiterated their conviction that the universal acceptance and application of the principles of peaceful co-existence are essential if international peace and security are to be safeguarded.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister view with deep concern the dangerous situation in South-East Asia, more particularly the escalation of the military operations in Vietnam, which threatens to develop into a wider war. The sufferings of the Vietnamese people, the loss to human life and the material damage cannot but cause great anxiety to all peace-loving peoples of the world. They reiterate that the bombing of North Vietnam should be ended immediately without any preconditions.

They firmly believe that the implementation of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and the withdrawal of all foreign forces would lead to peace and enable the Vietnamese people to decide their future themselves free from all external interference, They recognise that the participation of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front would be necessary as one of the main parties in any efforts for the realisation of peace in Vietnam.

The two Presidents welcomed the Tashkent Declaration as a significant contribution to the cause of peace,

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister welcome the progressive developments in Asia and Africa leading to the independence of a large number of countries and their emergence as a powerful new factor for peace and international cooperation.

They note, however, that colonialism still persists in certain parts of the world. They reiterate their firm opposition to colonialism and neocolonialism in all their forms and manifestations. They fully support the just struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe, South West Africa, Angola, Mozambique, the so-called Portuguese Guinea, Aden and the Protectorates. They equally reaffirm their opposition to recialism as practised in South Africa, South West Africa and Southern Rhodesia. They consider it imperative that these oppressed peoples should recover their freedom and independence in the immediate future. They condemn the alliance between the forces of colonialism and racialism and are confident that these forces shall be defeated.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister fully support the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs and their struggle for the realisation of their aspirations in accordance with the declaration of the Cairo Conference of Non-aligned Countries.

272

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister reiterated their conviction that the intensification of the arms race poses a serious threat to international peace and security and that an early agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control constitutes one of the most urgent problems facing the international community. They reaffirmed their support for the convening of a world disarmament conference to which all countries should be invited.

They emphasised the serious dangers inherent in the spread of nuclear weapons and called for the early conclusion of a treaty on non-proliferaion of nuclear weapons in accordance with the principles approved by the United Nations General Assembly at its XX Session.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister reiterated their faith in the vital role of the United Nations for the promotion of international co-operation, peace and security. They pledge their continuing support to make the world organization more effective in discharging its responsibilities in accordance with the Charter. They support the principle of universality of the United Nations. They urge the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the world organization.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister consider that rapid economic progress of the developing countries is a pre-requisite for safeguarding their political and economic independence. They reviewed the struggle of developing countries to break the shackles of poverty and technological backwardness, and noted with concern that the rate of economic growth of the developing countries has fallen short even of the target envisaged for the development decade. They recognized that the responsibility for development rests primarily with the developing countries themselves. The developing countries have made strenuous efforts to mobilise domestic resources and over the past decade and a half appreciable progress has been made in social welfare and economic development. However, self-sustaining growth has yet to be attained and in the meanwhile the disparity between the developed and developing countries of the world continues to widen, resulting in increase of social', economic and political tensions.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister feel that a principal obstacle to rapid economic growth is the insufficiency of external resources. The modest target of 1 per cent of gross national product set by the United Nations for the transfer of net resources from developed to developing countries has not been reached and the terms and conditions for the transfer of these resources impose fresh burdens on the limited capacity of weaker economies. The policies followed by affluent countries in relation to prices of primary Products and their reluctance to provide satisfactory conditions for the increase in imports of processed and finished products from developing countries have made it difficult for these countries to augment their foreign earnings.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister accordingly consider that the creation of more favourable international conditions for development remains one of the vital prerequisites for promoting economic progress of developing countries. They highly appreciate the concerted efforts that led to the convening of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; they regretted that effective measures have not been taken to implement its recommendations and expressed the hope that development policies of both developed and developing countries, would be guided by the Final' Act.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister are convinced that the 77 developing countries will strengthen their unity and consolidate their efforts to ensure the success of the Second Conference when it meets in the autumn of 1967.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister consider that it is necessary for developing countries to initiate new measures and to co-ordinate their individual efforts to face the challenge posed by the slackening in their rate of growth. They are resolved to take practical steps in this direction and trust that all developing countries would join in the effort to expand the area of mutual co-operation, increase trade exchanges among themselves pool technical and scientific expertence, and undertake joint endeavours to develop mutually beneficial patterns of trade and development.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister expressed satisfaction that friendship and understanding between their countries, based on common objectives and a common approach to world problems, as well as close co-operation in the economic, technical and cultural spheres, has continued to grow stronger over the years. They discussed the further steps to be taken by their Governments and agreed that their concerned Ministers meet at an early date to examine the possibilities of co-operation between their Governments in technical, commercial and industrial fields.

They appreciated that their three countries have continued to draw closer together and have strengthened bonds of warm friendship and brotherhood, reflecting the sentiments and common aspirations of their peoples towards lasting peace and social and economic progress.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister agreed to work together to strengthen the forces

273

of nonalignment in the changing world context and to co-operate with other countries in the task of promoting world peace and security in conditions of freedom and equality of all countries.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser and President Josip Broz Tito expressed to President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi their great appreciation for the warm . reception and hospitality accorded them throughout their stay in New Delhi by the Government and people of India.

INDIA USA YUGOSLAVIA EGYPT VIETNAM SWITZERLAND UZBEKISTAN ANGOLA ZIMBABWE GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA CHINA

Date : Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

President Nasser's Speech at his Banquet to President Radhakrishnan

The following is the text of President Nasser's speech at a Banquet given by him in honour of the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, in New Delhi on October 26, 1966 :

Dear Friend, Dr. Radhakrishnan dear friend Mrs. Indira Gandhi friends and guests :

Now that my visit to India is about to end, I can but try to express the gratitude of the U.A.R. delegation for the warm hospitality and sincere, cooperation extended to us.

I take pleasure in particular in referring to the sincerity and warmth extended to us by you personally, dear friend. I also take enormous pleasure in recording how dearly I cherish the opportunity afforded me to work closely with Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India.

In the past, I knew her as an excellent daughter of an excellent father. Here, whether at the Tripartite meeting. in which our friend Marshal Tito participated, or at the bilateral talks between India and the U.A.R., I was afforded the opportunity to see her as a great disciple of an illustrious professor. My feelings were with her as I saw her assume the national and human responsibilities, shouldered by Nehru, in the name of India and as an expression of India. I felt the power and depth of continuity and here, I do not mean family continuity, but what I primarily and basically mean is intellectual continuity.

Friends, the great people of India were both spontaneous and sincere in their feelings towards us. We felt that spontaneous sincerity wherever we went on both the official and popular levels.

In fact, brethren, the bonds uniting our two countries go beyond diplomatic relations. They constitute a genuine and healthy example of relations between developing countries, sharing the same past, the same struggle and the same aspirations.

This apart, we in particular are bound by historic ties, an ancient civilization and a striking similarity in our national and human aspirations.

My happiness abounds as I behold the friendship between India and U.A.R. re-affirmed and revived, growing stronger and deeper. I am fully aware, dear brethren, of the services that can be rendered by a reaffirmed, revived, strong and deep Arab-Indian friendship for the benefit of our two countries in the political, economic and cultural fields. Brethren, I invite you to joint me in a toast for our dear friend, President Radhakrishnan, for the distinguished and valiant lady, Indira Gandhi, for an ever strong and revived Arab-Indian friendship, for the great Indian nation and its patient ambitious struggle for the establishment-of a new life and for the principles and objectives which bind it to our Arab nation, bringing them together on the same field of action.

INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

Reply by President Radhakrishnan

The following is the text of President Radhakrishnan's speech at President Nasser's Banquet :

President Nasser, Your Excellencies, distinguished friends :

I am very happy to hear from President Nasser that be enjoyed his stay here and has found ties between our two countries further strengthened by his short stay. He must come, for a longer stay.

The Tripartite Conference, which took place here, enabled us to understand problems facing Europe, Asia and Africa, because the three countries come from three different continents.

President Nasser spoke about the ties that bind us. One : We try to treat all people, whatever their religion or nationality, as equal citizens of our State, whether they believed in one God or many Gods or no God. They are all treated alike. Religion does not interfere with politics. That one great lesson we have learnt from our own past history. The United Arab Republic has tour million Christians who feel entirely happy as citizens there.

The second thing that unites us is the policy of nonalignment which we have adopted. Put in positive terms, it is peaceful co-existence. That means co-existence even with nations which adopt different systems of thought and polity. It requires wisdom, tolerance and understanding to practise coexistence in a real way. And there.lore we are practising that to the best of our ability and so is United Arab Republic.

Stress that has been laid on the economic difficulties in the Communique issued by the Tripartite Conference is a thing which face, not merely our two countries but almost all the developing nations. We are all struggling to find our feet in this competitive world. Apathy, low national incomes, low productivity are all there. Well, here other people may help us or guide us; but, we have to depend largely on ourselves. We have to raise our own standards; we have to work hard. Self-reliance and hard work-these are the things that we require, if we want to make ourselves existent comfortably in this competitive world.

In all thew matter, there are so many things which bind us together and it is my calmest hope and desire, its it is President Nasser's, that the Indo-Arab friendship will be further strengthened and perpetuated for a long, long time to come. President Nasser and Indo-Arab friendship.

USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

Press Release on President Nasser's Visit

The following is the text of a Press release issued in New Delhi on October 27, 1966 at the end of President Nasser's State Visit to India

At the invitation of the Government of India, President Gamal Abdel Nasser extended his stav in New Delhi on a State Visit from October 25th to October 27th, 1966, on the conclusion-of Tripartite Meeting between President Josip Broz Tito, President Gamal Abdel Nasser and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. The President was accompanied by Mr. Zakaria Mohieddine, Vice-President, Mr. Anwar El-Sadat, Speaker of the National Assembly, Dr. Mahmoud Fawzi, Vice-Prime Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Salah Mohammed Nasr, Mr. Mahmoud Riad, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and other members of party. During his 'stay, the President attended various functions organised in his honour where he met a number of important personalities including representatives of some, important organizations of the country. This enabled the President and members of his party to meet friends and to exchange views about developments in India which have taken place since his last visit in 1960.

The President and the Prime Minister reviewed in an atmosphere of complete frankness and warm friendship the very close relations that exist between the U.A.R. and India and considered the further development and strengthening of mutual cooperation in the scientific. technical, economic and cultural fields. It was decided that a meeting should take place in December 1966 in New Delhi of the Minister's of India and U.A.R. to discuss economic and technical collaboration and to explore the Possibilities of joint ventures in the industrial and technological field. It was also decided that in order to exchange views about international developments and other matters of common interest, there should be periodic exchange of views between the Foreign Offices of both countries at ministerial or highest official level at least once a year, alternately in each capital'. It was further agreed that there should be early discussions for a two-year cultural programme at the appropriate level for greater cultural exchange under the Cultural Agreement between the two countries. 'Me President and the Prime Minister noted with appreciation the satisfactory implementation for mutual benefit of the Indo-U.A.R. Scientific Agreement which

enabled exchange of scientists in increasing numbers in different fields.

The Prime Minister greatly appreciated the opportunity offered by the State visit to exchange views about the relations between India and U.A.R. The President and the Prime Minister expressed deep satisfaction at the continued and growing friendship and understanding between the two countries and confidently hoped that this would continue to grow stronger in the interests of their common policies of nonalignment, peaceful coexistence and active cooperation between states for promotion or peace and progress in the world.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser expressed his admiration to his hosts for the great accomplishments he witnessed during his stay. He expressed to President Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi his great appreciation for the warm welcome with which he and his party were received in New Delhi by the Government and people of India.

275

INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1966

November

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1966 Vol XII NOVEMBER No. 11

CONTENTS

PAGES

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS MEETING

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament 277

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

President's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming President Novotny 279 President Novotny's Speech at Palam Airport Replying to Dr. Radhakrishnan 279 President Radhakrishnan's Speech at his Dinner to President Novotny 280 Reply by President Novotny 280 President Novotny's Speech at his Dinner to President Radhakrishnan 281 Reply by President Radhakrishnan 282 President Radhakrishnan's Speech at Ceremonial Farewell to President Novotny 282 Reply by President Novotny 283 Joint Communique 283 Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Parliament on Czechoslovak President's Visit 286 Indo-Czech Agreement for Cooperation in Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy 287

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the Special Political Committee on Pe acekeeping Operations 287 Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in the Political Committee on General and Complete Disarmament 289 Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in Political Committee on Non-proliferatio n of Nuclear Weapons 291 Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement on Elimination of Foreign Military Bases i n Asia, Africa and Latin America 295 Shri P. N. Haksar's Statement on Prohibition of Threat or Use of Force in

International Relations 296

LAOS

Vice-President's Speech at his Dinner to the Crown Prince 300 Reply by the Crown Prince 300 Vice-President's Speech at a Dinner given by the Crown Prince 301

NEPAL

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Lok Sabha on Prime Minister's Visit to

Nepal 302

TRIPARTITE MEETING

Prime Minister's Statement in the Lok Sabha 303

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

NORWAY SLOVAKIA USA INDIA LAOS NEPAL

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS MEETING

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in Parliament on November 7, 1966, regarding the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Meeting held in London in September, 1966 : The Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Meeting which opened in London on September 6 and ended on September 15 was the 16th in a series which began in 1944.

At the earlier meeting held in Lagos in January 1966 which was devoted entirely to the question of Rhodesia, the Prime Ministers had agreed to meet again in July if the Rhodesia rebellion had not by then been ended. However, following consultations with Commonwealth Heads of Government conducted by the Commonwealth Secretariat, it was agreed to hold the meeting in September, 1966. As the Prime Minister could not attend the meeting the Minister of External Affairs represented India and attended this meeting as Leader of the Indian Delegation. The meeting which devoted a major portion of its discussions to the problem of Rhodesia discussed also the situation in Vietnam, disarmament, danger of nuclear proliferation, the problems in Southern Africa, Cyprus, the future of dependent Territories and the world economic situation. At the end of the conference, a final Communique was issued.

Members of Parliament would wish to know the Government of India's stand on and assess ment of various international problems which were discussed in the Conference

Rhodesia

The discussion on this subject was free and frank. India's attitude on Rhodesia is well known and has been stated from time to time in Parliament, the United Nations and elsewhere. Our view has been and continues to be that majority rule an the basis of 'one man one vote' should be firmly established before independence is given to Rhodesia. This view was shared by most of the member countries of the Commonwealth. India supported their demand that Britain should not hesitate to give a clear and categorical assurance to this effect. The Government of India felt that the situation in Rhodesia amounted to an illegal seizure of power by a racist minority which should be ended by all possible means including the use of force, it necessary. There was no doubt that Britain as the metropolitan power had the responsibility to bring the illegal racist Smith regime to an end.

Most of the members, including India, were of the opinion that general and comprehensive economic sanctions under Chapter VII, Articles 41 and 42 of the U.N. Charter should be applied. Some members were in favour of the application of sanctions on. selected individual commodities important to the economy of Rhodesia. It was stressed that the, Rhodesian problem was of wider concern to Africa, the Commonwealth and the world and if not settled to the satisfaction of the majority of Rhodesians, racial discord would spread and engulf the whole continent of Africa.

The Indian Delegation worked in close cooperation with the Afro-Asian-Carribean. Group, who elected the Indian Minister of External Affairs as their Chairman of the Group. Informal meeting of this Group facilitated the reconciliation of the different points of view on Rhodesia and achieved success in producing an acceptable, Communique on this difficult question, incorporating both the majority and minority views. Some advance was thus made on the previous British position. It was agreed that a dine limit was to be set by Britain to the illegal Smith regime to end its rebellion and if they did not surrender by the end of the year, Britain agreed to ask the U.N. for the application of selective mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Britain also agreed that there would be, no independence before majority rule if the people of Rhodesia as a whole were seen to be opposed to it. It was agreed unanimously that assistance should be given to Zambia to produce a more complete cut-off of trade with Rhodesia and to assist her to withstand any serious effect on her economy resulting from this. It was further agreed that the problem should be kept under constant review and Heads of Governments should meet again if the illegal regime was not brought to an end speedily.

277

The question of Rhodesia had threatened to split the Commonwealth at one stage, but by patient handling of this explosive issue the Commonwealth was able to survive this threat. The division in the Commonwealth was not on grounds of race, or colour, but on the question of the use of force by Britain to end the rebellion and the establishment of majority rule on the basis of 'one man one vote' before the introduction of independence. It is a matter for gratification that the principle of equality of all races and the fundamental right of majority rule on the basis of 'one man one vote' before independence were vindicated in this Meeting of the Commonwealth.

India played a useful role in reconciling different points of view and this was greatly appreciated by ail concerned.

Vietnam

India did not favour the revival of the stillborn Commonwealth Mission which war. appointed in 1965 to deal with Vietnam, This view was accepted, although it was agreed that the Commonwealth should continue its efforts to promote peace in Vietnam. Our basic stand on Vietnam was endorsed, i.e. that the people of Vietnam should be able to live in peace and be free from outside pressure to be, able to work out their own destiny within the broad framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. We drew attention to the Prime Minister's appeal of 7th July this year calling for the stoppage of bombmg in North Vietnam, cessation of all hostilities throughout Vietnam, convening of a Genevatype conference of the parties to the conflict and others vitally concerned in this problem.

Indo-Pak Relations

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan alluded to Indo-Pak differences and Kashmir during his speech on the world political situation. The Indian Minister of External Affairs intervened immediately and took strong exception to the latter's references to India's domestic issues and bilateral differences in the Commonwealth forum. On the last day when the final Communique was being drafted the Pakistan Foreign Minister again tried to include a reference to Indo-Pakistan differences. The Indian Minister of External Affairs again objected to this proposal. Our objection was upheld and no other member of the Commonwealth supported the. Pakistan proposal and all references to Indo-Pakistan differences or Kashmir were omitted from the Communique. A convention was thus firmly established that domestic issues and questions of bilateral differences should not be included in the final Communique of the Commonwealth Prime

Ministers' Meetings unless both the countries concerned agreed.

Disarmament

The Meeting reaffirmed the principles set out in Resolution 2028 on Don-proliferation of nuclear weapons adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in its 20th Session on 19th November 1965. They urged all countries, nuclear as well as non-nuclear weapon powers, to agree to measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. They welcomed the initiatives by some non-nuclear weapon countries in suggesting procedures for bridging the differences among the major nuclear weapon powers. They reaffirmed their Support for the aim of general and complete disarmament subject to effective international inspection and control. The Meeting deplored recent nuclear weapons test conducted in the atmosphere by two major powers.

Dependent Territories

The British Government made a statement to the Meeting about the progress of the remaining dependencies towards self-government or independence. Members will be glad to note that at our instance Mauritius and Fiji were included in the list of such territories, mentioned by Britain.

World Eoconomic Situation

The Meeting discussed the world economic situation and recognised the value of Comonwealth preference system. They emphasised the need for better access and more stable prices for primary products and for exports of manufactured and semi-manufactured goods from developing countries. The British Government gave an assurance that if and when she joined the European Economic Community the essential interests of other Commonwealth countries would be safeguarded and the interests of developing countries would receive special attention. The need for additional liquidity for international payments was emphasised. The desirability for continuing assistance to increase the world's food supply was also stressed. The Meeting expressed concern at the slow economic progress of developing countries and the inadequate flow of resources from the developed to the developing countries resulting in economic imbalances and

growing difficulties regarding debt obligations. They agreed that all these matters should be discussed by the Commonwealth Trade Ministers.

Sir, I have attempted to give a brief account of the important items discussed in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Meeting. India participated in the discussion of all the matters on the agenda and I believe our participation was use-

278

ful and constructive. Our greatest gain, in my opinion, was an increasing understanding among the developing countries in the Commonwealth and an appreciation of their difficulties by the developed countries of the Commonwealth. We hope that this will lead to greater cooperation among the members of the Commonwealth for the good of all its members.

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA USA VIETNAM CYPRUS CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ZAMBIA SWITZERLAND PAKISTAN FIJI MAURITIUS RUSSIA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

President's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming President Novotny

The following is the text of the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan's speech at the Palam airport on November 19, 1966, welcoming His Excellency Mr. Antonin Novotny, President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Madame Novotna and party :

Mr. President, Madam and friends, we are very happy that you are able to come to our country and spend a few days. We are not satisfied with the short stay you are making but something is better than nothing.

You represent the Government and the people

who are very sympathetic and understanding of our problems and helpful in solving them. Many of our heavy industrial engineering projects were set up thanks to your cooperation and great assistance.

In foreign policies we have more or less the same views. We recently came to an agreement with regard to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In many ways we are friends and I hope that your visit to this country will strengthen the bonds of friendship already subsisting between our two countries.

It is my earnest wish that you, Madam, Ministers and other members of your party will have a pleasant and useful stay here.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

President Novotny's Speech at Palam Airport Replying to Dr. Radhakrishnan

In his reply, His Excellency Mr. Antonin Novotny, said :

Dear Mt' President, dear Mrs. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It was with pleasure that we accepted your invitation to visit India. We have come to get better acquainted with the life of the people of India and with their efforts to develop their country as well as to exchange views on the most important international questions and on further strengthening of the co-operation between our countries.

First of all, I would like, to convey both to you personally and to all the people of India

friendly greetings from the Czechoslovak people.

The peoples of our two countries have much in common. In the past as well as at present, our two countries have striven for securing peace throughout the world and peaceful understanding among nations.

Since your last visit to Czechoslovakia in 1965, Mr. President, the volume of mutual relations between the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Republic of India has grown ever further. Such all-round co-operation is beneficial to both our countries and at the same time constitutes a common contribution of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and India in the pursuit of the, policy of peaceful co-existence among nations and to the creation of a more favourable peaceful atmosphere in the world.

279

I am confident that the visit will contribute to further strengthening of friendship and mutual understanding between India and Czechoslovakia.

Permit me to thank you for the cordial welcome accorded to us and to express my conviction that our sojourn in India will be useful.

Long live mutual Czechoslovak-Indian friendship and co-operation.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

President Radhakrishnan's Speech at his Dinner to President Novotny

The following is the text of President Radhakrishnan's speech at a Dinner given by him in honour of the President of Czechoslovakia, H.E. Mr. Antonin Novotny, at Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi, on November 19, 1966 :

Mr. President, Madam Novotna, Your Excellencies, distinguished guests and friends :

May I extend to you both and the members of your party a very cordial welcome on behalf of the people and the Government of India.

You have been such good friends to us in several ways, most definitely in our idea of developing our industries. There are several towns here-Ranchi, Tiruchirapalli, Hyderabad, Bhavnagar, Bangalore, Varanasi-which bear witness to the collaboration of India and the Czechoslovakian people.

You have been well-known for the development of machines. Your Skoda Works were known to us before our independence.

After our independence when we both became free, our relations have grown closer and more intimate.

Your monuments are beautiful and your ancient University of Prague is well-known. It is a European University, more than a Czechoslovakian University. One of the great Rectors of that University, John Hus, was the starter, initiator so to say, of several schemes of progress in your country. He was condemned no doubt because he condemned religious formalism and emphasised contemplation of religious truth and anti-institutional type of Christianity. His work is evident today in the Vatican Council where they are adopting a more liberal attitude with regard to religious questions.

Having borne the brunt of two wars, you are deeply interested in peace. The kind of agreement which we have signed on the 9th of November about the peaceful uses of atomic energy hears witness to your interest in peace. After all we have to go steeply down or we have to rise up. If we want to make this world safe for human habitation, the greatest adversary of war is communication. If you have communication you have understanding. If communication fails, understanding fails and differences crop up. By working together we will be able to solve many of our problems. If we work separately, our problems will remain there and will cause distress and difficulty.

You are interested not merely in machines and machine production; you hold a film festival once in two years in Czechoslovakia. Many of our people go there and come back with great ideas on what you are doing. My friends from both sides here have informed me a great deal about the studios and other things which you have there. You yourself told me about university development.

There is no doubt that our relations are getting closer and in years to come, they will get much closer and your visit, Mr. President, will strengthen the bonds of friendship which already prevail between our two countries.

May I ask you to drink to the health of the President of Czechoslovakia, Madam Novotna, the distinguished guests and Indo-Czech friendship.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA CZECH REPUBLIC MALI

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Reply by President Novotny

Replying to the toast, His Excellency Mr. Antonin Novotny, President of Czechoslovakia, said:

Mr. President, Mrs. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen, friends:

Permit me to thank you cordially for your friendly words about the Czechoslovak people. I thank you for your words of appreciation for the Czechoslovak history. Yes, it was a rich and cultural history through which the Czechoslovak

people went in the past as they live through a sew rich life at present on their road towards socialism and peace.

It was with pleasure that I accepted your invitation to visit India together with other officials of our country in order to get acquainted with the country of our friends and at the same time to discuss questions of mutual interest.

Today we have paid tribute to the memory of the great personality of India, Mahatma Gandhi. Once again have we realized how many things the histories of our countries have in common. India and Czechoslovakia had to tight for their national independence even though under different conditions. We have in good memory Jawaharlal Nehru's voice, who in the most difficult moments for our people raised in protest against the ignominous Munich dictate which was the beginning of the Fascist occupation of our country and the prelude to World War Two. At the same time when the Czechoslovak people fought for their freedom and independence also the people of India rose in their liberation struggle against the colonial regime.

The results of this struggle influenced also the ensuing development of our countries. For the first time in their history the people of Czechoslovakia could start building their life in harmony with their desires and have attained since that time results which changed the image of Czechoslovakia.

We know that also the people of India are doing their utmost to develop in every possible manner their great country and that they have already achieved considerable results, particularly in the development of the national economy.

We need peace and friendly relations among nations, in order to be able to build a better life for the peoples of our countries. We hold that it is necessary to put immediately an end to aggressive actions anywhere in the world and to refrain from interventions in affairs of foreign countries. Effective measures aimed at general and complete disarmament would contribute to the invigoration of international situation. All that, together with the eradication of

280

vestiges of colonialism, would greatly contribute to the economic and social development of all countries of the world.

In its foreign policy the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic consistently observed the principles of progress and peaceful co-existence, the principle of equality and mutually advantageous relations, solidarity and co-operation with independent developing countries. In this way we build also our relation with your country.

It is with great satisfaction that I may note that the relations between India and Czechoslovakia have been successfully developing to the benefit of our two countries. Along with the successfully continued economic co-operation the Agreement on Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy was signed a short time ago. Likewise relations in cultural, scientific and political spheres have developed.

Our visit has followed the objective to promote mutual relations and existing friendship between our two countries and to contribute to the strengthening of peace in the world. Thank you once again from the bottom of my heart for the friendly reception.

Permit me to raise my glass and to drink to the health of the President of the Republic of India Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, to the health of the Prime Minister Madam Indira Gandhi, to the friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and India, to the 'victory of peace in the world.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA GERMANY **Date :** Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

President Novotny's Speech at his Dinner to President Radhakrishnan

The President of Czechoslovakia, Ms Excellency Mr. Antonin Novotny, made the following speech, proposing a toast to the President', Dr. Radhakrishnan, at a dinner given by him in his honour in New Delhi on November 20, 1966:

Permit me to welcome you cordially on the occasion of this festive evening in the spirit of friendship which is typical of our all-round relations and of the atmosphere prevailing during our visit here and to reiterate that we appreciate the friendship of the people of India to the people of Czechoslovakia as well as the co-operation between our two countries.

The negotiations held here reaffirmed that our two countries were particularly interested in ensuring the life of their peoples in peace. Consequently, as we have noted with satisfaction, India and Czechoslovakia share identical views on a number of important international, issues, The results of our negotiations will be expressed in the joint communique. We agree particularly to one principal point-we recognise the neces-

281

sity of preserving peace throughout the world. The Czechoslovak foreign policy pursues the maintenance and' strengthening of peace as, its main goal. Peaceful co-existence among countries with different social systems, support to all peoples fighting for their independence and freedom, co-operation among all peoples on the basis of equality-those are the main ideas constituting the fundamentals of our foreign policy.

In our opinion another world-wide problem of no less importance is the abstention from the threat and use of force in relations among states. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic especially strives for the application of this principle in the United Nations. We are convinced that the observance of this principle would also contribute to the relaxation of international tension and would create conditions for better co-operation among nations. We are convinced that peoples have the right to choose their own social system without external pressures, whether political or economic. Today the world follows the road of progress and no reactionary force-, can change this development. Esteemed Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that mutual relations between India and Czechoslovakia will continue to develop in the traditional friendly spirit to the benefit of the two countries.

Permit me to propose a toast to the health of the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, to the health of Prime Minister Madame Indira Gandhi, to the happy future of the people of India, to the friendship between our peoples.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Reply by President Radhakrishnan

Replying to the toast proposed by President Novotny, Dr. Radhakrishnan said:

Mr. President, Madame Novotna, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are glad to have another opportunity offered to us to reaffirm our friendship to the President, Government and the people of Czechoslovakia and express gratitude for the help they have rendered us.

The special note of the President's speech was safeguarding of peace. Peace is the harmonising of differences, dissipating of mistrust, misunderstandings and prejudice among the peoples of the world. It is necessary that we should adopt the policy of peaceful co-existence which recognises equality of all and also tells us that we should allow all people to grow according to their own genius and tradition and not hamper their progress by political or economic pressures.

The other thing that the President referred to was the work which Czechoslovakia is doing at the United Nations. We have followed it with great sympathy and much agreement.

There again Czechoslovakia is trying to bring about, if possible, eventual and complete disarmament, and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. After all, this policy is not merely good morals but it is a good policy as well. Men are not fighting animals and war is not a national industry for any nation.

It is therefore essential that we should work with all our heart for the maintenance of peace in this world. If only we realise what the disaster would be if the great forces at the hands of the Great Powers are unleashed, how it would involve the whole world in a holocaust from which it would be difficult for us to recover for a long, long time to come; we would all work for peace.

So, Mr. President, we agree with the sentiments you have expressed and I want you to convey to your Government and the people of Czechoslovakia our best wishes for their progress and prosperity and our bonds of friendship for them.

I now rise to drink to your health, to the health of Madame Novotna and the people and for Indo-Czech friendship and world peace.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA USA **Date :** Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

President Radhakrishnan's Speech at Ceremonial Farewell to President Novotny

The following is the text of President Radhakrishnan's speech at the ceremonial farewell given to H.E. Mr. Antonin Novotny, president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic at the

282

Palam airport on November 24, 1966 at the and of his seven day State visit to India:

My dear President, Madame, distinguished guests and friends:

We are sorry that this trip has conic to an end so soon. We are sorry also for the inclement weather which prevented the Presidential party from visiting Ranchi. They would have seen there how much collaboration there is between Czechoslovakian and Indian people in developing that industrial complex.

There are two things in which we are most interested: first the raising of the standard of living of the common people and working for peace. In the former, we, have the assured co-operation of the Czechoslovak Government and people; as for the latter, we are intensely interested in developing peace.

Scientific, technological and' nuclear development for peaceful uses have brought the world together. Human nature has resilience', time has healing power and social and political institutions have the capacity to adjust themselves to changing conditions. Under all these, the differences which divide the nations may fade away soon. and we may have a world in which we can claim citizenship, partnership and collaboration

The fact that you were not able to visit Ranchi, Gakhra and Nangal is an invitation to you and your party to visit us again. I hope. that you will do so. I wish you luck in your Onward journey.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA **Date :** Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Reply by President Novotny

In his reply, His Excellency Mr. Antonin Novotny, said:

Dear Mr. President, dear Madame, Prime Minister, Friends:

Our stay in India is coming to an end. The impressions from the meetings with the people of India who in all places we have visited expressed their friendship towards the people of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic will live in our memory. I assure you that we esteem such friendship very much.

After one year we had the opportunity to talk with you, Mr. President, to have talks with the Prime Minister Madame Indira Gandhi and other members of the Government. For us these friendly talks were not only important but also very useful. They proved that our positions were either identical or close on fundamental questions concerning the development of mankind. They resulted in an identity of views that it was imperative to strive actively for the maintenance of peace in the world, to seek all roads towards understanding among nations, roads leading towards ensuring progressive development in the world. We have been concerned over the aggravation of international tension which is brought about in the first place by foreign interference in domestic affairs of States and by the use or threat of force directed at putting through political objectives.

We discussed our mutual friendly relations and co-operation which we consider very good and we came to an agreement that it would be useful to further ever more in an all-round manner the Czechoslovak-Indian relations which are beneficial to the peoples of the two countries. Our co-operation reflects sincere efforts of Czechoslovakia and India to contribute to the strengthening of friendship between the peoples of the two countries and thereby to bring into life the principles of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Before departing permit me, Mr. President and Madame Prime Minister, to thank you from the bottom of my heart once again on my behalf and on behalf of my party for the friendly and cordial reception accorded to us in India. During our stay in our big country we saw only a few places. However, we became convinced that the people and Government of India make great

I wish to you, Mr. President and Madame Prime Minister and to all the people of India many further successes in these efforts.

Long live Czechoslovak-Indian friendship!

Good-bye, friends!

Namaste!

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Joint Communique

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on November 24, 1966, at the conclusion of the visit to India of His Excellency Mr. Antonin Novotny, President of the

283 Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, and Madame Novotna:

In response to an invitation from the president of India, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, H.R. Mr. Antonin Novotny. President of the Czechoslovak, Socialist Republic, accompanied by Madame Novotna, paid it State visit to India front 18th to 24th November, 1966.

During their stay in India, President Novotny and party visited New Delhi, Bombay, Agra Chandigarh and Jaipur, and saw economic development projects, industrial establishments, scientific institutions and historic monuments. These visits gave them the opportunity to see the latest developments and achievements of the Indian people. The Czechoslovak President was greatly touched by file warmth and cordiality of the reception accorded to him and his party by the Indian people.

During his stay in India the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, H.R. Mr. Antonin Novotny, had talks with the President of India, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and other leaders in an atmosphere of traditional friendship and mutual understanding. They exchanged views on major international problems and discussed questions pertaining to the further development of bilateral relations between the two countries.

Associated in the talks on the Czechoslovak side were: H. E. Mr. Vaclav David, Minister of Foreign Affairs; H. E. Mr. Frantisek Barbirek, Deputy-Chairman of Slovak National Council; H. E. Trig. Ludvik Ubl., First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade; B. E. Col. General Vladimir Janko, Deputy Minister of Defence; H. E. Mr. Ladislav Novak, Head of the Office of the President, H. E. Mr. Jaroslav Kohout, Ambassador of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in India; and H. E. Dr. Ivan Rohal Ilkiv, Head of Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Associated on the Indian side were : Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs; Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs; Shri C. S. Jha, Foreign Secretary; Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary to Prime Minister; Shri K. B. Lall, Commerce Secretary; Shri J. N. Dhamija, Ambassador of India in Czechoslovakia; and Shrimati Rukmini Menon, Director in the Ministry of External Affairs.

The President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Prime Minister of India noted with great satisfaction the progress achieved in the fast-developing cooperation between the two countries in the economic, cultural, scientific and technical fields. They expressed satisfaction at the rapid growth of Indo-Czechoslovak trade and agreed that there was considerable scope for its further expansion and diversification.

The two sides expressed their gratification at the conclusion of an agreement on scientific cooperation, the establishment this year of a Join Indo-Czechoslovak Inter-Governmental Commission on Trade and Economic Co-operation, and the signing of an Agreement on co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The Prime Minister conveyed the warm thanks and appreciation of the Government and the people of India for the continued assistance extended by Czechoslovakia in establishing important branches of heavy industry in India.

The President and the Prime Minister noted the Success of Indo-Czechoslovak cooperation in important industrial projects such as the Foundry Forge Plant and Heavy Machine Tools Plant at Ranchi, Bihar, the Heavy Power Equipment Plant at Ramachandrapuram, Andhra Pradesh, and the Heavy Pressure Boiler Plant at Tiruchirapalli, Madras.

The President and the Prime Minister also noted the strengthening of cultural, educational and scientific relations. They expressed their keen desire to promote further cooperation between the two countries in the economic, cultural scientific and technical fields.

The President and the Prime Minister reviewed the international situation. There was identity or closeness of views on important issues of mutual interest and of international importance. They expressed their deep concern at the deteriorating world situation in which world peace is endangered. Both sides reiterated their continued adherence to the principle of peaceful co-existence among States with different political and social systems without which there can be no harmonious development of international relations. They expressed their support for the codification by the United Nations at an early date, of the principles of peaceful co-existence and friendly relations between States including the avoidance of the use of force in the settlement of international disputes. They believe that such codification will be a contribution to the relaxation of international tensions and would also be conducive to increased international economic cooperation. They agree that the policy of nonalignment has been playing a vital role in reducing world tensions and non-aligned countries have helped in the maintenance of. world peace.

The President and the Prime Minister emphasised the importance of the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of world peace and security and in the development of international cooperation. They expressed their full and continuing support to the United Nations in the pur-

284

suit of the objectives set out in the Charter. They stressed the need to achieve universality of membership of the United Nations and equitable geographical representation on all organs of the United Nations.

The two sides stressed the need for general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They affirmed their determination to coordinate their efforts in achieving this goal within and outside the world organization. in this context they welcomed the UN resolution on the convening of a World Disarmament Conference with the participation of all the States. They expressed support to the concept of nuclear weapons free zones and agreed on the urgency of an international agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which would exclude the possibility of any direct or indirect proliferation of such weapons in accordance with the principles enunciated in Resolution 2028 (XX) adopted by the UN General Assembly. They also support the conclusion of an agreement. on the prohibition of underground nuclear weapon tests on the same basis as the Moscow Treaty.

They expressed their hope that on the basis of the directive and guide lines furnished by the XXth and XXIst Sessions of the UN General Assembly, the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee would address itself to the task of achieving general and complete disarmament expeditiously and effectively.

During the exchange of views on the present situation in Europe, the President and the Prime Minister welcomed the efforts towards an improvement of relations between European States with different social systems and expressed the hope that these would contribute to the creation of suitable conditions for the solution of the problems of European security. They considered the safeguarding of European security to be in the interest of the preservation of peace not only in Europe but the whole world. The process of further normalisation of relations among all European States would improve the general atmosphere in Europe and would make it possible to solve the yet unsolved European problems, specially the peaceful settlement of the German question. They agreed that any attempt to change the present borders by use of force would have dangerous consequences.

President Novotny welcomed and expressed his strong support for the Tashkent Declaration. While adhering to the Czechoslovak views regarding Kashmir, he affirmed that the Tashkent Declaration in the conclusion of which the Soviet Union had contributed so much and the leaders of India and Pakistan had shown statesmanship. gave a new direction to the relations between India and Pakistan. The President and the Prime Minister agreed that the Declaration provided the basis for a peaceful solution of all outstanding problems between India and Pakistan. President Novotny expressed the hope, that the Declaration will be fully implemented and that all differences between the two countries will be settled amicably.

The President and the Prime Minister discussed the dangerous situation in Vietnam. Theyreiterated their well-known respective views on this question. They agreed that there Should be immediate stoppage of bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and that a peaceful solution should be sought within the framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. They further agreed that the people of Vietnam have the right to decide their own future without any interference from outside.

The two sides condemned Imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism in all their forms and manifestations. Both sides denounced the apartheid policy of the South African Government and the illegal declaration of Independence by the white minority regime in Rhodesia, both of which constitute a danger to world peace and security and violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In this context the President and the Prime Minister called for strict observance of the "UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples" of 1960. They expressed their full support to national liberation movements in all countries under colonial domination and particularly in the Portuguese colonies of Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea.

During the discussions both sides expressed satisfaction at the close contact and co-operation between the delegation of the two countries in various international bodies, particularly the, United Nations, aimed at the solution of urgent international problems.

The two sides expressed the conviction that the visit of the President of the Czechoslovak-Socialist Republic, H.E. Mr. Antonin Novotny to India constitutes an important milestone in the further development of friendly relations and mutual understanding between India and Czechoslovakia.

The President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic expressed the hope that the Prime Minister of India would be able to visit Czechoslovakia in response to the invitation extended to her by the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia. The Prime Minister of India confirmed with pleasure her desire to visit Czechoslovakia as soon as possible.

285

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM RUSSIA MALI UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN VIETNAM SWITZERLAND SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Parliament on Czechoslovak President's Visit

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in Parliament on November 30, 1966, on the visit of President Novotny to India and his talks with the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, and the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi:

As the House is aware, H.E. Mr, Antonin Novotny, President of Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, accompanied by H.E. Mr. Vaclav David, Foreign Minister, paid a State visit to India from 16th to 24th November, 1966. The visit provided an opportunity to renew personal contacts between the leaders of Czechoslovakia and India and strengthen further the friendship between them.

During his stay in India the Czechoslovak President had talks with the President and Prime Minister on a wide range of important international issues, and on subjects of mutual interest, particularly the further development of cultural and economic relations between the two countries. There was also an exchange of views between the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia and me.

The talks between the Czechoslovak President and the Prime Minister revealed identity of views between the two countries on many important issues, and on those on which our views were not identical they were very close. The President and the Prime Minister confirmed their adherence to the principles of peace and peaceful co-existence between States belonging to different political and social systems. As is already known, Czechoslovakia and India have always co-operated in the United Nations in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racialism and neocolonialism and have firm faith in the United Nations and its role in preserving world peace.

There was exchange of views with the President of Czechoslovakia on the problems of disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and on banning of nuclear explosions. Both sides consider that urgent steps should be taken to achieve these objectives.

The Czechoslovak President gave his assessment of the situation in Europe and the Prime Minister gave him a resume of the situation in India, India's happy relations with most of her neighbours and difficulties created on India's borders by the only two countries who have been unwilling to reciprocate India's desire for friendship. The Prime Minister also explained the dangers inherent in Sino-Pak collusion against India. The President of Czechoslovakia expressed his appreciation of India's efforts to implement the Tashkent Declaration in letter and spirit.

On Vietnam both sides were agreed that bombing must stop and a peaceful solution sought within the framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

It was in the, field of bilateral relations that conclusions were reached and decisions taken. The President of Czechoslovakia and our Prime Minister reviewed the successful co-operation between the two countries in various fields and examined the scope for expansion of co-operation in the economic and cultural spheres. Both were convinced that the success so far achieved underlined the great deal that remains to be done and the necessity of giving immediate attention to the increase of collaboration in these fields. On both sides keen desire was expressed for expanding the area of economic and cultural co-operation.

On the educational and cultural side in particular, the Czechoslovak President pointed out the high standards of Czechoslovak universities and the readiness of Czechoslovak institutions of learning to make their facilities available to Indian students or scholars. Dr. F. Kahuda, Deputy Minister of Education and Culture of Czechoslovakia, will visit India in December, 1966, to finalise a Cultural Exchange Programme between India and Czechoslovakia.

On the economic side, it was decided that the Joint Indo-Czechoslovak Committee for Economic, Trade and Technical Co-operation, established by an agreement in April, 1966, should have its first meeting in January 1967, to explore the possibilities of further co-operation between the two countries in the economic field. The Czechoslovak delegation will be led by the Chairman of the Czechoslovak side of the Joint Committee, Mr. Josef Krejci, Deputy Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, and the Indian team will be led by the Chairman of the Indian Committee, Shri Asoka Mehta, Minister of Planning.

It was pointed out by the Czechoslovak President that before a collaboration project is established, it would be advantageous to have Indians trained in Czechoslovakia for such projects. The Prime Minister expressed our appreciation of Czechoslovak assistance to us, particularly in the field of heavy industry and thanked the President for the offer of further collaboration, which we would be happy to avail ourselves of.

We were very happy to have the privilege of welcoming President Novotny, Madame Novotny, the Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Mr. David and Madame David, and other members of the President's party. The talks between the two sides were held in an atmosphere of complete

286

understanding and friendship. The Czechoslovak Government showed appreciation for our standpoint on various important issues. The visit of President Novotny has further cemented the, excellent relations already existing between India and Czechoslovakia and represents a further milestone on the road to Indo-Czechoslovak friendship.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA UZBEKISTAN VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czech Agreement for Cooperation in Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy

An Agreement of co-operation in the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes was concluded between India and Czechoslovakia at New Delhi on November 9, 1966.

H.E. Dr. Frantisek Vlasak, Minister-Chairman, State Commission for Technology and Dr. V. A. Sarabhai, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission and Secretary, Department of Atomic Energy, signed the Agreement on behalf of their respective Governments. This was yet another link in the growing friendship between the two Countries.

Under the terms of the Agreement, co-operation between the Atomic Energy Commissions of the two countries is envisaged or. a broad spectrum in the use of nuclear energy for health, agriculture. industry and power generation. The Agreement also envisages exchange of scholars ships and fellowships, exchange of visits by the scientists of the two countries to acquaint themselves with the latest progress and development made by each country in this field. Both the countries will also cooperate with each other in the application and use of radioactive isotopes in science, medicine and in diverse industrial and technical fields. They will formulate and implement research programmes of mutual interest.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA USA INDIA **Date :** Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the Special Political Committee on Peace-keeping Operations

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, made the following statement in the Special Political Committee on November 25, 1966 regarding the U.N. peace-keeping operations: Mr. Chairman: The delegation of India is grateful for this opportunity to place before the Special Political Committee its views on agenda item 33.

It is not necessary at this late stage of the debate on the item to recapitulate, in any great detail, the history of the item or indeed to refer to the great crisis which the United Nations faced at the 19th regular Session of the General Assembly. It would suffice to say that the crisis which all of us faced at that time served to focus our attention on the long standing dispute over the interpretation of certain provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. While the crisis connected with the interpretation of Article 19 of the Charter could be said to have ended, we still have before us the problem of arrangements for the future.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, it is useful to draw certain lessons from the past. Some of these lessons should have lasting impact and, if taken to heart, lead to fruitful cooperation amongst all the members of the Organisation in the task of maintaining international peace and security. One clear lesson is that resolutions of the General Assembly which are not wholly in accord with the 'provisions of the Charter cannot, even if they are supported by large majorities, serve to strengthen the capacity or the effectiveness of the United Nations. My delegation has stated this view in the past but we take leave to reiterate it lest the same unrealistic approach be adopted once again.

The fruitful lesson we could draw from the crisis we faced two years ago and which has

287

been referred to by many Speakers during' this debate, is that, in matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, the role of the Security Council must not be minirinsed. It is now a truism to speak of the complementary role of the Security Council and the General Assembly. It is recognised that while the Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the General Assembly is not barren in this respect. It is even accepted that enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter is within the exclusive competence of the Security Council. The remaining point of difference is whether any armed forces at all can be despatched by the General Assembly. While some delegations believe that the General Assembly has no such right, there are others who still maintain their conviction that the General Assembly has residuary powers to maintain international peace and security by mounting peace-keeping operations. There is yet another view that the General Assembly could, in limited cases, keep the peace by despatching armed forces on behalf of the United Nations with the consent of or an invitation from the parties concerned. On this aspect of the question, the view of my delegation was clearly stated at the fourth meeting of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping operations on April 27, 1965. We said at that time and I quote: "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 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 despatch of armed personnel other than for the mere purpose of observation 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 power-, may agree, save in exceptional circumstances or for special reasons, not to vote against a proposal involving the despatch 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." Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I would draw the attention of my colleagues to the statement made by the distinguished representative of France, Ambassador Seydoux in this Committee on the 22nd of this month. I am happy to note that the delegations of France and India hold similar. although not identical, views on this particular aspect of peace-keeping.

Mr. Chairman, if there has been some progress in regard to defining the authority which is competent to initiate and authorize peace-keeping operations, that progress must necessarily reflect itself in regard to the question of financing of future peace-keeping operations. For, as my delegation has stated before, it is obvious that the method of financing in the future will have to be related to the decision as to which authority is competent to authorise peacekeeping operations, This is not to say, however, that an organ of the United Nations which does not comprise the entire membership should be in a position to impose burdens on the totality of the membership without its expressed consent. The delegation of India continues to believe that the Security Council, even though it has the authority to initiate peace-keeping operations, cannot tax the entire membership of the General Assembly on its own. According to the Charter, it is possible for the Security Council to make arrangements for conducting a peace-keeping operation, including such financing as may be necessary, through Article 43. If, however, special arrangements under Article 43 are not possible, the Security Council has four courses open to it in regard to the financing of a peace-keeping operation ---

- (a) It could decide that the parties to a dispute should themselves finance the operation;(b) It could decide that the operation would be financed by voluntary contributions;
- (c) It could decide that the operation would be financed by apportioning the cost among all or some members of the Council itself. Indeed, the Charter underlines the principle of unanimity of the Permanent Members of the Security Council. The realities of the financial implications of any action decided upon by the Security Council are entirely parallel to this constitutional fact enshrined in the Charter. For, after all, the total percentage of contributions---even at the regular rate of scales--of the five permanent members does add upto 64.38 per cent; and
- (d) It could request the General Assembly to find ways and means to finance the operation.

The essential point is that the Security Council does not have, in the view of my delegation, the authority to tax the entire membership of the Organisation without their concurrence and such concurrence can be obtained only through the General Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, if the above views in regard to the initiation or authorisation and financing of peace-keeping operations are accepted, it would no longer seem to be urgently necessary to adopt a special scale of assessment or even to formu-

288

late guidelines in that behalf. Indeed, in the past, the General Assembly has found ad hoc ways and means to spread the financial burden more or less equitably on the membership of the Organisation. The delegation of India recognizes that a certain amount of vagueness still persists in this regard. We would welcome any initiative which tends to remove uncertainties and formally indicates the financial burden of each member of the United Nations in respect of future peacekeeping operations. However, it would not do for the General Assembly to formulate a special scale of assessment or even to indicate guidelines without, at the same time, formally recognising the precise and exact role of the Security Council in respect of initiation, authorisation, control, conduct and financing of future peace-keeping operations.

Another aspect of financing future peace-keeping operations also deserves some consideration. It is sometimes sought to work out formulae which give one or more permanent members of the Security Council the right to opt out from the obligation to finance such operations. My delegation is firmly of the view that formulae of this kind are inappropriate for adoption by the General Assembly. We should like to emphasise that for any given operation, the funds should beobtained either through voluntary contributions or through an assessment which should be compulsory in nature. It should be impractical to combine the two methods for any particular operation by giving option to only a few members not to make any payment and expecting, at the same time, that the rest must all pay.

It is appropriate at this point to mention that the Special Committee of Thirty-three has already identified the various areas and facets of the problem- If it could not complete this work between the XIX Session and the present session, it is because of political, and indeed historical factors, which came in the way. The task of the Committee is well-defined and the work already accomplished by the Committee is before us. We would commend to that Committee the considerations that have already been clarified, so far in this debate, in this context, and urge it to continue its work and carry it on to completion. Mr. Chairman, any mention by us here, of the work of the Special Committee of Thirty-three cannot be considered complete unless we have put on record the appreciation of my delegation for the stewardship provided, in that Committee, by its distinguished and sagacious Chairman, my friend Ambassador Cuevas Cancine of Mexico.

INDIA USA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MEXICO

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in the Political Committee on General and Complete Disarmament

Shri V. C. Trivedi, India's Ambassador in Switzerland and Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the First (Political) Committee on November 23, 1966 on the question of general and complete disarmament:

The General Assembly at its last session gave special urgency to two problems of disarmament: the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the cessation of nuclear weapon tests in all environments. In fact, the United Nations, and the international community as a whole, has now been demanding the discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests for many years.

India has believed right from the inception of these weapons of mass destruction that the cessation of nuclear weapon tests is the, first step in the path of nuclear sanity. Such cessation of tests is also imperative to safeguard the health of humanity. India was therefore the first country to appeal to the international community that an end be put to all nuclear weapon tests. As numerous representatives have pointed out, over twelve years ago India proposed to the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee that there should be a stoppage of test explosions pending progress towards some solution, full or partial, in respect of prohibition and elimination of these weapons of mass destruction. Unfortunately, those early appeals were unheeded. Nevertheless, India continued to raise the issue in the United Nations year after year, and although it was not successful initially, the General Assembly finally adopted the historic resolution 1762 (XVII), which condemned all nuclear weapon tests. That resolution marks a significant landmark in the field of nuclear test-ban, as does resolution 2028 (XX) in the field of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear test ban is also one field in which the international community achieved some progress. The partial Test Ban Treaty of August 1963, banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, was hailed by all peace-loving peoples of the world, offering, as it did, freedom from increasing contamination from the death-dealing radioactive fall-out of atmospheric weapon tests, respite from the feverish race of bigger and deadlier weapons of mass destruction

289

and, above all, hope that the nuclear weapon Powers will live up to the objective explicitly accepted by them in the preamble to the Treaty, namely :

"Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations, which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end ...". [ENDC/100.Rev.1]

The peoples of the world placed their faith in this proclamation and over a hundred nations subscribed to the Treaty. India was the first, the very first country, to sign the Treaty in Moscow after the original parties.

Subsequent developments have, however, belied these hopes. The partial Test Ban Treaty continues to remain partial in more ways than one. In fact, it is doubly partial. It has not been adhered to universally and two non-signatories continue, to test nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. This aspect of the Treaty's partiality has the most serious consequences, not only in respect of the deleterious effects of the radioactive fallout resulting from the tests, not only in respect of what the preamble to the Treaty called the incentive to an armaments race, but also because it places the Treaty itself in jeopardy.

The partial Test Ban Treaty is partial in another respect as well. It continues to be partial in its prohibited environments and the nuclear weapon Powers continue to conduct underground nuclear weapon tests. The objective solemnly proclaimed in the preamble to the Treaty over three years ago seems to be all but forgotten.

If this is the fate of a declaration of intent in a treaty, one wonders what will be the fate of another declaration of intent to reverse the nuclear arms race which is being talked about on all sides in the context of a non-proliferation treaty. And it is useful to emphasize that cessation of testing underground is a much more clearly defined undertaking compared to a so-called declaration of intent to halt and reserve the nuclear arms race. A comprehensive test ban is indeed the touchstone of the determination of the nuclear weapon Powers to implement declaration of intent.

India has consistently maintained that a universal and total test ban is urgent and imperative for a variety of reasons. Radioactive fall-out creates the most incalculable harm to civilization, to men, women and children living as well as yet unborn, and to all human environment-fields and crops, animals on the land and fishes in the sea. As the latest report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation points out, "nuclear tests are the main source of present world-wide radioactive contamination of the environment". (A/6314). Continued atmospheric testing also weakens the Moscow Test Ban Treaty irretrievably. In the words of the preamble to that Treaty, such testing provides "the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons" (ENDC/100/Rev. 1)

Underground nuclear weapon tests, continuing as they do three years after the partial Test Ban Treaty, lead to the same dangers. Their only justification, if one can use that word, is to sustain and promote the nuclear arms race. Whether they are meant to maintain the quality of warheads, or to perfect the use of tactical nuclear weapons, or to develop the vicious circle of offensive-defensive weaponry, these tests only serve the cause of war and the purposes of war. As the eight non-aligned delegations stated in their memorandum to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament on 17 August 1966,

"They have been deeply impressed by the dangers of the continued testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere and by the risks inherent in the continued nuclear weapon testing underground, with the resulting development and sophistication of nuclear weapons, They view with the greatest apprehension that such a development imparts a renewed impetus to the arms race, bringing about unforeseeable consequences in regard to imblance and mistrust in the relationship between States and causing immense and increasing diversion of human and material resources for purposes of war". (ENDC/177, pages 1-2)

The first essential requisite, therefore, is in the words of the memorandum, that "the partial Test Ban Treaty will be adhered to and complied with universally". Without an immediate implementation of this requirement, the prospects for progress are indeed bleak.

The second requirement is a suspension of underground nuclear weapon tests. India has consistently maintained over the years that while negotiations are proceeding for formal treaties, there should at least be a standstill agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests. It was on the basis of this approach that the Indian delegation advanced, as well as supported, suggestions for a formal treaty prohibiting underground nuclear weapon tests above an agreed seismic magnitude, this threshold being owered

290

subsequently in the light of progress in detection and identification techniques. At the same time, there should be a suspension of all testing of nuclear weapons. As the memorandum of the eight non-aligned delegations concludes,

"Pending the conclusion of such a treaty, they reaffirm their strong demand that States responsible for nuclear weapon tests take immediate steps for their discontinuance." (Ibid. p. 3)

A total test ban is, in addition, an effective non-proliferation measure, at least in so far as the non-nuclear weapon countries are concerned. As far as the nuclear weapon Powers are concerned, they have indulged in enough testing already and it is in the interest of international peace and stability that they stop further testing. The next logical step, the Government of India emphasized in its memorandum of July 1956 to the Disarmament Commission, is the prohibition of the further use of fissionable material for military purposes. These two measures represent the functional and the really effective approach to achieve the objective of putting a halt to the nuclear arms race, including the proliferation of these arms.

The Indian delegation is aware that the continuing controversy, principally between the two super nuclear weapon Powers, on the need or otherwise of on-site verification for the identification of underground nuclear weapon tests as distinct from natural seismic events,- has so far held up the conclusion of a treaty banning underground nuclear weapon tests. The Indian delegation believes that negotiations on this matter could proceed more constructively if there were in existence a suspension of all nuclear weapon tests' Apart from giving additional filip to the commendable work already being done in the field of improvement of detection and identification techniques, the atmosphere created by such suspension will undoubtedly provide greater incentive to all concerned for the acceptance of constructive suggestions, like the Swedish ideas of verification by challenge or enquiry and of

co-operation among the national seismic establishments over the world.

On the item on the question of general and complete disarmament, the Committee has just finished consideration of the commendable suggestion made by the Secretary-General for a study of the impact and implications of all aspects of nuclear weapons, including their manufacture, acquisition, deployment, development and possible use. The Indian delegation had the privilege of co-sponsoring the draft resolution designed to implement this suggestion of the Secretary-General, which was unanimously adopted by the Committee,

It may be pertinent to observe in this connection that the late Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, initiated a similar project in 1955 and, as a result, the Government of India published a study entitled "Nuclear Explosions and their Effects". This publication was revised in 1958 and translated into other languages. Before I end, I should like to read an extract from the foreword written by Jawaharlal Nehru to this book. Referring to the hydrogen bomb, he said :

"Enough is known to give us some kind of a picture of a war in which these weapons are used. War is associated with death. We have now to face death on a colossal scale and, what is much worse, the genetic effects of these explosions on the present and future generations. Before this prospect, the other problems that face us in this world become relatively unimportant. But even without wars, we have what are called nuclear test explosions which, in some measure, spread this evil thing over all parts of the world. These explosions continue in spite of the dangers inherent in them".

Later, referring to the suspension of tests announced by the nuclear weapon Powers at that time, he said

"Let us hope that this will not be a mere suspension, but a final end to something which threatens the future of humanity."

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA RUSSIA

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in Political Committee on Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Shri V. C. Trivedi, India's Ambassador in Switzerland and Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Political Committee on November 7, 1966 on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons:

The Indian delegation made a statement at the 1436th meeting of the Committee and dealt with the principles which are basic to an adequate and acceptable treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is the fervent hope of the Indian delegation that the terms of the treaty

291

should be, such as to reflect the requirements laid down in General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) so that the treaty is acceptable to all concerned and satifactory to the international community.

The most heartening development in this context has been the overwhelming support that the members of this Committee have reaffirmed for resolution 2028 (XX) and for the principles laid down in it. It is obvious, therefore, that any proposition which dilutes at least the basic philosophy of resolution 2028 (XX) cannot be acceptable to the vast majority of the membership of the Committee. There may be some differences when details are being worked out, but there can be no difference whatever on the basic approach of the general problem of prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

This basic approach was clearly spelled out in the joint memorandum submitted by the eight non-aligned delegations to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in September 1965. Relevant extracts of the memorandum have been quoted in this Committee many times, but they bear repeated quotation. The memorandum said:

"... the delegations of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden, and the United Arab Republic believe that it would be of advantage if they place on record their basic approach to the, question of non-proliferation. A treaty on non-proliferation is not an end in itself but only a means to an end. That end is the achievement of general and complete disarmament, and, more particularly, nuclear disarmament The eight delegations are convinced that measures to prohibit the spread of nuclear weapons should, therefore, be coupled with or followed by tangible steps to half the nuclear arms race and to limit, reduce and eliminate the stocks of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery." (ENDC/ 158)

That memorandum was submitted before the twentieth session of the General Assembly. The Committee and the Assembly accepted this basic approach which, as we know, formed principle (c) of the five principles of resolution 2028 (XX). Principle (c) reads

"(c) The treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament, and more particularly, nuclear disarmament;".

This is an extremely important principle and a fundamental principle. In fact, a large part of the joint memorandum submitted by the eight non-aligned delegations to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament this year, on 19 August, is devoted to an analysis of this particular principle.

What the Indian delegation wishes to emphasize is that no proposal can be acceptable which detracts from this basic approach adopted by the United Nations on the question of prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is not merely a question of reaffirming resolution 2028 (XX) and its principles, although that is vital; it is really a question of maintaining our allegiance to this fundamental approach of the resolution. A limited and one-sided approach which seeks to refer only to tire question of what is called "further" spread or "further" proliferation of nuclear weapons or emergence of "additional" nuclear weapon Powers militates against this basic approach and completely relegates into the back-ground the essential feature of a treaty on non-proliferation being only a means to an end. Once we proceed from an inadequate or incomplete concept, we find that we adopt wrong methods and reach unsatisfactory conclusions.

The Indian delegation would, therefore, urge that we should never abandon the basic approach which we have all adopted on the problem of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This approach does not derive its acceptability only because. it has been adopted by the United Nations; it does not derive its strength only because the international community has arrived at it through years of progressive precision; it does not derive its validity only because it represents a way towards the common objective of all humanity, namely, general and complete disarmament. These are undoubtedly important factors. The real validity, the real strength and the real acceptability of the five principles set out in resolution 2028 (XX) are also derived from the fact that they represent the correct analysis of the problem and its effective solution.

The Indian delegation dealt with this matter in some detail in its last intervention in the Committee. In particular, it devoted special at tention to an analysis of principle (b) in paragraph 2 of resolution 2028 (XX) dealing with mutual and balanced obligations and responsibilities. Further, it stated that it was necessary to deal with the problem of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons comprehensively and correctly, and that if one wished to deal with the consequence, the only effective method was to deal with the cause, An unscientific or ineffective remedy does, in fact, more harm than good.

An important fact in our analysis in history. As we know, certain powerful countries belonging to military alliances went in for proliferation of nuclear weapons in the past, and if we wish to prevent such proliferation effectively we must 292 analyses what led those countries to embark on their proliferation. The countries where proliferation of nuclearweapons took place in the past have generally given two reasons for their action. One is that they wanted then voice to carry weight an dthey wanted political power. In other words, there was the consideration of prestige. Second-ly, the y felt that they could best safeguard theirsecurity by possessing an independent nuclearforce. In o ther words, there was the consideration of security or national de-fence. It is these two co nsiderations.therefore that we must bear in mind, and eliminate, in our efforts to prevent the proli-fe ration of nuclear weapons. The question of prestige is important, and very often many of us, m ostly unconsciously.invest the nuclear weapon Powers with specialprestige. The United Nations has condem nednuclear weapons and called their use a crimeagainst humanity, and yet marry Governments'continue to act in the context of what they callrealities, talk in terms of acceptance of faits accomplis and prop agate the ideas of five-Powerconfabulations to solve the problems of theworld. No wonder, therefore, t hat the worldsociety in general comes to believe that the pos-session of nuclear weapons gives prestige andpower, authority and influence. In our strategy for preventing the prolifera-tion of nuclear wea pons, it is esesntial to makeconscious and determined efforts to ensure thatno such distinction is made and no opportunity is given to the nuclear weapon Powers to exer-cise the prerogatives of their prestige. TheIndian delegation feels, therefore, that as far asissue-, of disarmament are concerned we mustavo id gatherings, limited either to non-nuclear-weapon Powers or to nuclear-weapon Powers.Issues of disar mament are of common and con-current concern to all countries, whet-her they are big or small, whether they are nuclear or non-nuclear. It isentirely unprofitable to discuss them without theparticipati on either of the nuclearweapon Powersor the non-nuclear-weapon Powers. This isparticularly true of a p roblem like the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, which is of common and concurrent concern to t he nuclearand the nonnuclear Powers, alike. It is in the light of this supreme principle that the no n-align-ed countries proposed in Belgrade in 1961 and in Cairo in 1964 the convening of a world dis-a rmament conference: and the United Nations hasendorsed that proposal. That is the only correct pproach : a limited approach is unfruitful anddangerous. On this question of prestige, therefore, we haveto

make 'conscious and determined efforts to

ensure that, as far as possible, there is a progresssive denial of prestige to the possession of nuclear weapons. The Indian delegation believes. that this is one field where it is nobler as well as safer to lose prestige rather than acquire prestige. The real answer to the problem can be furnished only when the existing nuclear-weapon Powers begin a programme of reduction of their stockpiles and the means of their delivery. Herein lies the validity of principle (c) of resolution 2028, (XX), As the eight non-aligned delegations suggested in their memorandum of 19 August 1966, different measures of disarmament should be embodied in a treaty of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as part of its provisions or as a declaration of intention.

The second consideration, that of security or national defence, which was advanced by the countries which went in for proliferation of nuclear weapons is also amenable to a similar answer. To be sure, all nations wish to safeguard their freedom and their independence. At the same time, history has shown that purely military means have not been adequate instruments of achievement of national or international security. This is particularly valid in respect of nuclear weapons. Military alliances and guarantees or protection or security umbrellas provided in these alliances have furnished no real or lasting security and have not prevented proliferation of nuclear weapons, as can be seen from the fact that it is only the members of military alliances which have gone in for such proliferation. What is more, nuclear weapon Powers still continue to proliferate. The so-called balance of terror seems to produce only terror but no balance, and provides proliferation but no Table security.

The Indian delegation is convinced that nuclear weapons do not provide security. In common with the rest of the non-aligned countries of the world. India also believes that security is not provided by military alliances as well. In fact, as the Cairo declaration pointed out :

"...the existence of military blocks, great Power alliances and pacts arising therefrom has accentuated the cold war and heightened international tensions." (A/5763, p. 25) The problem of security is not one of seeking protection from nuclear weapon Powers or one that can be debated in a large Gathering of nations composed of countries belonging to alliances and countries which are non-aligned or one of concluding security arrangements with big Powers and nuclear weapon Powers.

The Indian delegation believes that the question of national security must be viewed in the context of international security. Real security lies, therefore, in meaningful steps towards disarmament. The emphasis placed in principle (c)

293

of resolution 2028 (XX) merits special significance in this context. As I said earlier this can be achieved only in a global concept.

It was for this reason, that is, for a correct analysis of the real cause of the problem of proliferation, that the eight non-aligned delegations devoted the major part of their memorandum of 19 August of this year to principle (c) of resolution 2028 (XX), which stressed that the treaty should be an integral part of the process of disarmament.

I should now like to take this opportunity to add a few comments to what I said in my statement at the 1436th meeting of the Committee regarding the benefits of science and technology, particularly for the developing nations

At the outset, it should be emphasized categorically that the principle that the benefits of science and technology should not be denied to the developing nations has nothing to do with a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

As far as nuclear weapons are concerned, the non-nuclear weapon Powers are irrevocably against their proliferation. The question of proliferation of nuclear weapons does not, however, bear any practical relationship to the possible future use of the fusion technique for undertaking explosions for building canals' or dams or harbours. As I said earlier, these controlled fusion techniques are still in an experimental stage even for the super-weapon Powers. For the developing countries, even the early experimental stage is far away. For them it is only a question of principle and not of practice.

The question of manufacture of nuclear weapons by new countries is that of manufacture of these weapons by the fission process and not by the fusion process. In fact, two of the existing nuclear weapon Powers are at present producing these weapons principally by the normal fission technique. Even when we are talking of the dangers of horizontal proliferation, or further proliferation, therefore, we are talking of the dangers of manufacture of nuclear weapons and not of thermonuclear weapons. Many countries have had the capability of manufacturing these weapons for many years and they have-as India certainly has--deliberately and as a matter of policy, declared their determination not to manufacture nuclear weapons. These countries do not need to wait for decades till the super-Powers perfect their experiments on controlled fusion in some distant future in order to embark on their nuclear weapon programmes. They can do so today if they want to. They could have done so years ago. Let us not, therefore, confuse the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons with that of the future and distant development of controlled fusion techniques.

As I said earlier, however, it is the question of principle that is important In the context of the application of science and technology. Is it desirable, or, as, President Truman put it, morally fensible, to deny the benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy to other nations, particularly to the developing nations

I appreciate that there art two aspects to this problem. The first aspect is that of a country developing its own technique of controlled fusion for peaceful purposes. Is it seriously suggested that a country should be prohibited from developing its own technology, through its own endeavours, so as to achieve cconomic development ? I submit that no developing country can accept a proposition of that kind.

It is recognized, of course, that such explosions must be adequately safeguarded on the principle that atomic energy must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. The States of Latin America have given careful and exhaustive consideration to this problem and have suggested a system which will ensure that there is no abuse of such peaceful undertakings. I would invite the attention of the Committee to article 13 of the Final Act of the Third Session of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America held in Mexico City in April-May this year (A/6328, dated 12 May 1966).

India is in agreement with this approach and believes that States conducting such an explosion should announce it beforehand, make known the precise purpose and permit international observation and inspection of the explosion.

The second aspect of what I call the freedom of technology is that of dissemination. In this context, the Indian delegation would like to emphasize that it supports the objectives and the hopes of the three United Nations International Conferences on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. The only effective and abiding answer to the energy problems of the world, particularly of the developing nations, can be provided by atomic energy. The presently known reserves of coal and oil in the world are insufficient to enable the developing countries of the world to attain or maintain for long a standard of living comparable to that of the industrialized nations. It is for this purpose that we are looking forward to the day when a method is found for liberating fusion energy in a controlled manner. A technological development of that kind will give energy to the entire world in a cheap and plentiful manner. To save an illustration, the complete combustion of a pound of carbon yields some 14,650 British thermal units of energy, while the complete fission of a pound of uranium yields 3.3 thousand million units, which is equivalent to 2.5 to 3 million tons of coal. But this fission process of today in itself will become the primitive period

294

of the atomic age when fusion energy is liberated in a controlled manner. Then fuel will be as plentiful as the heavy hydrogen in the oceans.

That is what the developing countries are interested in even though it is only a matter of principle today. They have illustrated, by their policies and actions, that they are not interested in nuclear weapons, even though they have the technology. Their man concern is the economic advancement of their teeming millions.

We have two draft resolutions before us. The

draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.371 has been co-sponsored by a large number of nonaligned delegations, including the Indian delegation. The other draft resolution is in-document A/C.1/L.372, submitted by the delegation of Pakistan. In this statement and in its earlier statement, the Indian delegation has spoken of the broad and specific principles which are relevant in the consideration of the problem of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Indian delegation, however, reserves the right to speak, if necessary, on the draft resolutions at an appropriate time.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA BRAZIL BURMA MEXICO NIGER NIGERIA SWEDEN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA RUSSIA PAKISTAN

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri N. C. Trivedi's Statement on Elimination of Foreign Military Bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America

Shri V. C. Trivedi, India's Ambassador in Switzerland and Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Political Committee on November 29, 1966, on the question of elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America :

he United Nations has expressed its concern on the question of foreign military bases and troops right from its inception, and the very first session of the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the withdrawal of foreign armed troops. Since then, this matter has continued to represent an important element in all consideration of issues of disarmament and arms control, of measures of collateral significance and of reduction of tension. The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has devoted considerable attention to this matter, and many delegations have emphasized not only the dangers of the continuance of the existing state of affairs but also the benefits to individual nations and to the international community as a-whole of the speedy amelioration of the situation. The Indian delegation, therefore, supports the initiative taken once again by the Soviet delegation in bringing up this issue before the United Nations.

India has consistently voiced its opposition to foreign military bases wherever they are established and believes that the existence of foreign military bases hinders the free and unfettered development of nations, creates international tension by sustaining the paraphernalia of the cold war and, if established in a colonial territory, serves as an instrument for thwarting the aspirations of the people for freedom and independence.

he Indian delegation thus views the problem of foreign military bases and troops on the basis of considerations of colonial freedom, non-alignment and international peace and security. India is convinced that the real way to achieve international security is through disarmament. Maintenance or establishment of foreign militray bases and the stationing of foreign troops, on the other hand, serve the interests of the arms build-up and are contrary to the purposes of disarmament. The dismantling of these bases and the decision not to establish any new bases as well as the withdrawal of foreign troops will thus demonstrably represent an important step in the process of arms limitation that the international community wishes to initiate in a, determined programme of total and comprehensive disarmament under effective international control.

The abolition of foreign military bases is also a measure of considerable value in our endeavours for reduction of international tension and building of mutual confidence. Foreign military bases are a patent illustration of international fear and distrust. Their removal is equally a step towards the reduction this fear and distrust.

The second consideration on the basis of which the Indian delegation views this problem is that of non-alignment. As a non-aligned nation, India believes that military blocs, great-Power alliances and pacts arising therefrom have accentuated the cold war and heightened international tension. In the language of the Cairo Declaration, therefore, India is opposed to taking part in such pacts and alliances.

Foreign military bases are a consequence of these pacts and alliances. The Belgrade and the Cairo Conferences, accordingly, declared themselves against---and I quote the Cairo Declaration

"....the maintenance or future establishment of foreign military bases and the stationing

295

of foreign troops on the territories of other countries, against the expressed will of those countries..." NAC-II/HEADS/5, page 25)

Foreign military bases, which are the outcome of alliances and pacts arising therefrom, create their own political and economic compulsions and often tend to dictate international relations. As the Belgrade Conference of the non-aligned nations pointed out, the military blocs are growing into more and more powerful military, economic and political groupings which, by the logic and the nature of their mutual relations, necessarily provoke periodic aggravations of international relations. An effective way to reverse this unwholesome, trend is to start with the dismantling of foreign military bases and with drawal of foreign troops.

The third consideration which is pertinent in this context is the position of the colonial territories. Military bases in colonial territories represent the most objectionable features of this undesirable development. They have been established without the consent of the people; they serve, purely warlike ends and, above all, they are instrumental in thwarting the freedom struggle of the colonial people in question. The United Nations has, accordingly, demanded in resolution 2105 (XX) the dismantling of the military bases installed in colonial territories.

The Indian delegation believes that the arguments of security advanced in defence of military bases do not take into account either, the armed pressure that these bases exert on the colonial peoples struggling to be free or the real requirements of genuine security based on arms control and limitation or the benefits of the reduction and tension and building of mutual confidence which are the inevitable outcome of the abandonment of foreign military bases.

The problem of removal of foreign military bases is that of an important aspect of disarmament, apart of course from that of bases installed in colonial territories, where it is also an issue of great political importance affecting, as it does. the fate of people struggling to be free from colonial bondage. Viewed as a problem of disarmament and of international peace and security, it can obviously have only one solution, namely, the withdrawal of foreign bases and troops as outlined in the declarations made by the Heads of State or Government, both in Belgrade in 1961 and in Cairo in 1964. That is the solution which leads to freedom and international peace.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri P. N. Haksar's Statement on Prohibition of Threat or Use of Force in International Relations

Shri P. N. Haksar, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on November 16, 1966 on strict observance of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations and of the right of peoples to self-determination :

My delegation has the honour to be one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.493. We in our delegation, consider this co-sponsorship as both normal and natural. Anyone who has cared to examine the course of evolution of the basic ideas, beliefs and principles underlying our country's conduct of its international relations would come to the conclusion

that the draft resolution reflects, in a variety of ways, our country's basic principles and purposes. Consequently, our support for the draft resolution stems from some of the basic principles of our policies, and should not be construed as being the result of any fortuitous circumstances.

It will not be out of place to spell out briefly some of the basic elements in the efforts which India has been making for the last nineteen years to fashion its destiny and to evolve a policy which would help in the shaping of its destiny. There are three terribly simple, but terribly basic, urges which move the millions upon millions of my countrymen. The first urge obviously is to safeguard the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country; many of the finest sons and daughters of out land devoted their lives--generation after generation-to the achievement of this objective. The second overwhelming preoccupation of our people is, to put it very simply, to grow two blades of grass where only one grew before. And, finally, we seek to fashion, out of the vast and varied religious, cultural and ethnic diversity of our people, a modern nation State, responding to the urges of present-day world of science, technology and rational development of human society.

Such being our predilections, we naturally view the problem of the world in the light of these predilections, or aspirations.

Further, we observe that in one other most important respect there is a qualitative change in our world today. Up to to first half of this century, it was legitimate for politicians and strategists to think of war as a legitimate instru-

296

ment which sovereign States employed for pursuing the aims of their politics. although the human mind never quite succeeds in accurately reflecting the changes which time and tide bring, the great leaders who shaped the destiny of our nation foresaw that in the context of the present-day realities it was no longer permissible to talk of war as providing a legitimate means of promoting any one's objectives.

Out of these considerations, both domestic and international, the policy which has come to be known as non-alignment was born. It may be of some interest to recall that when Jawaharlal Nehru had occasion to address this august Assembly during the fifteenth session, way back on 3 October 1960. at its 882nd plenary meeting, he had this to say:

"The main purpose of the United Nations is to build up a world without war, a world based on the co-operation of nations and peoples. It is not merely a world where war is kept in check for a balancing of armed forces. It is much deeper than that. It is a world from which the major causes of war have been removed and social structures built up which further peaceful co-operation within a nation as well as between nations." (882nd meeting, para. 117)

I find it rather difficult, through the debased coinage of words, to express the strength of conviction underlying the statement that I have just quoted.

The Indian delegation thus approaches the main elements set out in draft resolution A/L.493 in the spirit of, and in consonance with, the objectives which my country has sought to pursue during the nineteen years of its existence, as a sovereign independent State. The object is not merely to pass one more resolution, but to seek to set afoot processes which would take our minds away from the vestigial remnants of the, bygone age: of power politics and to divert our attention to the problems of the present-day world, problems which are agitating the minds- and hearts of literally millions upon millions of human beings inhabiting the, continents of Asia and Africa, and, indeed, the other parts of the world.

I hope I have succeeded in my attempt briefly "to indicate the logical nexus connecting the draft resolution with India's hopes and aspirations, as indeed, the hopes and aspirations of a very large segment of the human race which is today dispossessed and struggling to gain its freedom in the most difficult circumstances. The principle that States shall refrain from the threat or use of force in their international relations is one. which is implicit in all social and legal systems. The renunciation of the use of force, or the threat thereof, is also one of the cardinal principles of great many religions, and in particular, of Bud dhism, which had its origin in my country. In contmporary times, Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter has given the expression to the essence of this principle. It is our understanding, however, that the term "force covers not only armed or military action but also other forms of coercion of an economic or political character. The Programme for Peace and International Co-operation adopted by the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Countries field at Cairo in October 1964 states in this connexion :

"As the use of force may take a number of forms, military political and economic, the participating countries deem it essential to reaffirm the principles that all States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the Charter of the United Nations." (A/ 5763. Part VI)

The delegation of India is convinced that it is not feasible, realistic or accurate to restrict the definition of the term "force" to armed force alone, and would accordingly urge that the view expressed at the, Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Cairo, which we believe has the support of several other delegations from Asia, Africa and Latin America, should receive due, attention and consideration in this Assembly of ours. Equally, my delegation considers that the right of colonial peoples to use force as a means of achieving their independence, if they are compelled to do so by necessity, is also one that cannot in all conscience be, denied. My delegation has on several previous occasions, in the United Nations and elsewhere, expressed its views on this point, and we will not take up the time of the Assembly by covering well-known ground.

it was stated in the Programme for Peace and International Co-operation adopted by the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in 1964 that :

"The process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible. Colonized peoples may legitimately resort to arms and secure the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence, if the colonial powers insist in opposing their natural aspirations (Ibid. . Part I). By the same token, we would also wish to emphasize our view that force should not be used to violate the frontiers of States, and that no situation resulting from such use of force should be recognized by other States. The Indian delegation adheres to the position that the aggressor should not be permitted in any way to benefit by his act of aggression and transgression. The

297

rule of the sanctity of frontiers is a basic rule, recogaized, among others, by the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Cairo in 1964, by the second summit Conference of the Organization of African Unity and in inter-American jurisprudence-I may mention. connexion Articles 5 and 17 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. In this connexion, we would like to emphasize that frontier disputes and territorial questions should in particular be settled by peaceful means alone for the alternative would be vast chaos.

The principle of equal right, and self-determination is one which is perhaps the most important for us in Asia and Africa. In the twentyone years that have elapsed since the establishment of this Organization, we have witnessed is the result of the application of this principle. the emergence into independence of several countries in our region. One might almost add that this principle in the present-day world has a special significance for the continents of Asia and Africa, for it is the peoples of these continents who have had recent occasion to benefit from the application of this vital principle-in most cases after a long, protracted, agonizing and bitter struggle. But I regret to add that today, in some cases, the right guaranteed by this principle, a right which should by now have been established beyond assail, beyond dispute, beyond cavil and questioning, is still being wilfully denied by the colonial Powers.

In this twentieth century, we are witnessing the tragic, but heroic, efforts of the Zimbabwe people, the peoples of South Africa and South West Africa, the peoples of Angola and Mozambique, to mention the most obvious examples, to liberate themselves from a foreign and despotic yoke. Whether it be the presence of a minority racist settler regime, as in the cases of Zimbabwe and South Africa, or whether it be the case of classical colonial rule, in the sense in which the people, of Angola and Mozambique are being deprived of their fundamental and inherent human rights, one cannot in all conscience but condemn these flagrant violations of the dictates of humanity, of morality and of the very soul of the United Nations, and, to put it at its lowest, of the very practical modalities of day-to-day life in an international community.

It is not necessary for me to recall each and every stage of the battle which-we all of us here --waged in this very hall to obtain recognition of this fundamental right to self-determination, now enshrined in General Assemly resolution 1514 (XV). The delegation of India has vivid recollections of the incessant debates, negotiations and arguments in which we, together with our brother delegations, have engaged from 1946 onwards in order to obtain the implementation of the right set forth in Article 73 of the Charter, a right which lies at the very foundation of the United Nations and which constitutes the very corner-stone, on which this edifice rests.

One of the objectives of this Organization as have already had occasion to point out, is,' in the words of Article 1 (2) of the Charter

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples ...

So long its one colonial territory still languishes under foreign yoke, so long will our task remain unfulfilled, so long will this objective of the United Nations remain frustrated and unfulfilled.

The debates during this session on the questions, of South West Africa and Rhodesia have amply demonstrated that the battle is far from won. So long as the colonial Powers and minority regimes, such as those of South Africa, Portugal and the illegal Smith regime in Rhodesia among others, continue to flout the conscience of mankind and the repeated resolutions of this Assembly, there can be no rest for us or any cessation in the intensity of our endeavours.

Six years have passed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It was envisaged at the time of the adoption of that resolution in 1960 that the moral and political authority behind it would lead the colonial Powers to change their policies and to turn over a new leaf. Unfortunately for us and for the cause of this Organization, these hopes have remained largely unfulfilled. At the same time, we note with regret that attempts are being made by colonial and other Powers to use the very principle of self-determination as a pretext or a device for dividing peoples and for subverting the independence and territorial integrity 'of established sovereign States. It was so as to safeguard against this that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), in operative paragraph 6, condemned in unmistakable terms all such attempts to distort the true meaning of the principle of self-determination.

Everyone here realizes the dangers of continuing with our outmoded ways of thought and action. I am sure that each one of us here is fully alive to the dangers of war-this much is part of our current cliche-to the dangers of the use of force, to the inhumanity and injustice of denying oppressed peoples the same freedom in which we live, a denial which, in itself, is a root cause of tension, strife, turbulence and instability the world over.

298

We are aware of the manifold steps taken in the fields of science and technology which are beginning to unfold new vistas that could be opened up by means of international co-operation for mutual benefit, and yet, today, we find ourselves in the position of having to salvage what was conceived as the very bedrock of this Organization.

As the representative of Poland observed during the debate on this item at the 1461st plenary meeting. on 11 November 1966.

"The choice and the decision are up to all nations : to persist in old habits of international relations, inconsistent with the new reality, or to build a community of independent States living in freedom and peace: to be slaves of the force, that we have unleashed, prisoners of circumstances that we ourselves have created, or to control them to use means provided by science and technology in order to create a better future, or to use them for our destruction." (1461st meeting, p. 7)

My delegation hopes that the outcome of this debate will take us some little step forward in the direction of the ideal of a peaceful and tolerant world, the declared objective of the founders of this Organization.

Speaking at an international conference against war dangers held recently in New Delhi, my Prime Minister called for the creation of massive strength against the forces of exploitation and war. She said:

"We have to renounce the idea of war; we simply have to renuonce the idea of war to solve our problems."

I began by stating that our sponsorship of the draft resolution is part and parcel of the general approach which my delegation, throughout these nineteen years, has endeavoured to display in this Assembly. In this connexion, the most recent statement of our policy. our principles, our aspirations, was made by the Chairman of our Delegation, our distinguished Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, when he participated in the general debate in plenary. May I take the liberty to quote once again from a very meaning-ful passage of his speech of 7 October 1966?

"In India, we strongly feel that the future of a peaceful world depends, in a decisive way, on the growth and consolidation of those tendencies which would scrupulously respect differences in political and, social systems prevailing in the world. It is our firm belief that countries such as ours-newly emergent and trying to give bread and liberty to their people ---can best serve the cause of peace in the world through consistent adherence to the principles of non-alignment.

In the measure this is recognised by the great and small Powers, in that measure we will generate the confidence that nations can develop, give a better way of life to their people and maintain liberty and national dignity in freedom and diversity," (1432nd meeting, p. 47).

Finally, I should like to refer briefly to the argument advanced--and I concede with great sincerity whether there is any point in reiterating passages of texts taken from the Charter and trying to draft a resolution. It is a valid point but I will submit in all humility, and ask, a counter question : Is there any point in the great teachers and leaders of the great religions of the world-which were born between two and three thousand years ago pronouncing day after day, or week after week, or on every sabbath, the fundamental principles of the Sermon on the Mount, or anything else ? Is there any point in their reiterating those principles which are two or three thousand years old ?

If it is not right for each generation to recall some of the truths which embody great human movements, either in the form of religion, or of great institutions, such as this United Nations of ours, it is to our mind always valid to repeat solemn principles, lest we may forget them. But the spirit in which our delegation co-sponsored this resolution is not with the idea of repeating mere moral precepts, howsoever well founded they might be. The object is, in all sincerity, to provide an opportunity to discuss and debate some of the fundamental premises and practices of the respective policies which we wish to pursue, and to see and examine to what extent, truly, the urges and temper of the latter half of the twentieth century warrant the pursuit of policies which probably may have had some justification in the past, but now constitute the most fundamental impediment to the restoration of confidence in relations between States.

299

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT ZIMBABWE SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE PORTUGAL POLAND

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

LAOS

Vice-President's Speech at his Dinner to the Crown Prince

His Royal Highness Prince Vong Savang, Crown Prince of Laos, and Princess Maniley Panya, paid a visit to India from November 3 to 18, 1966. On November 4, the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, gave a dinner in honour of the Crown Prince and Princess of Laos at Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi.

Speaking on the occasion, the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, said

Your Royal Highnesses, Excellencies, Ladies & Gentlemen,

On behalf of the Government and people of India, I should like to extend to Your Royal Highnesses and the Members of your party a most cordial welcome. We sincerely hope that your stay in India will be enjoyable, interesting and useful and that you will take back happy memories of your visit to our country. During the few days that you will be with us in India,. we hope that it will be possible for you to obtain a glimpse not only of the great cultural heritage that India and Laos share but also of our efforts to modernise our economy and thereby raise the standard of living of our people.

The visit of Your Royal Highness to India is another happy event in the long history of close friendship between Laos and India. Between the peoples of our two countries there. have existed ties of brotherly friendship which are centuries old. These ancient ties have been strengthened in modern times by our common endeavour not only to protect our freedom, but also to give social and economic meaning and content to that freedom.

I should like here to pay a tribute to Their Majesties, the King and Queen of Laos under whose guidance and inspiration your people have so valiantly, faced - innumerable viciss tudes brought about by developments in the area. The conflict in neighbouring Vietnam has inevitably cast its shadow over Laos, but under the wise leadership of His Majesty and the purposeful direction of the Royal Laotian Government, Laos has been able to steer a middle course in international affairs. We have every confidence that despite the difficulties, Laos will continue on the true path of non-alignment and neutrality.

In this difficult task, may I assure Your Royal Highness, that India, in her capacity as Member and Chairman of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos, will spare no effort to see that the Geneva Agreements am fully observed in the interests of peace. We are not unmindful of the difficulties and obstacles that have come in the way in the past or of the difficulties that might arise in the future, but we are encouraged by the fact that the Royal Government of Laos has provided all support and cooperation to the International Commission.

Your Royal Highness, between Laos and India there is no conflict of interests or any difference of opinion. Our two countries have assisted each other in many fields and I have no doubt that in the years to come, such cooperation will grow for the mutual benefit of our peoples.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I should now like to request you to join me in drinking a toast to Their Majesties, the King and Queen of Laos,, to His Royal Highness Prince Vong Savang and Her Royal Highness Princess Maniley Vong Savang and to the growing friendship between the peoples of Laos and India.

LAOS INDIA USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND **Date :** Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

LAOS

Reply by the Crown Prince

Replying to the toast by the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, His Royal Highness Prince Vong Savang, Crown Prince of Laos, said:

Your Excellency, Madam, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I would like to express to the Vice-President and the Prime Minister of India my gratitude and sincere thanks for being received so kindly and with friendship.

Our visit to India is first of all a pilgrimage to the source of our faith, to the holy place of our religion. We realise how strongly we are linked to the land of India by creed, culture and civilisation.

300

During this visit, besides seeing some parts of ancient India, we will also see the realisation of modern India in the fields of and industry.

We will certainly have the opportunity to appreciate the significant efforts made by the Government of India to improve the condition of living of its people.

Belonging to the same part of Asia, Laos has almost the same climatic conditions as India. India's experience in the fields of social and economic development is, therefore, of great importance for my Government. The lessons

We are particularly anxious to preserve and maintain the friendship and affection shown by India to Laos on so many occasions, and very recently, during the recent catastrophic floods in Laos.

I will be very happy if my visit can contribute to strengthen the links of friendship already existing between our two countries.

In expressing my deep gratitude to India, I wish you to drink to the-prosperity and happiness of the people of India.

Volume No

1995

LAOS

Vice-President's Speech at a Dinner given by the Crown Prince

The following is the text of the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain's speech at a dinner given in his honour by the Crown Prince of Laos in New Delhi on November 6, 1966:

Your Royal Highnesses, Excellencies, Ladies & Gentlemen:

I am deeply touched by the kind and generous remarks made by Your Royal Highness. I should also like to express my gratitude for this magnificient banquet which you have been good enough to hold in my honour. I have no doubt that the warmth of your sentiments springs from the heart of the great Lao people whose friendship we in India cherish so much.

Laos and India have known centuries of friendly relations. This great historical tradition of friendship and fraternal accord has had a common base in the cultural and religious heritage that we share. In more recent times, we have had the same ideas and aspirations, first in our common struggle for freedom and thereafter in bringing the fruits of that freedom to our peoples.

Your Royal Highnesses, visit has further strengthened these bonds. There is great scope for cooperation and exchange of ideas between our Governments and peoples and I have no doubt that the sharing of our experiences can be richly rewarding. The countries of Asia have Similar economic problems and social traditions and it is of importance that we draw from the experiences of each other. There is scope for economic and technical collaboration as also social and cultural intercourse which can make the concept of Indo-Laotian friendship a living reality.

Your Royal Highness, we are deeply conscious of the great problem confronting your country--problems which are not of your own making. There are pressures and pulls endemic in the situation in that area of Asia. I can assure you that we in India are watching with admiration the noble efforts of His Majesty the King of Laos and the Government of Laos to maintain the unity and independence and the neutrality of your country. In our own modest way we shall not fail to extend to your country our support in these efforts of yours. As Chair-man of the International Commission in Laos, we have been entrusted with special responsibilities. We firmly believe that the Geneva Agreement on Laos provides a sound basis for bringing peace and stability to your country. We are grateful to the Royal Government of Laos for their cooperation and support to the International Commission. We look forward in the coming years to still more fruitful and happy cooperation between our two countries.

May I request Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen to raise your glasses and drink a toast to Their Majesties, the King and Queen of Laos, to Their Royal Highnesses the Crown Prince and Princess of Laos and to the everlasting friendship between Laos and India.

301

LAOS USA INDIA SWITZERLAND **Date :** Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Lok Sabha on Prime Minister's Visit to Nepal

Shri M. C. Chagla, who took over as the Minister of External Affairs from Sardar Swaran Singh on November 13, 1966, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 21, 1966, on Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's visit to Nepal :

In response to an invitation from His Majesty the King of Nepal, the Prime Minister visited Kathmandu from 4th to 7th October, 1966. The Prime Minister was happy to have had this opportunity to exchange views with His Majesty the King, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and other leading personalities of Nepal.

The Prime Minister was deeply touched by the friendly and warm welcome extended to her during her stay in Nepal which was a manifestation of the friendly feelings of the people of Nepal towards India and the Indian people.

India and Nepal share a long border which is free and open for unrestricted movement by people on both sides. Our peoples share a common heritage and are closely bound together by history and geography and by a common culture and tradition. With such close associations in the past, it is only natural that we should work closely together to promote our many common interests.

The Prime Minister was greatly impressed by the 'visible and varied signs of progress she saw or that were reported to her in Nepal since her last visit to Kathmandu 13 years ago. We are happy that India has been of some assistance in furthering this progress. His Majesty the King also express to the Prime Minister his satisfaction at the speedy progress achieved in the implementation of Indian aided projects in recent years. She had the honour to inaugurate one such project in which we have collaborated--the Sundari Jal Water Supply Scheme, which serves the city of. Kathmandu. All the assistance we have rendered to Nepal has been conceived and made available in a spirit of friendly co-operation between neighbours. It is in accordance with this spirit that we have renamed what was hitherto known as the Indian Aid Mission, as the Indian Corporation Mission. Despite our own economic difficulties, we have decided to double the quantum of assistance to Nepal to about Rs.

40 crores during our Fourth Plan period which happens almost to coincide with Nepal's current five year plan. Large numbers of students and trainees from Nepal are studying in our universities and technical institutions. We welcome these and other contacts and would like to see them enlarged and strengthened in both directions.

The House will, I am sure, be glad to know that agreement has been reached on the Western Kosi Canal and the East-West Highway. Steps are being taken to sign the concerned agreements and it is expected that work will begin in the present cold weather.

The Prime Minister greatly welcomed the opportunity she had for a frank and cordial exchange of views with King Mahendra and Chairman Thapa. Our delegation also had talks with other Ministers and officials of the Government of Nepal. All these discussions have been extremely fruitful and have resulted in close and mutual understanding between our two countries. Our discussions, once again, revealed a continuing similarity of approach on international issues based on the principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. Both sides re-affirmed their vital interest in the territorial integrity, prosperity and general well-being of the other. We agreed in particular that international issues should be settled by peaceful means.

There was a preliminary discussion on certain issues pertaining to trade. It was agreed that these matters should be More fully considered by the officials concerned. An Indian Trade Delegation is accordingly visiting Kathmandu shortly' and I have no doubt that all the issues will be fully considered by them and resolved satisfactorily.

The Prime Minister was accorded a very warm civic reception by the citizens of Kathmandu and had an opportunity of addressing the rat Maitri Sangh and the Women's Organization of Nepal and meeting their members. Her visit to Bhaktapur, near Kathmandu, also enabled her to see something of the splendid cultural heritage of Nepal which has intermingled so closely with our own.

The Prime Minister extended an invitation to

Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal to visit India which they have accepted.

302

NEPAL INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING

Prime Minister's Statement in the Lok Sabha

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 2, 1966 regarding the Tripartite Meeting:

From October 21 to 24, a meeting between President Abdel Gamal Nasser and President Josip Broz Tito and the Prime Minister of India was held in New Delhi and we were privileged to play host to President Nasser and President Tito.

The meeting served a useful purpose in enabling the Heads of Governments of the three countries to exchange views about international developments and other matters of common interest. Although the meeting was of three countries only, some of the matters discussed are of great importance and will, no doubt, be of wider interest to the non-aligned and other developing countries, with whom we propose to share the results of our deliberations.

In our review of recent developments and the present international situation, the two Presidents and I were fully reassured in our belief in the continuing validity of the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence and their importance in fostering peace. We discussed and condemned every form of domination of one country by another, the attempts to divide the world and the Use of force in the settlement of disputes. We noted with satisfaction that the principles of nonalignment and peaceful co-existence were gaining greater acceptance and in this context considered the Tashkent Declaration as a positive contribution towards finding peaceful solutions.

Our analysis of current international trends helped identify several threats to non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, In brief, these stem largely from attempts to exercise pressures on or interference in the affairs of some nations by others; the blocks to progress created by forces of social reaction, sometimes with external support; the continuing existence of remnants of colonialism as well as of entrenched racialism, especially in Southern Africa; the failure to take more determined action to resolve the oppressive problem of poverty with its attendant tensions; and the increasing resort to force.

The statement on Vietnam included in our Joint Communique restates the basic elements that should go into a peaceful solution of the problem necessary for the well-being of the Vietnamese people and world peace.

The meeting reiterated its faith in the vital role of the United Nations. We are, glad that the efforts of the non-aligned nations and other progressive opinion found concrete expression in the latest resolution on South West Africa, which reflects the conscience of the world. The implementation of this resolution will be a challenge which we must meet unitedly.

The three Heads of Government expressed their anxiety over the intensification of the arms race and called for the early conclusion of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in accordance with the principles approved by the 20th Session of the U.N. General Assembly which clearly stipulate a balance of responsibilities between the nuclear and non-nuclear nations.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most outstanding result of the meeting was our collective approach to the economic challenges to non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. The newly independent and developing nations will be liable to strains and pressures until they attain a minimum level of development and enter a, stage of self-sustaining growth. The major effort in this regard must be their own. But the developed nations cannot evade their responsibility to accept and adopt fair trade practices as expressed in the Final Act of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development and to fulfil their obligation to transfer at least a net one per cent of their gross national product to the developing nations on terms and conditions that do not themselves constitute a crippling liability of debt repayment.

The unity of the 77 developing nations was one of the most notable achievements of the first U.N. Conference on Trade and Development. A second conference in this series is, to be held in New Delhi next autumn. We discussed the steps which the UAR, Yugoslavia and India might take, in cooperation with other developing countries, to ensure the success of the second World Trade Conference. As a first step we agreed that our Economic Ministers might meet in December not only to consider this issue but also to examine the, possibilities of cooperation between our three countries in the commercial, technical, industrial and other fields. For our part, we attach the highest importance to this decision. There is wide scope for mutual, regional, interregional and international cooperation. The conditions for this exist in some cases and can be created in others.

303

The positive reaction to the Tripartite Meeting on the part of several non-aligned and developing nations as well as of some developed countries is indicative of the extent of active interest in our deliberations and the growing desire on the part of the non-aligned and developing nations to ameliorate their common economic problems.

We are happy that at the end of the Tripartite Meeting, President Nasser was able to stay on for a brief State visit which gave us an opportunity to further discuss matters of interest to our two countries.

In concluding, Sir, I should like to say how much we appreciated the opportunity of welcoming in our midst the distinguished Presidents of the UAR and Yugoslavia with whose Governments and peoples we have such close ties. I am sure that warm friendship and co-operation between our countries will continue to grow And strengthen the forces of non-alignment' international peace and co-operation.

INDIA USA UZBEKISTAN VIETNAM YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Nov 01, 1966

December

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1966 Vol. XII DECEMBER No. 12

CONTENTS

PAGES CANADA

Indo-Canadian Agreement for Expansion of Rajasthan Atomic Power Station 305

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czechoslovak Cultural Exchange Programme 305

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the Security Council on Rhodesia 306

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly on the Granting

of Independence to Colonial Peoples

304

309

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly on Internatio nal

Co-operation Year

311

Shri B. C. Mishra's Statement on Protection of Independence and Sovereignt

- у
- of States
 - 312

Shri C. R. Gharekhan's Statement in the General Assembly on South West Africa

314

INDONESIA

Joint Communique on Indo-Indonesian Trade Talks 315

NEPAL

Joint Communique on Indo-Nepalese Trade Talks 317

RHODESIA

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in the Rajya Sabha 318

TRIPARTITE MEETING ON ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Shri Manubhai Shah's Opening Address 319 Joint Communique 321

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Joint Communique on Indo-UAR Trade Talks 324

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreement Signed 325

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CANADA NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA INDONESIA NEPAL

Date : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CANADA

Indo-Canadian Agreement for Expansion of Rajasthan Atomic Power Station

The Governments of India and Canada signed in New Delhi on December 16, 1966 an agreement, which will provide for the expansion of the Rajasthan Atomic Power Station by the addition of another unit of 200,000 kilowatts.

Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, Chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission and Secretary, Indian Atomic Energy Department, signed on behalf of India, and His Excellency Mr. D. Roland Michener, High Commissioner for Canada, on behalf of Canada. The expanded Rajasthan Atomic Power Station, which will now have a total capacity of 400,000 kilowatts, will make a valuable contribution to the power needs of Rajasthan and interconnected grids of neighbouring States in the northern region.

The Agreement provides that this expansion of the Rajasthan Station will be carried out on the same terms and conditions as the Agreement signed on December 16, 1963 for the installation of the first unit of 200,000 kilowatts. This includes provisions by the Government of Canada of special credit facilities (for an amount of about \$38.5 million for the additional unit) for the purchase of material and equipment that may be imported by India from Canada for the Station. It is envisaged that Indian design, equipment and facilities will be used to the maximum possible extent.

Letters were also exchanged between the Governments of India and Canada to specify the procedures for the implementation of provisions in the Agreement regarding the peaceful uses of both the Rajasthan Atomic Power Station in India and the Douglas Point Nuclear Generating Station in Canada. These provisions are reciprocal; they confer on both countries identical facilities for assuring themselves the peaceful uses of the two stations.

It is envisaged that the International Atomic Energy Agency will be requested jointly by the two countries to perform services for the implementation of these provisions within the scope of the bilateral Agreement and strictly in accordance with the procedures agreed to between India and Canada. This request to the International Atomic Energy Agency is to be made so that the Agency, following its agreement to undertake the services, may commence them when a reactor in each of the two stations has operated at full power for one year, or 15 months after a reactor in each of the two stations has first achieved criticality, whichever is earlier.

Today's Agreement and exchange of letters further reflect the long-standing cooperation between Canada and India in the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the desire of both countries to extend this cooperation further and to strengthen the close and friendly relations existing between them.

CANADA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA **Date :** Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czechoslovak Cultural Exchange Programme

A two-year Cultural Exchange Programme for the period 1966-68 between the Governments of India and Czechoslovakia was signed in New Delhi on December 14, 1966. Dr. (Mrs.) T.S. Soundaram Ramachandran, Union Deputy Minister of Education, signed on behalf of the Government of India, while Dr. F. Kahuda, First ViceMinister, Ministry of Education and Culture and Leader of the Czechoslovak Delegation, signed on behalf of the Government of Czechoslovakia.

305

The programme envisages exchanges and cooperation in the fields of education, science and technology, art and culture, social welfare, health, radio, films and television, etc., through visits of experts. scholars, research students, artists, art exhibitions, cultural troupes, grant of scholarships, exchange of publications, radio programmes, scientific publications and specimens, etc.

The programme has been signed in accordance with the Indo-Czechoslovak Cultural Agreement of 1959.

The Czechoslovak Delegation consisted of H.E. Dr. F. Kahuda, First Vice-Minister, Ministry of Education and Culture (Leader), H.E. Mr. Michalecka, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Education, Slovak Region and Madame C. Durdilova, Incharge of Cultural Affairs on India in the Ministry of Education and Culture.

The Indian Delegation was led by the Union Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. (Mrs.) T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA

Date : Dec 01, 1966

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 December 13. 1966 on the question concerning the situation in Rhodesia:

Mr. President, I am grateful to you and to the Council for affording an opportunity to my delegation to present its views on the question of Southern Rhodesia, with which the Security Council is once again seized. My delegation, along with other Afro-Asian delegations, attaches the highest importance to this grave colonial problem which poses a, threat to international peace and security.

The dramatic events of the past few days have confirmed the belief that my delegation has always held, namely, that the answer to the grave question of whither Africa will be a continent of peace or a scene of bloodshed and war depends on the speedy, bold, forceful and successful solution of this problem. It is now thirteen months since a handful of racists, defiantly and in utter contempt for the fundamental principles of the charter, dared to usurp authority from a Power many times stronger and declared Rhodesia to be independent.

The illegal seizure of power by fan Smith and his henchmen was condemned by the entire world community. The United Nations expressed its determination to put an end to the intolerable state of affairs in Rhodesia and repeatedly called upon the Government of the United Kingdom, in its capacity as the administering Power, to exercise its authority to the utmost to restore constitutionality and establish a democratic Government in Southern Rhodesia, based on the principle of one man one vote. The British Government itself declared the Smith regime to be illegal, and gave assurances of its firm resolve to put down the rebellion.

We had hoped that the administering Power would take appropriate steps to fulfil its promises. However, it is admitted on all sides-and the British Government would itself agree-that the measures adopted so far to- deal with the rebellion have proved to be totally inadequate to produce the desired results.

My delegation has always held, and continues to bold, that the only really effective method is the use of force, which the-administering Power is fully empowered to employ in dealing with such a situation. It is hardly necessary to go into all the details of the economic sanctions imposed by British and others on a voluntary basis; their ineffectiveness has been conclusively established. The very fact of the Council's present meeting, at the initiative of the Government of the United Kingdom, is final confirmation of what has been so earnestly urged by many delegations in the United Nations: half-hearted measures, imposing a limited-embargo on trade, would serve no purpose. Ian Smith and his hencemen will not come to their senses so long as they are treated with kid gloves.

As the Council is aware, the question of Rhodesia was discussed at great length at the last meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, held in London in September 1966. The Commonwealth Prime Ministers were unanimous on the objective that the rebellion in Rhodesia must be

306

brought to an end speedily. They also reaffirmed that the authority and the responsibility for giving Rhodesia independence rested with Great Britain. They restated their position that the principle of one man one vote was the very basis of democracy and should be applied to Rhodesia.

The then Foreign Minister of India, Sardar Swaran Singh, who participated in the conference, subscribed to these basic features, but made it unmistakably clear that India was not fully satisfied with the results of the conference. For one thing most Heads of Government, including mine, urged that Great Britain should make a declaration that independence would not be granted to Southern Rhodesia before majority rule was established on the basis of universal adult franchise and that this declaration should not be conditional on weather the illegal regime agreed to surrender or not.

However, no categorical assurance in this respect was forthcoming from the British Government. Again, most delegations, including ours, were convinced that mandatory sanctions of a general and comprehensive character should be applied under Chapter VII, Articles 41 and 42, of the United Nations Charter, and should cover both exports and imports. The British Government, however, would not go beyond giving the assurance that they would approach the Security Council for the imposition of effective and selective mandatory sanctions if, by the end of the year, the rebellion was not brought to an end.

My Government has always had the gravest misgivings over the negotiations which had been going on between the official representatives of the Government of the United Kingdom and the illegal regime in Salisbury. The British Government had repeatedly stated in the beginning that it would not, and in fact, could not, enter into official negotiations with a 'rebel regime. We all know, however, that the so-called "talks about talks" were actually high level negotiations between the two sides. Senior ministers and officials of the British Government made several trips to Salisbury to induce the Smith regime to come to some understanding. The climax of these negotiations came last week when no less a person than the British Prime Minister himself met the Head of the illegal regime on British territory. As the talks were held in utmost secrecy, we waited with anxiety and apprehension to learn the terms offered to Mr. Smith aboard the H.M.S. Tiger.

The proposals made by the British Government, which have now been published in an official White Paper, have confirmed our worst fears. Indeed, it has come as a great surprise to many of us that the Smith regime decided to reject these proposals because the amended constitution would have provided, in the words of the editorial in The New York Times of 9 December 1966,

"...for a permanently entrenched white, minority strong enough to block any future changes that would be unfair to the country's 220,000 whites". (The New York Times, 1966, p. 46).

Again, John, Hatch, writing in the New Statesman and Nation from Salisbury, has commented that, if Mr. Smith had accepted the working document,

"... the independence constitution would have given to the white supremacy group permanent power to maintain the status quo".

Whatever Mr. Smith's reasons for rejecting the British offer, it is obvious that for the people of Zimbabwe, the proposed constitution would have been entirely unacceptable. It is based on" the same discredited 1901 constitution which was rejected by the Africans, as well as the United Nations, its being unjust and undemocratic. Under the proposed constitution, the British Government offered to increase the "B" roll seats, which are reserved for the Africans, by only two, while earmarking seventeen "reserved" seats for the Europeans. The qualifications for franchise were so framed-as the Foreign Minister for Zambia has pointed out-that the Europeans would still have had fifty seats in an Assembly of sixty-seven. Of the twenty-six seats in the Senate, twelve would be reserved for the white minority and six for the Chiefs. The effective majority, therefore, in the Senate too, would have remained with the white minority and their feudal supporters. Further, what Ian Smith describes as the "unrepresentative interim government" would, in fact, have been headed by himself and would have been made up mostly from his own racist Rhodesian Front, with only two Africans, to be appointed by the Governor, in the cabinet. The proposed interim government could hardly have inspired confidence in the people of Zimbabwe when vital decisions regarding their future were to be taken by this authority. We in India, are familiar with device of this kind adopted by the Imperial power to present a facade of constitutional advancement, but that was many decades ago. We' are amazed that, after the progression of all these years, the British Government should have made such retrograde proposals.

The efforts to reach accommodation with the Smith regime having failed, the United Kingdom Government has taken the initiative to bring the matter to the Council in pursuance of the assurance that Prime Minister Wilson gave to the Commonwealth Conference.

May I now turn to the measures envisaged in the draft resolution contained in document S/7621 ? The commodities originating in Rhodesia, whose import into other States is to be prohibited under paragraph 1 (a) of the draft resolution, may theoretically constitute about half of Rhodesia's total, annual exports. We

307

believe however, that even if all States were to implement the trade embargo on these itemsand, this itself is doubtful--it would tail to have the necessary impact on the Rhodesian economy to the extent of producing the desired political result. We are firmly of the view that, in order to be effective, sanctions have to be of a general and comprehensive character to include both imports and exports of all items of trade. Such a comprehensive embargo alone, if implemented, would have some effect on the power-drunk minority regime in Rhodesia.

The single most important item of course, is oil. The voluntary oil embargo has proved to be totally inadequate. Oil has reached Rhodesia through South Africa and Mozambique in quantities more than enough for Rhodesian needs. The total requirement of oil in Rhodesia constitutes only 3 per cent of the consumption of oil in South Africa. It would, therefore, not be difficult at all for South Africa to continue to supply oil to Rhodesia for an indefinite period. The diplomatic representations made by Britain and others to South Africa and Portugal have not met with any success. The only effective course is to ban the export of petroleum and petroleum products to Rhodesia under Article 41 of the Charter.

It has been argued that mandatory sanctions of a general and comprehensive nature would inevitably lead to a confrontation with South Africa and Portugal. This may well be true. Indeed, both the South African and Portuguese Governments have made it clear that they would not participate in any sanctions against Rhodesia, thus once again demonstrating to the world the existence of the unholy alliance between the forces of racism and colonialism in southern Africa. The British Government has publicly declared that the new sanctions must be confined to Rhodesia. In the words of Prime Minister Wilson:

"This must not be allowed to develop into a confrontation, economic or military, involving the whole of southern Africa. Such a confrontation-and economic might lead to military--could have incalculable consequences for central and southern Africa going far beyond the issues raised by the Rhodesian problem." Such a statement at this juncture is unfortunate as it would encourage South Africa and Portugal in their defiance of the world community, even as an earlier affirmation by Prime Minister Wilson that on no account would force be used encouraged Mr. Smith to his illegal declaration of independence.

Nobody would under-estimate the serious import of the firm measures required to deal with an irresponsible racist regime like Ian Smith's and its friends. My delegation believes, however, that any hesitation on the part of the British Government would have far more serious consequences than wide-ranging mandatory sanctions would involve. The issues are clear. The policy of voluntary economic sanctions, with the many loop-holes that have been shown to exist and are capable of widening, will not bring the rebellion to an end. Therefore, if efforts to overthrow the Smith regime are to take the form of maximum economic pressure, such a policy should not be inhibited by tears of repercussions in southern Africa It is possible, though perhaps not probable, that South Africa and Portugal might choose not to defy the Security Council resolution. But it they did the widening of the scope of the Rhodesian conflict would be a direct result of their actions. It must be dealt with at the appropriate time with appropriate means.

In view of the considerations I have urged above, the measures envisaged in the draft resolution contained in document S/7621 have to be amplified and strengthened. The African members of the Council, after due deliberation, have proposed amendments with which my delegation is in full agreement.

Sanctions of the type that have been advocated would bring considerable hardships and sufferings to the Government and the people of Zambia. Here my delegation would like to pay a most sincere tribute to President Kaunda and the other leaders of Zambia for their resolve to undergo any sacrifice, with a view to restoring the lawful rights of the African people of Zimbabwe. Zambia has suffered a great deal--both financially and otherwise---owing to theh Rhodesian crisis. Comprehensive mandatory sanctions would mean yet more hardships for Zambia. A concerted programme of aid to Zambia to counteract these effects would have to be pursued as a matter of highest priority. My Government, which has already made a modest contribution in this regard, is willing and ready to participate in such a programme to the maximum extent which our resources would permit.

Our debate here concerns itself with the terms and clauses of the United Kingdom draft resolution, on which I have offered some comments. Let us not forget, however, that the course of history is irreversible and irrevocable. We are convinced that nothing and nobody can now put up an obstacle or a dam to prevent the forces of freedom in Africa from advancing to their goal. Our debate today and the decision of this Council must therefore be directed to assisting a speedy solution of the problem. The cost may be heavy and the course may be hard, but the stakes are high-and the stakes are the freedom and independence of the 4 million people of Zimbabwe and the issue of war and peace in the African continent.

308

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM PERU ZIMBABWE ZAMBIA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA PORTUGAL

Date : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's in the General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Peoples

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent, Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on December 12, 1966 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

The item now under consideration in the General Assembly is the report of the Special Committee of Twenty-four covering its work for the year 1966, which is a highly significant document. The Special Committee has undertaken extensive studies of some sixty Non-Self-Governing Territories, ranging from Territories that happen to be the focal point of world attention today to remote and small islands whose problems are hardly known to the rest of the world. The Special Committee has also undertaken two very valuable and specialized studies concerning the activities of foreign economic and other interests which am impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the territories under Portuguese administration and in Southern Rhodesia. My delegation, as a member of the Special Committee since its inception in 1961, has participated with keen and active interest in the Committee's work. In this regard, my delegation would like to place on record its great admiration for the dynamic and constructive leadership and guidance provided by Ambassador Collier of Sierra Leone as the Chairman of the Special Committee. My delegation is also deeply appreciative of the untiring efforts of the Chairman and the most cooperative attitude of the other members of the Committee, which enabled us to undertake our work in a most comprehensive and efficient manner.

The interest of my Government and peple in the historic process of decolonization artists from the fact that we emerged as an independent sovereign nation only about twenty years ago. While my delegation has been highly gratified to see a great many nations emerging as masters of their own destiny in the past few decades, we are also deeply concerned to note that there are still large ares in Africa and in other parts of the world under colonial domination. As my Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, stated while addressing the Afro-Asian group at the United Nations on 1 April 1966.

".....we who have recently gained independence from colonial rule cannot for a moment forget the sad plight and anguish under which our brothers and sisters exist in. Aden, Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and South West Africa".

The situation, especially in the southern part of the African continent, continues to be critical with no prospect for a peaceful and early solution, The diehard colonialists who have formed an infamous alliance against all forces of reason and justice continue to prosper at the expense of the blood and sweat of the indigenous Africans. In the opinion of my delegation-an opinion shared, I am sure, by a number of others these vicious remnants of colonialism manage to survive, partly at least, due to the direct and indirect assistance they get from some; of their powerful friends. My delegation regrets this deeply and reiterates its appeal to those countries to take effective action, that we believe is within their power, to destroy these bastions of colonialism.

It is not the intention of my delegation to comment in detail on the situation prevailing in the southern part of Africa as we have already done so on prior occasions in the Fourth Committee, as well as in the General Assembly. However, I wish to reiterate the gratification of my delegation at the decision of this Assembly to terminate South Africa's mandate over South West Africa. My delegation, which has been deeply concerned about the miserable plight of the people of South West Africa and has championed their cause in the United Nations since its very beginning, eagerly awaits the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the General Assembly in its resolution 2145 (XXI) concerning the practical means by which the Territory should be administered. Let me reaffirm once again the full and unreserved support of my delegation for the inalienable of the people, of South West Africa to self-determination and independence.

As regards the Portuguese colonies in Africa, we find that the policy of Portugal has only become more and more intolerable. Portugal, along with its racist-colonialist allies, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, has successfully thwarted every attempt made by this world organization to free the long-oppressed people of its colonies. In this regard my delegation also believes, as the study on the activities of foreign, economic and financial interests operating in Portuguese colonies indicates, that the large foreign monopolies operating in these colonies have long-exploited the indigenous people to reap quick benefits for themselves. In view of the foregoing, my delegation co-sponsored a

309

draft resolution in the Fourth Committee asking for mandatory economic sanctions against Portugal. It is the belief of my delegation that nothing short of this action will have any impact on the intransigent attitude of Portugal.

Southern Rhodesia is today the most explosive and critical problem facing this world body. The recent events that have brought the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom to the Security Council to ask for selective mandatory economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia have only served to substantiate the view of my delegation, often stated here, that the racist minority regime cannot be brought down by the half-hearted and ineffective measures that have so far been applied. The views of my delegation in this regard are fully expressed in resolution 2151 (XXI), 'Which seeks the application by the Security Council of the necessary enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter and calls upon the United Kingdom Government to take all necessary measures, including the use of force, to put down the rebel regime.

The extensive study on Southern Rhodesia undertaken by the Special Committee of Twentyfour has very clearly indicated that voluntary economic sanctions applied against Southern Rhodesia alone will not have the desired effect on the Southern Rhodesian economy as long as South Africa and Portugal refuse to co-operate. My delegation will, however, refrain from making any further comments on the failure of sanctions to bring about the desired results, as we shall have an occasion in the near future to state our views at length.

A great deal of time and attention has been given to the issue of Aden by the Special Committer, of Twenty-four and the Fourth Committee this year. My delegation welcomed the assurance given by the United Kingdom Government that it would- leave the territory by 1968, and that the military base in Aden would be removed. However, the statements made by the administering Power, as well as by the petitioners from Aden, indicated that the situation in Aden had worsened considerably and that an atmosphere of fear and violence prevailed in the territory. My delegation, along with a number of other members of the Special Committee, believed that the best manner in which the United Nations could assist-the People of Aden was by sending a special mission to Aden with appropriate term of reference. We hope and trust

that the mission, which will be appointed by the Secretary-General, will be able to accomplish its task with the co-operation of all concerned.

Now I turn to the island of Fiji, far away in the Pacific, where the United Kingdom 'Government has consistently disregarded the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Administering, Authority has vigorously pursued a policy meant to divide the communities and keep them apart in order to perpetuate the minority European interest in the island. It is commendable, however, that the Fourth Committee recently adopted, a draft resolution reaffirming the universally recognized democratic principle of "one man, one vote" and calling for its application in Fiji. My delegation has always rejected communal voting and has upheld the equal representation of every citizen, regardless of race or religion, as an inviolate and just principle. My delegation hopes that the Administering Power will agree to the visit of a mission to the territory, as it has done in the case of Aden.

Perhaps this is an appropriate stage in my intervention to comment on the general idea of sending visiting missions of the United Nations to Non-Self-Governing Territories. My delegation believes that its benefits are manifold. Not only does it help the United Nations to study the problems of a territory in their true perspective, but it also enables the peoples of these areas to become fully aware of the ultimate possibilities concerning their future. The practical utility of such missions in helping to prepare for elections or referendums and in any similar arrangements necessary before the achievement of internal autonomy or independence cannot be exaggerated. The case of the Cook Islands and the more recent case of a visiting mission to Equatorial Guinea are two of the many examples illustrating the utility of such missions. Needless to say, they also serve to highlight the deep involvement of the United Nations in the process of decolonization.

The Special Committee of Twenty-four through its Sub-Committees has done a commendable and pioneering study of the many island territories scattered in the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans. My delegation believes that these studies are very valuable for they not only provide guidelines to the Administering Authorities but urge them to take action where no action in the desired direction has been forthcoming, or where it has been delayed unduly. It is no exaggeration to maintain, as my delegation does, that but for the attention given to these small territories by the Special Committee, none of them would have achieved even the measure of self-government and economic and social development that they possess today.

The Special Committee visited Africa during the months of May and June 1966, at the invitation of the Governments of the United Republic of Tanzania, Algeria, the United Arab Republic, Somalia and Ethiopia. These visits enabled the members of the Committee to Some into closer

310

contact with the people of the dependent trrritories and better to comprehend the complexities of the situation. Many nationalist leaders from these colonies who could not have come to the United Nations Headquarters to ventilate their grievances, owing to the distance and cost involved, were also given easy access to the Committee in Africa.

I should like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation and gratitude of my delegation to the host countries in Africa, whose hospitality and co-operation were overwhelming. In this regard, my delegation also feels compelled to express its intense disappointment with some of the Administering Powers whose uncooperative and negative attitudes prevented the Committee from visiting some of the colonial countries to learn the facts at first hand.

At this stage I should like to refer with satisfaction and pride to Barbados, which achieved independence only a few days ago. My delegation followed the trials and tribulations of Barbados before independence with 'great interest and concern in the various bodies of the United Nations. The people of that new and young nation, who have long fought for the enjoyment of their inherent rights, have just begun their challenging and most exciting venture of national reconstruction and progress. Despite the many problems common to all newly independent nations and despite the problems arising from particular situations, my delegation has no doubt that these, courageous people, under the able guidance of Prime Minister Errol Barrow, will be able to shape their destiny in peace and prosperity. We extend our most sincere felicitations to the Government and people of Barbados, and my delegation looks forward to working with their representatives in this organization.

As a nation which has suffered all the evils of colonialism and imperial domination, our commitment to the cause of achieving freedom in every single colony is irrevocable. Colonialism and peace are irreconcilable and hence all nations of whatever ideological persuasion, which are devoted to the cause of peace should strive to put an early end to the last vestiges of colonialism.

Finally, let me affirm. on behalf of my Government and people that my delegation looks forward to another year of hard but most worthwhile work as a member of the Special Committee in our endeavours to bring freedom and independence to the millions who are still deprived of them.

My delegation has co-sponsored the draft re, solution contained in document A/L. 506 on the item now before the Assembly for consideration. We have done so in the belief that the implementation. of its provisions would greatly expedite the process of decolonization, which, in its turn, would help reduce the tensions prevailing in the world today, My delegation hopes that the draft resolution will be adopted by the Assembly by an overwhelming majority.

INDIA SIERRA LEONE USA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA PORTUGAL FIJI GUINEA ALGERIA TANZANIA ETHIOPIA MALI SOMALIA

Date : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly on International Co-operation year

Shri G. Parthasarathi, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the, General Assembly on December 7, 1966 on the International Co-operation Year

The draft resolution that has just been introduced by my colleague from the United Arab Republic, Mr. Hilmy, who has served with such distinction as the Vice-Chairman of the International Co-operation Year Committee, marks a happy finale to the activities of that Committee. Its work, as you know, grew out of a suggestion made by Jawaharlal Nehru, our late Prime Minister. In an address delivered to this General Assembly on 10 November 1961, he suggested that the time had come to make an attempt to create an international atmosphere in which it would be easier to solve the outstanding problems, of the world. He added that, while he could not suggest any rapid or magic ways to deal with the problems of the world, it might be helpful if more attention were directed to the cooperative activities being successfully pursued by the nations 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.

"... even... between countries which are opposed to each other in the political or other fields, there is a vast amount of co-operation. Little is known, or little is said about this co-operation that is going on, but a great deal is said about every point of conflict, and so the world is full of this idea that the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. Perhaps it would be a truer picture if the cooperating elements in the world today were

311

Put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on co-operation and not on conflict." (1051st meeting, page 623).

In pursuance of that idea, I recall with pleasure how my delegation, on 16 November 1961 proposed an item, "United Nations year for international co-operation" (A/4972), for consideration by the General Assembly. The suggestion was that a year could be designated during which all countries of the world could be requested specifically to emphasize and publicize the aspects of international co-operation which are usually taken for granted. That, we felt, could direct some of man's energy and some of his thinking to this essential aspect of today's world picture, thus making it easier to solve the problems which beset mankind. Our initiative finally led to a twenty-one-Power draft resolution which was adopted unanimously at the seventeenth session. The General Assembly then designated 1965, the twentieth year of the United Nations, as International Co-operation Year. By the same resolution the General Assembly set up a Committee which was entrusted with the task of making plans and preparations for the International Co-operation Year.

I need not at this stage go into the details of the activities undertaken by Member States, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations.

The special messages issued by various Heads of State, the seminars, lectures, programmes over radio and television networks, film shows, etc., all organized on what can be called a truly global scale, brought the concept of international co-operation to the citizens of the world-and, I hope, more especially to the younger people, all over the world. That 107 Member States and Territories found it possible to issue postage stamps of the same design, symbolizing international co-operation, was in itself encouraging The activities organized in many parts of the world are well known and were successful in creating increasing public awareness of the extent and significance, of international co-operation at all levels, and thus in creating better opportunities for further action and further progress.

An idea, a dream or it philosophy is difficult to concretize. And yet all of us who have participated in doing exactly that can truly feel grateful for the awareness that has been shown, not in one country or a dozen countries, but around the globe, grateful that the germ of this idea has taken root.

I described this as the finale of the activities of the International Co-operation Year. and yet perhaps it is only the beginning. The activities of a specific International Co-operation Year-1965-may well belong to the past, but the concept lives, and the work goes on. Co-operation, and not violent competition, keeps life moving and is the only hope for the future of mankind. Even the various specific projects and activities generated during the International Co-operation Year in a number of Member States have had a snowball effect, and a number of new ideas have emanated from them. Let us all hope that the spirit which motivated the work done during the United Nations Year for International Co-operation will continue to direct man's energy and man's thinking to the ideals of peace and cooperation and make it easier for us to evolve solutions to our problems.

INDIA USA

Date : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. C. Mishra's Statement an Protection of Independence and Sovereignty of States

Shri B. C. Mishra, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the First (Political) Committee of the General Assembly on December 10, 1966 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty :

The item under consideration, namely, the "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty", is one of Prime importance to the United Nations and particularly to the developing States Members of this organization. Last year. at its twentieth session, the General Assembly adopted, on the recommendation of this Committee, resolution 2131 (XX) setting forth the Declaration which is universally recognized and which testifies to the high importance that this Organisation attaches to the principle of non-intervention.

It is not necessary for my delegation once again to state in detail its views on the principle of non-intervention. I need only mention that the views of my delegation were stated in the First Committee during the twentieth session of the General Assembly. What we are discussing today is not so much the substantive content of the principle of non-intervention That has already been discussed and set out clearly in re-

312

solution 2131 (XX). Rather, our task today is to. consider the degree of compliance, if I may use. that term, with the rules of conduct spelt out in that Declaration.

The provisions of that Declaration make explicit what is already implicit in international law. Despite the arguments advanced to the effect that the Declaration is primarily a political document, my delegation remains convinced that compliance with its provision-, is not a mere matter of political desirability or necessity. In our View, the Declaration is not simply an exhortation to States to follow certain guidelines in their international behaviour; we consider that effective compliance with the Declaration is incumbent upon all States, especially States Members of the United Nations, not only as a matter of good faith, which is of cardinal importance in international behaviour, but also as a consequence of the modern dimensions of international law.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to dwell briefly upon the perspective in which we should assess the range and effect of the Declaration which we adopted last year. International law is not and cannot be static. As the distinguished jurist, Dean Pound, has stated, law must keep in touch with international life and reflect the realities of modern international relations.

This necessitates a dynamic process which, in

our imperfect world, is frequently found wanting. It is incumbent on us to remember that the number of independent States has vastly expanded during the past two decades. The basic norms of international law can only spring from the consent of States which constitute, even today, the vast majority of the subjects of international law. If the legal doctrines and principles are not commensurate with the real needs and aspirations of our times, then we will be faced with the situation where conditions are, not ripe for the development and maintenance of a world public order. If we are to enthrone Lex as Rex, then, surely, we should strive for adapting and formulating the basic norms of international law so as to give them full meaning and vigour.

Speaking at the twentieth session of the General Assembly, the Indian delegation referred in detail to the various developments which have taken place in Latin America, in Asia and Africa, in the non-aligned world, the United Nations and elsewhere, which have already added to the specific content of the principle of nonintervention and which is now crystallized in the Declaration adopted at the twentieth session. The Convention concerning the duties and rights of States in the event of civil strife, signed in Havana in 1928; the, Declaration of American Principles, adopted at Lima in 1938; the Charter of the Organisation of American States, signed at Bogota in 1948; the Declaration of Bandung of Afro-Asian countries of 1955; and the Declarations of the non-aligned countries of Belgrade, 1961, and cairo 1964, and Article 3 of the Charter of the Organisation of African Unity, 1963, constitute some of the positive legal and juridical bases underlying resolution 2131 (XX).

There can be no doubt that the principle of non-intervention, in all its ramifications, is an established norm of international law. In fact, it is a direct corollary of the basic principle of respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of States. Peaceful and friendly relations among States depend on the strict application of the principle of intervention. Intervention by one State in the internal affairs of another tends to increase international tension and threaten the peace and security of the world. The principle of non-intervention thus is an essential principle governing relations among States and it serves as one of the bulwarks guaranteeing the sovereign equality of States. Any interference aimed at fettering the right of a State to decide the course of its own political or economic development is bound to cause international friction, thus endangering peace and security in the world.

It was those considerations which led the nonaligned countries to declare in unambiguous terms the following at their Second Conference held in Cairo in 1964 :

"States must abstain from all use or threat of force directed against the territorial integrity and political independence of other States, a situation brought about by the threat or use of force shall not be recognized, and in particular, the established frontiers of States shall be inviolable. Accordingly, every State must abstain from interfering in the affairs of other States, whether openly or insidiously, or by means of subversion and the various forms of political, economic and military pressure, Frontier disputes shall be settled by peaceful means."

Again, it was those considerations which led my delegation to conclude its statement in this Committee at the last session with the following words :

"Without firm, resolute and unreserved action on the basic first principle, we can proceed no further. The principle of non-intervention should be the basic norm of our civilization and is an essential prerequisite of international co-operation and the maintenance of international peace. In fact, it is the 'ground norm', or the mainspring, of other norms regulating relations among States.'

313

In expressing our regret and disappointment at the lack of compliance with the Declaration in certain parts of the world, we do nor intend to minimize the difficulties of interpretation and of judging in specific case just what act constitutes intervention. We are all aware that a great deal rests upon States acting in good faith. International society is still, today, on a different plane from municipal societies. We do not have an effective mechanism for ensuring compliance With the norms of international law, except in the admittedly remote contingency of unanimity among the great Powers. This being the case, it is all the more important, in our view, that the General Assembly should fully exert its considerable moral and political authority by examining from time to time the current trends in international relations, against the background of the basic norms of conduct such as those contained in the Declaration under discussion now. My delegation would sincerely hope that, by this process, we would contribute, at least indirectly, to the re-examination by States of their politics, with a view to ascertaining their compatibility with the basic principle of non-intervention, which has been expounded and affirmed by a near unanimous vote at the twentieth session.

I referred a little earlier to the emergence of new States. The most crucial problem facing States which have recently shaken off the chains of colonialism relates to their political, economic and social development. But planned, orderly and peaceful development is just not possible without universal acceptance of the concept of peaceful coexistence. And, of course, the foundation of the concept of peaceful coexistence is the principle of non-intervention. Instances have been cited here in this Committee of some systematic policies of intervention pursued by major Powers. True enough, and they deserve to be condemned. But it is true that the principle of non-intervention is basic to the development of peoples of developing States, what are We to say of the spectacle of intervention in the domestic affairs of developing States by other developing States ? It is not enough that there should be peaceful coexistence among major or super Powers. It is even more important for developing States to adopt the concept of peaceful coexistence as basic to relations among themselves. There is no other way to protect our political independence and pursue our economic and social development. The balance of terror has made it impossible for the major Powers to intervene directly in the affairs of each other. But in many developing nations there are leaders who for well known reasons, fall prey to the policies of the major Powers and become tools for indirect intervention. This is true not of one or two regions of the world but of all the regions of the world.

We have before us a draft resolution sponsored by the delegation of the Soviet Union, and amendments which were originally sponsored by certain Latin American States and which we have now agreed to co-sponsor. We urge the Committee to give unanimous support to the draft resolution as it would be amended.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CUBA PERU COLOMBIA INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA EGYPT

Date : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. R. Gharekhan's Statement in the General Assembly on South West Africa

Shri C. R. Gharekhan, Member of the Indian 'Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on December 20, 1966 on the question of South West Africa:

One of the most important decisions taken by the General Assembly at its current session was undoubtedly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966. Under the terms of that resolution the General Assembly, conscious of its obligations to the people suffering under colonial domination anywhere and, in particular, in South West Africa, and acting within the terms of the Charter and in conformity with its almost universally recognized competence, terminated the mandate conferred upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa. Under the same historic resolution the General Assembly also declared that South Africa had no other right to administer the Territory and that South West Africa henceforth came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. What is more important. the General Assembly resolved--and

I should like to emphasize the word "resolved" to discharge those responsibilities with respect to South West Africa.

Paragraph 7 of resolution 2145 (XXI) called upon the Government of South Africa

"... forthwith to refrain and desist from any action, constitutional, political or otherwise, which will in any manner whatsoever alter or tend to alter the present international status of South West Africa.

The response of the racists of South Africa to this call of the world community has been predictably negative and defiant. South Afria's res-

314

ponse was to extend to the Territory all its hideous policies of aparthied and racial discrimination in various fields of social intercourse. The last of the series of such acts was the. appointment of the notorious Odendaal Commission.

"The General Assembly, as was to be expected, reacted very strongly to the recommendations of the Odendaal Commission and declared, in its resolution 2074 (XX) that :

".....any attempt to partition the Territory or to take any unilateral action, directly or indirectly, preparatory thereto, constitutes a violation of the Mandate and of resolution 1514 (XV)."

The provisional summary record of the 1679th meeting, of the Fourth Committee in document A/C. 4/SR. 1679, however, contains some very disturbing information. We find therein that the South African Government has formulated plans to remove, by force if necessary, the entire African community from its location at Windhoek to a new location in Katutura. It will Be recalled that a similar move by the South African Government in 1959 had led to violent opposition by the Africans, eleven of whom died and many of whom were injured during the disturbances that followed. Despite all efforts by local and South African officials, by persuasion, offers of compensation and various forms of pressure, to secure their removal to Katutura thousands of Africans and some Coloureds remained in the old location. The present plans of the South

African Government are conclusive evidence of its determination to go ahead with the implementation of the Odendaal Commission report, thus once again demonstrating its utter contempt for the world Organization.

My delegation, along with many others, has submitted a draft resolution to this Assembly which is contained in document A/L. 511. The draft resolution seeks to give voice to the grave concern which the cosponsors feel about the reports of the latest actions of the South African Government. These actions, coming as they do after the momentous resolution adopted less than two months ago, must be regarded as beingillegal and invalid, since that Government has been deprived of any locus standi whatever in the Territory of South West Africa. The General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI), has assumed a very grave responsibility in full awareness of all the implications involved.

The time has now come-as it was bound to come sooner or later to assert the authority of the United Nations. As a first step towards discharging these responsibilities, the least the General Assembly can do is to denounce these illegal acts committed by South Africa in South West Africa.

That is what the sponsors of the present draft resolution call upon the Assembly to do. However, as was explained by the representative of Ghana, we have been approached by many of our friends with a request not to press the draft resolution to a vote. We have been assured that they agree in principle with the ideas contained in it, but would require more time to consult their Governments to obtain the necessary instructions in order to be able to support it. The sponsors are also aware that the General Assembly is to meet in a special session to consider the question not later than in April 1967. Furthermore, the Special Committee of Twenty-four is fully competent to deal with this matter. In the circumstances, the sponsors have decided not to press the draft resolution to a vote.

INDIA USA SOUTH AFRICA NAMIBIA GHANA **Date :** Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Joint Communique on Indo-Indonesian Trade Talks

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in Djakarta on December 28, 1966 at the conclusion of the Indo-Indonesian trade talks

At the invitation of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, Shri Manubhai Shah Minister of Commerce, Government of India, visited Djakarta from 26th to 28th of December, 1966, as the head of a delegation for talks on trade and economic cooperation. The Indonesia delegation was led by H. E. Maj. Gen. D. Ashari, Minister of Trade, Government of Indonesia.

315

Shri Manubhai Shah took the opportunity of his 'Visit to 'pay courtesy calls on H. E. Gen. Socharto, Chairman of the Presidium of the Ampera Cabinet, H. H. Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono IX, Presidium Minister for Economic and Financial Affairs and H. E. Mr. Adam Malik, Presidium Minisiter for Political Affairs, and laid a wreath on the Heroes' Cemetery.

The Indian delegation consisted of : Shri P. Ratnam, Ambassador of India in Indonesia; Shri D K. Srinivasachar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, Shri S. G. Rarnachandaran, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Shri R. Bhandari, Director, Ministry of External Affairs; and Shri P. K. Kapur, Commercial Secretary, Embassy of India in Djakarta. The members of the Indonesian delegation were: Brig. Gen. Subijono, Member of Parliament; Mr. Harmiel Sonda, Head, Directorate for Foreign Trade Relations, Department of Trade; Mr. Sukiram, Head, Directorate of Foreign Trade Policy; Department of Foreign Affairs; Mr. Samadikun, Assistant Manager, Foreign Department, Bank of Indonesia; Mr. Darmono, Economic Counsellor, Indonesian Embassy in New Delhi; and Mr. Kusumonegoro, Head of Asia Section, Directorate of Foreign Trade Policy, Department of Foreign Affairs. and the delegation was assisted by four experts, namely, Mr. Sanusi of the Department of Health; Mr. Murtolo of the Department of Textile & People's Industry; Mr. Siswanto Putranto of the Department of Plantation, and Mr. Atje Wirjaman of the Department of Trade.

The, talks between the two delegations which were presided over by H.E. Maj. Gen. D. Ashari, were primarily intended to negotiate and conclude a new trade agreement in place of the agreement which expired earlier this year. At the conclusion of their discussions, the two Ministers set their signatures to-day to the Trade Agreement which will remain in force for two years.

Under the Agreement, the two countries will endeavour to increase the levels of their trade and diversify it to the maximum extent possible. Indonesia will export to India commodities such as petroleum products, rubber, palm oil, copra, betel nuts and any other goods which are permitted to be exported under the Indonesian import and export regulations. India will export to Indonesia a variety of goods like textiles; jute manufactures; chemicals; pharmaceuticals and drugs; paints and varnishes, steel and steel products and engineering goods, as also other goods which are allowed to be exported under the Indian import and export regulations.

The two delegations also discussed the possibilities of increasing economic and technical cooperation between the two countries. It was considered that there was plenty of scope for the establishment of joint ventures. It was mentioned in this connection that the National Industrial Development Corporation of India, which had undertaken a number of feasibility studies in other countries, could also be of assistance in locating fields for possible joint ventures in Indonesia and for preparing feasibility studies thereon. The two delegations felt that technical experts and Industrial advisers of the two Governments should meet as early as possible with a view to drawing up proposals and programmes for such studies and for joint ventures.

It was also agreed that the two Governments would explore the possibilities of providing training to technicians in the fields in which each country had the necessary know-how and that existing facilities in both countries should be utilised more intensively. India's Minister invited Indonesian youths to be trained in India in Banking, Accounts and Audit, Railways, Power Plant-, and various industrial technologies. This was in conformity with the concept of growing regional economic cooperation in technical assistance amongst the developing countries.

During the talks, the possibility of each country holding exclusively national exhibitions in the other was discussed. This would help the businessmen and industrialists of each country to acquaint themselves with the growing diversification of products and the technologies in the other country. It was stated that India would be prepared to hold such an exhibition in Djakarta in 1967. The Government of Indonesia would also consider the possibility of holding an Indonesian exhibition at a suitable place in India thereafter, as may be convenient.

Both the delegations recognised that it was essential for businessmen, traders and industrialists from each country to visit the other as frequently as possible with a view to familiarising themselves with the scope for imports and exports from either country. For this purpose each country will endeavour to receive at least two businessmen's delegations in 1967.

The discussions also covered the question of utilisation of Rs. 100 million (US S 13-33 million) credit recently offered by India to Indonesia, and the delegation agreed on the procedures that would be necessary for the quick implementation of the credit agreement. The Ministers expressed the hope that with the introduction of these procedures, the flow of trade between the two countries would be speeded up, and that this would lay the foundation for steadily increasing levels of trade exchanges between them. It is expected by both the sides that not only would normal trade relations between the two countries be restored soon but that as a result of all these steps, there would be considerable expansion of trade and economic cooperation between the two countries in the near future.

316

The two delegations agreed to continue and intensify mutual cooperation in international bodies such as ECAFE, UNCTAD and GATT, and also work in close cooperation with other developing countries in various international forums.

In order to review the working of the Trade Agreement and the progress of the various measures for increasing technical and economic cooperation between the two countries. it was agreed that senior officials of the two countries should meet periodically as and when mutually convenient.

The talks took place in a very cordial and friendly atmosphere. Both Ministers were deeply gratified at the successful conclusion of the talks. H. E. Maj. Gen. Ashari expressed his pleasure at the visit of India's-Commerce Minister and his delegation and Shri Manubhai Shah conveyed the grateful thanks of himself, his delegation and the Government of India for the generous hospitality extended by the Indonesian Government during his delegation's visit to Indonesia.

INDONESIA USA INDIA MALI UNITED KINGDOM RUSSIA **Date :** Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Joint Communique on Indo-Nepalese Trade Talks

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued on December 28, 1966 at the conclusion of the trade talks held in Kathmandu between the official delegations of India and Nepal:

In pursuance of the provisions of Article XIII

of the Treaty of Trade and Transit, the delegation of Nepal led by Shri Kumarmani A. Dikshit, Acting secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, His Majesty's Government of Nepal, and the delegation of India, led by Shri K. B. Lall, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, Government of India, held talks with each other from December 20, 1966 to December 27, 1966. These talks were held in the traditional spirit of cordiality and friendship and yielded solutions for some of the difficulties, which had been experienced in effectively implementing the provisions of the Indo-Nepal Treaty.

The developments which have taken place in Nepal in the field of trade promotion since the conclusion of the Treaty were noted with satisfaction. It is hoped that the conclusions reached in the current round of discussions will prove helpful to the expansion of mutual trade and to the diversification of Nepal's trade.

The Indian Delegation gave expression to the Government of India's keenness to aid and assist in the process of industrialisation. In this connection the proposal for the formation of a Joint Industrial Co-operation Council was discussed and it was envisaged that it would be set up as early as possible- The proposed terms of reference for the Council include, inter alia, cooperation between their respective Industrial Development Corporations and the preparation of feasibility studies and project reports.

Both Governments have agreed to make further endeavours severally and jointly to make available to each other, commodities and products which one country needs from the other and to avoid to the maximum extent possible diversion of commercial traffic or deflection of trade.

An Inter-Governmental Joint Committee has been set up to resolve, for the mutual benefit of the two countries, such difficulties as may arise in practice. This Committee would meet once every quarter alternately in Kathmandu and New Delhi.

Some of the difficulties experienced in the movement of goods across the Indo-Nepal border have been resolved; for instance, procedures regarding piece-meal clearance of goods or inspection of broken or damaged consignments at border rail heads or expeditious settlement of claims, and provisions of crane facilities have been agreed upon. It has been decided that difficulties which may arise in future will be referred to the Border Committee, which has been formed and to which representatives of the concerned Departments and State Governments will also be invited.

317

Matters relating to the levy of excise duties and import duties on trade exchanges between the two countries were discussed. On the question of the export of Nepalese manufactures to India, agreement has been reached providing for the waiver of the countervailing charge i.e., Additional Duty leviable in lieu of Indian excises. A procedure for the exports of some manufactures has been adopted whereas for others the procedures are expected to be completed before February 1, 1967.

The two delegations discussed the question of Nepalese tariff discriminatory to India and of the refund of additional and special excise duties to Nepal and agreed to further discuss the matter later with a view to arriving at a mutually satisfactory solution.

To provide further facilities for transit traffic across India and to remove the difficulties which have been experienced by the Nepalese importers/exporters, it has been agreed that all import cargo arriving at the port of Calcutta will be moved in the first instance to the transit shed, from where it will be expeditiously cleared by the Customs authorities in Calcutta. It has also been agreed that Indian laws will not apply to the transit trade of Nepal. In the event of discrepancies between the import licence and relevant invoices, the concerned consignments will be moved under a note of discrepancy, subject to regularisation in due course by the Nepali authorities. It was agreed, that suitable alternatives to the procedure relating to import licences would be further considered.

The Indian Railway authorities will endeavour to move Nepali import and export cargoes expeditiously. A Working Group of Indian and Nepalese railway officials will be set up to consider how 'these arrangements can be further improved, including the proposal for Nepal to own or rent its own wagons.

It was also agreed that the question of road movement for transit traffic would be considered by the Joint Committee.

It was also agreed that air passengers to and from Nepal along with their accompanied baggage would be accorded the internationally accepted transit facilities.

The proposal to provide a separate and selfcontained space for handling Nepalese cargo at an Indian port in West Bengal has been agreed to in principle. The matter will be discussed further between the two Governments in the light of the study which is proposed to be made of the arrangements which are in force for the movement of cargoes from the ports of Rotterdam, Trieste and Hamburg to land-locked States.

The movement of Ganja from Nepal to India has been prohibited.

The two delegations recognised that the close connections between the economies of the two countries promote mutual benefit and also gives rise, from time to time, to certain difficulties. They are convinced that the arrangements which they have agreed upon will help to remove these difficulties and strengthen economic cooperation and promote economic progress for the benefit of both the countries.

NEPAL USA INDIA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GERMANY

Date : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

RHODLSIA

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in the Rajya Sabha

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Aff-

airs, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on December 9, 1966 on Rhodesia:

As the House is aware, at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference held in September last, most of the Representatives, including India, urged that Britain should make a categorical declaration that independence would not be granted to Rhodesia before majority rule is established on the basis of universal adult franchise and that this declaration should not be conditional on whether or not the illegal regime agreed to surrender. They further urged that Britain should refuse to resume discussion or to negotiate with the illegal regime. The British Government. however. did not agree with this. but informed that they would try to bring the rebellion in Rhodesia to an end before the end of the year failing which they will withdraw all previous proposals

318

for a constitutional settlement and would be prepared to join in sponsoring in the Security Council of the United Nations before the end of the year a resolution providing for effective and selective mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia.

The British Government have had since then series of talks with Mr. Smith, ending in lastminute final round of talks between the British Prime Minister and Mr. Smith. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Smith concluded their discussions on HMS 'Tiger' and produced without commitment on either side a "working document". It was decided between them that both sides would decide by 10 a.m. G.M.T. December 5, 1966, whether the document was acceptable in its entirety by their respective colleagues.

The terms of the document in substance, we understand, conformed to all the six principles laid down by the British Government and, in particular, laid emphasis on the fifth principle which related to the testing of the opinion of the people of Rhodesia as a whole after the restoration of the legal government to see that a basis proposed for independence was acceptable. The test was to be carried out by a Royal Commission who would be given freedom to operate as it wished. Censorship was to be removed and arrangements were to be made for the release of detenus before the test of opinion. It is now known that Mr. Smith finally rejected the "working document". The British Government in pursuance of the commitment made by them at the Commonwealth Prime ministers' Conference, have now called for a meeting of the security Council to invoke selective mandatory sanctions on the following items of export from Rhodesia :

Tobacco, asbestos. meat and meat products, copper, chrome, sugar, pig iron, hides and skins and iron ore.

While we note the British initiative to bring the matter to the Security Council, we are, at the same time, of the view that the sanctions proposed do not go far enough and are unlikely to be effective. The Government of India continues to be of the view expressed at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, a view supported by most of the members of the Commonwealth, that voluntary sanctions having failed, if the Smith regime is to be brought down, mandatory sanctions of a general and comprehensive character should be applied under Chapter VII, Articles 41 and 42, of the U. N. Charter, covering both imports and exports.

We believe that apart from an embargo on Rhodesian exports, some, at least, of the major imports such as oil, petroleum products, textile fabrics, machinery and spares and fertilizers should also be banned mandatorily from reaching that country. Among these imports we attach the greatest importance to oil and petroleum products.

To this end, we have instructed our representative at the U. N. to put forth our viewpoint vigorously on these lines and in consonance with Afro-Asian opinion.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ITALY **Date** : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

TRIPARTITE MEETING ON ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Shri Manubhai Shah's Opening Address

Shri Manubhai Shah, Union Minister of Commerce, made the following speech on December 12, 1-966 at the opening of the three-day Tripartite meeting on economic cooperation of the Ministers of the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and India, which was convened in New Delhi in pursuance of the decision set out in the Joint Communique of October, 1966 by the three Heads of State

I deem it a great privilege to welcome all of you here for the Tripartite Meeting on Economic Cooperation between U. A. R., Yugoslavia and India. This is a historic meeting-indeed first of its kind---ever held between countries drawn from different continents to forge closer economic links between themselves. When our leaders met in October 1966, they considered it imperative to give meaning and content to their

319

endeavours by strengthening and deepening the economic cooperation between oar Governments in technical, commercial and industrial fields. We are assembled here in pursuance of the agreement between the two Presidents and the Prime Minister.

May I venture to point out at the, very outset that it is none of our task i.e., the task of this Tripartite meeting, to lay down precepts or principles for other countries, or to be anybody's spokesmen, except our own. We meet here-a number of friends in a friendly way to discuss and deliberate on common problems that confront us.

Our meeting is the result of the felt need on our part for widening the areas of economic and technical cooperation between our three countries. It is also in recognition of the immense potentialities that exist in this field. It is in endeavour to discharge our responsibilities to

1995

our respective countries, to one another and to the world community as a whole.

In the course of our work at this Meeting, we would have to make a determined effort to explore ways and means for taking practical steps for discharging these responsibilities. I hope that in doing so, we can try to evolve a sound and practical basis of cooperation, relevant to the problems of developing countries as a whole and also to the problems as between developing and developed countries. We also hope that it will be possible for other countries to participate in such endeavours so that the pressing problems of our time are mitigated and resolved. The gap between the rich and poor nations is widening and it is, therefore, necessary to rouse the conscience of the world to bestir betimes to take a hard and practical look at these problems and to take remedial measure on an urgent basis, to solve them.

Your Excellencies will perhaps bear me out that in this meeting we are not embarking upon an altogether new venture or trying to blaze a new trail. We are starting on the solid basis of a very close economic and commercial cooperation already existing between us on a bilateral basis. We have also established very close collaboration between our three Governmets and with those of the other developing countries in the work of international bodies like UNCTAD, GATT, ECOSOC etc. In our meeting during the next few days, we have to address ourselves to the task of what needs to be done further to widen and enhance our cooperation for economic developing bilaterally, trilaterally and on a multilateral basis.

We had regarded the first U.N. conference on Trade and Development held in Geneva in March/June, 1964. as a turning point in the history of our times, as it was at that Conference that the international community for first time, took a pledge to tackle the problems of the developing poor countries--the Historic 77-in a systematic and concerted manner and gave to itself the. necessary machinery, and the framework of a dynamic international trade and development policy, to redeem this pledge during the shortest possible time. Unfortunately the results achieved so far have been distressingly disappointing. Action since the first UNCTAD has fallen far short of the expectation aroused by the UNCTAD Conference and in the meantime, the reasons which led to the convening of the first conference have become more compelling and have assumed greater urgency than at the time of the first conference.

In this context, it is a matter of some satisfaction that a consensus has emerged among both developed and developing countries that the second conference, which is going to be held in New Delhi in early 1968 (and not 1967), should concentrate on action and achievement, In the coming year, before this conference, the developed and developing countries should together intensify their efforts, in the meetings of the Trade and Development Board and its committees and expert groups, to make an advance in fields which are of immediate and primary concern to the developing countries.

The exchange of views that is going to take place between us during the next few days will, I am sure, enable us to evolve effective means for cooperating closely among ourselves and with other developing countries towards making an adequate preparation for the Second Conference: We could perhaps also discuss how the three countries can, by individual and joint efforts, make an effective contribution for the formulation of concrete proposals by the developing countries in the meeting of the '77', preparatory to the second conference, and now, on that basis, an understanding could be reached with the developed countries to ensure that the second conference succeeds in achieving its basic objectives.

The two Presidents and the Prime Minister in their meeting in October declared the resolve of their Governments to take practical steps to expand the area of mutual cooperation, increase trade exchanges, pool technical and scientific experience and undertake joint endeavours to develop mutually beneficial patterns of trade and development. Our task in this meeting is to give concrete shape to this resolution. There are immense possibilities in all these fields :-

There can be a substantial increase in our trade exchanges and a planned augmentation in such exchanges can greatly stimulate our economic growth and can lead to a more rational utilisation of the resources of the three countries.

320

We can also usefully cooperate, in jointly exploiting the marketing possibilities for our products in other countries, particularly in the developed countries and in seeking the removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers to our exports in these markets.

There is also tremendous scope for increasing our invisible earnings by cooperating in the field of shipping, insurance, tourism etc. We will examine what practical steps we can take by way of pooling of knowledge and resources to expand our infrastructure in these fields.

In the industrial field, we could try to identify the sectors in which the existing bilateral arrangements can be strengthened and explore the possibilities of cooperating on a tripartite basis for setting up joint ventures in one of our three countries or in fourth countries for the fullest and most efficient utilisation of our factor endowments.

There are also wide possibilities of cooperation in the scientific, and technical field by exchange of research information, through the establishment of a joint clearing agency for the exchange of such information, through the fuller utilisation of the facilities available in the existing technical and scientific institutions in the three countries and, wherever possible, by jointly establishing new institutions.

Our officials, in their meetings during the last four days have covered, in a business-like and thorough-manner, the entire field of economic cooperation among the three countries. They have produced extremely useful documents mapping out the possible areas of cooperation among the three countries in the scientific. industrial, commercial and broad economic sectors. I am sure the comprehensive work already done by them will considerably facilitate our task and enable us to successfully complete our work during the short time at our disposal.

Your Excellencies and distinguished delegates, allow me to conclude by expressing my best wishes for the successful outcome of our meeting and for our taking at least one step forward, howsoever modest it may be, towards the fulfilment of the high expectations which the meeting of- the two Presidents and the Prime Minister only a few months ago had justifiably given rise to. I also wish your Excellencies and the distinguished guests a pleasant stay in India.

INDIA YUGOSLAVIA USA SWITZERLAND **Date :** Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

TRIPARTITE MEETING ON ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Joint Communique

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on December 14, 1966 at the conclusion of the Tripartite meeting on economic cooperation of the Ministers of the UAR, Yugoslavia and India:

In pursuance of the decision taken by President Tito, President Nasser and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi at the Tripartite meeting held in October this year, the Ministers of the three countries met in New Delhi from December 12th to 14th, 1966, to examine the possibilities of cooperation between their Governments in the technical, commercial and industrial fields.

The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was represented by H. E. Mr. Aleksander Grlickov, Member of the Federal Executive Council; the United Arab Republic by H. E. Mr. Hassan Abbas Zaki, Minister for Economy and Foreign Trade; and the Republic of India by Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of Commerce.

The three Ministers noted the progress already achieved in developing economic cooperation on a bilateral basis, and agreed that there was considerable scope for strengthening and widening economic relations on a tripartite basis.

EXPANSION OF TRADE

The Ministers were impressed by the possibilities that existed for augmentation of production in each of the three countries, with a view not only to meeting one another's growing requirements of primary products, industrial raw materials, intermediate goods and finished products, but also to build up their export capacity in general. They accordingly decided that these possibilities should be explored in depth, and that the scope for mutual cooperation in export sales to one another's markets and to markets of other countries determined as concretely as practicable. They considered that to this end special payment arrangements may be entered into as and when necessary.

The Ministers discussed the possibilities of reciprocal expansion of trade, and were of the view that trade exchanges among the three countries could be developed to much higher levels than at present.

In this connection, they agreed that steps should be taken to establish preferential tariff arrangements within the framework of the evolving international commercial policy. It was decided that officials of the three countries should meet at an

321

early' date, to negotiate mutual exchange of preferences, extendable to other developing countries on a basis of mutual benefit. These officials would also make recommendations for simplifying and adapting trade regulations and procedures. with a view to promoting the expansion of trade. The hope was expressed that their work would be completed within three months.

It was also agreed that trade and payments procedures currently in force on a bilateral basis between the three countries should be reviewed, taking into account the developments in their respective economies and the recent trends in their commercial policies, with a view to evolving measures for enlarging mutual trade exchanges and for furthering the trend in the direction of multilateralising their trade relations.

The Ministers were of the view that maritime transport services among the three countries should be improved, and that consideration should be given to the establishment of a permanent and regular joint shipping service. They decided that the details in this regard should be worked out by a group consisting of shipping experts and representatives of the organisations concerned in the three countries.

The Ministers noted that facilities were available in the free trade zones of the three countries for storing, processing and transhipment of goods, and considered that the utilisation of these facilities would promote not only trade between the three countries but also the expansion of. trade with other countries. It was agreed that the organisations and enterprises concerned should be encouraged to enter into specific arrangements for utilising the facilities.

INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION

The three Ministers reviewed the existing arrangements for technical and industrial cooperation, and noted with satisfaction that considerable progress had already been made in several sectors. It was agreed that in these sectors the basis of cooperation could be intensified, and wherever practicable, enterprises encouraged to negotiate tripartite arrangements. It was further considered that industrial cooperation could be usefully extended to a number of other sectors, more particularly to industries engaged in the processing of agricultural products and of minerats, in the manufacture of capital goods and durables, and in the production of fertilisers and other chemical products.

To this end, it was felt that steps should be taken to exchange information on development perspectives, programmes and projects, and there after to consult with one another in order to identify areas of fruitful cooperation with a view to promoting specialisation in production, bringing about economics of scale and facilitating the establishment of joint ventures.

It was decided that the three Governments should examine the current difficulties suitable measures, particularly in the field of adaptation of trade regulations and provision of credit facilities, so as to intensify industrial tooperation aid to provide expanding markets for their finished products.

The adequacy of the services provided by banking and insurance institutions in the three

countries was reviewd, and it was considered that closer contacts between these institutions, especially for financing trade exchanges and providing reinsurance facilities and credit support would help to promote trade and industrial and technical collaboration.

The Ministers took note of the existing facilities for travel, particularly for businessmen, industrialists and technicians, between the three countries, and agreed that the question of streamlining procedures for the grant of visas, as also the suggestion for waiving visa fees, should be studied. It was decided that appropriate measures, including payment arrangements, to promote travel. and tourist traffic between the three countries, should be adopted. It was also agreed that consultation and contact between the tourist agencies of the three countries would contribute towards the promotion of tourism.

TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

The Ministers noted the progress which had been made in the three countries in the field of industrial technology and scientific research and felt that the sharing of technical and scientific knowledge between them on a tripartite basis was not only practicable but could prove mutually helpful, and could hasten the: process of industrial cooperation. They felt that such cooperation could with advantage extend to : the, provision of the services of experts; utilisation of training facilities in institutes of technology, industrial establishments, laboratories etc.; fuller use of engineering and other consultancy services available in the three countries; greater and regular exchange of information on research work. conducted in the industrial and scientific fields, including the adoption of production processes developed in any of the three countries; conducting joint research in scientific, technological and industrial fields; and promoting greater exchange of students and trainees.

As a first step, it was agreed that information in regard to institutions and organisations and availability of facilities and expertise in various fields such as productivity, management, technical skills, planning, consultancy, market research etc., should be exchanged, and specific measures for the utilisation of such services, facilities and expertise devised thereafter by means of joint consultations.

322

The three Ministers considered that fuller use could be made of the consultancy and design services available in the three countries and agreed to encourage contacts and collaboration between competent organisations towards that end.

The Ministers considered that the various steps proposed to be taken by their Governments to strengthen economic relations between the three countries have been conceived as an integral part of the efforts currently being made by developing countries to strengthen mutual cooperation. it was their hope that their initiative would lead to concrete results, and that it would be possible to bring together initiatives in other parts of the world for regional and inter-regional cooperation, with a view to promoting mutual cooperation embracing all developing countries.

COOPERATION IN INDUSTRIAL FORUMS

The three Ministers surveyed the course of the struggle against under-development, and noted with appreciation on the consensus among developing countries, members of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in regard to their common interests, objectives and endea-vours. They expressed satisfaction at the close collaboration that had developed between the three Governments, and addressed themselves to the task of What needed to be done to strengthen their contacts, among themselves and, with the other developing countries, in the work of international forums like the U. N., UNCTAD and GATT.

The Ministers noted with deep concern that action since the first Conference for meeting the needs of developing countries had not matched the promises held out by the Final Act of UNCTAD. In view of the recent decision to postpone the Conference to early 1968, the need had become more imperative, during the year 1967, for the implementation of the recommendations of the first Conference and for taking concerted action in fields which are of immediate and primary concern to developing countries. The Ministers expressed the confidence that it would be possible to take meaningful action in this interval in particular matters, such as, stabilising prices of primary commodities and providing fuller access for them, improving the conditions of access for the manufactures and semimanufactures of developing countries into the markets of developed countries, fulfilling the targeted increase in the magnitude of transfer of capital from developed to developing countries and improving its terms and conditions resolving the difficulty posed by the outstanding debt burdens of developing countries, and finding suitable solutions to the problems of liquidity as affecting the developmental process in developing countries.

The Ministers reiterated the importance they attached to the second Conference, due to be held in New Delhi in early 1968, and took note of the consensus that had already emerged among the developed as well as developing countries that it should concentrate on action and achievement. They expressed the hope that further dialogue between the developed and developing countries, and further work in the UNCTAD and its organs, would help the extension of this consensus, and promote the emergence of a common determination to deal conclusively at the Conference with matters of immediate concern to developing countries, and to provide guidelines for tackling other problems. The Ministers felt that such an approach should lead to a programme of practical action for the, remaining part of the current Development Decade, and pave the way for securing more substantial progress during the succeeding decade.

The Ministers felt that it was essential for developed and developing countries to prepare themselves. in advance and adequately for the second Conference. Towards this end, the Ministers thought it important for developing countries to meet together, preferably in the autumn of 1967, to formulate their concrete proposals for a fruitful dialogue with developed countries. They endorsed the proposal for a special Ministerial mission of developing countries meeting the Heads of Governments/States of the principal developed countries with a view to impressing on them the urgency of finding solutions to the problems of developing countries, and consulting with them on the programme of work and action necessary to secure a further move for progress in these fields.

The Ministers agreed that the three countries should continue to exchange views and information, not merely amongst themselves but with other developing countries, on the various aspects of preparations both for the meeting of developing countries and for the second Conference itself, and expressed their readiness to take appropriate initiatives in that behalf.

The Ministers reviewed the work in the GATT and the progress in the Kennedy Round negotiations. While noting that Part TV of the General Agreement had now come to have legal effect, they were disappointed that the commitments made therein remain unfulfilled. The hope was expressed that the forthcoming meeting of the Trade and Development Committee in Punta del Esto would help to make substantial progress.

The Ministers were concerned to note that the trading concessions so far offered in the course of the Kennedy Round were inadequate and urged the principal Contracting Parties to make meaningful improvements in their offers so that the

323

commitments made at GATT Ministerial level meetings might be at least partially fulfilled. They considered that it might be necessary for the Contracting Parties to address themselves at an early date to seeking solutions for the trading problems of the developing countries which might remain unresolved at the conclusion of the Kennedy Round of Negotiations.

MEASURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION With a view to implementing the conclusions reached by them during the course of their discussions, the Ministers decided to set up a number of ad hoc Working Groups to deal with and make recommendations in regard to the various aspects of cooperation They further decided to establish a permanent Joint Committee to guide, and coordinate the work in the technical, commercial and industrial fields, and to review the progress from time to time.

In the course of these discussions; the Ministers were gratified at the closeness of approach and similarity of outlook on the part of the three Governments in regard to problems and possibilities of economic cooperation. The cordiality, friendliness and frankness with which the talks were held enabled them to evolve a common understanding and a community of thought which, they felt, constituted a very good augury for the future of economic cooperation among themselves and in the comity of nations.

INDIA USA YUGOSLAVIA RUSSIA

Date : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Joint Communique on Indo-UAR Trade Talks

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on December 15, 1966 on the bilateral discussions between India and U. A. R. on matters relating to economic and trade co-operation :

In pursuance of the decision taken during the talks in New Delhi in October 1966 between the President of the United Arab Republic, His Excellency Mr. Gamal Abdel Nasser and the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. the Minister of Economy and Foreign Trade of the U. A. R., His Excellency Mr. Hassan Abbas Zaki, and the Union Minister of Commerce of the Government of India, Shri Manubhai Shah, held discussions in New Delhi from 8th to 14th December on the development of technical and economic cooperation between India and the UAR.

The two Ministers noted with satisfaction the progress already made in this direction, particularly in the field of trade. The trade between the two countries had grown almost two-fold from Rs. 250 million in 1961-62 to Rs. 480 million in 1965-66. They were convinced that there was further scope for the two countries meeting each other's needs. As a step in this direction, the two Ministers agreed on an in-

crease in their trade exchanges in cotton, tea, steel etc., by Rs. 135.5 million. This will be over and above the, levels of trade envisaged in their Trade Agreement for 1966-67.

The two Ministers considered the possibility of industrial cooperation between India and the UAR in the setting up of joint ventures. They felt that there was scope for such cooperation in the UAR in the field of (i) machine tools, (ii) diesel engines and pumps and (iii) fertilizers, and that the UAR in her turn could collaborate in India in (i) reclamation of deserts and (ii) improvement of cotton cultivation. They agreed that these questions should be examined in depth by experts of the two sides Who should submit their report within six months.

The two Ministers also agreed that the industrial activity in the two countries could be harmonised with a view to complementing production of various components and ancillaries of industries already established in the two countries.

The two Ministers also discussed the possibility of utilisation of the facilities for storage, transhipment and processing available in the Free Trade Zones at Port Said and Kandla. They agreed these facilities could be utilised not only for stepping up their mutual trade, but also their trade with third countries. They decided that this question would be examined in detail by their experts.

The two Ministers noted that advanced training facilities in various fields of technology were available in both countries and that full advantage was not yet being taken of them. They

324

agreed that this potential should be exploited to the full.

The two Ministers agreed to set up a Joint Committee consisting of high officials of both countries to, coordinate all activities connected with Indo-UAR economic cooperation. The Committee will meet once a year alternately in Cairo and New Delhi. The Ministers will take personal interest in the work of this Committee and meet as and when necessary in the interests of rapid development of economic relations between the two countries. The two Ministers expressed their conviction that cooperation between India and UAR would be of mutual benefit and would lead to further strengthening of the friendly relations already existing between them. It would also be in keeping with the objectives set out in the first U. N. Conference on Trade and Development for efforts by developing countries to assist one another in their development programmes and in the industrialisation and diversification of their economies.

INDIA USA EGYPT

Date : Dec 01, 1966

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Loan Agreement Signed

An agreement for a loan of œ 13,500,000 to the Government of India from the British Government was signed in New Delhi on December 5, 1966 by Shri C. S. Krishna Moorthi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Mr. John Freeman, British High Commissioner in India.

This loan has been made available in flexible non-project form in recognition of India's need for quickly disbursible aid arising from the im-Port liberalisation measures, the current food shortages and the substantial service payments due to Britain under previous loans.

This completes Britain's aid pledge to India for 1966-67. The new loan will be for 25 years, free of interest, with repayments beginning after the seventh year, as were the three loans totalling œ 17,000,000 signed on May 10, 1966. INDIA USA **Date :** Dec 01, 1966